



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 166

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JULY 22, 2020

No. 129

House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CUELLAR).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
July 22, 2020.

I hereby appoint the Honorable HENRY CUELLAR to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2020, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with time equally allocated between the parties and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 9:50 a.m.

THE CULTURE WE CREATE IN OUR ARMED SERVICES MATTERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BROWN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman SMITH and my colleagues on the House Armed Services Committee for their bipartisan work on this year's National Defense Authorization Act.

We advanced progressive ideals to support our military families; improve readiness; sharpen our technological edge; and foster American leadership,

our alliances, and a culture that is in line with the values of our Nation.

This bill is truly transformational when it comes to advancing diversity and inclusion, as well as fairness and justice, in our military.

We are at an inflection point when it comes to race in this country, demonstrated by peaceful protests across the country and at a time when a pandemic has widened disparities in healthcare, education, economic opportunity, and housing along racial lines.

Our armed services are not immune to these currents.

The military has historically prided itself as leading in opportunity and advancement for men and women of color, but we have fallen far short of our expectations. Today we are still grappling with a military that doesn't fully reflect our country's diversity. Forty-three percent of the Active-Duty servicemembers are people of color, yet only two of the 41 most senior generals and admirals in the military are Black, and only one woman.

As recent events have brought a reckoning in our society, we are still debating symbols of oppression. White supremacy, racism, and other toxic beliefs exist within our ranks, impacting how Black soldiers advance, their assignments in career fields, and how they are treated and assessed.

African Americans comprise just a single-digit percentage of fighter pilots and navigators, only 5 percent of Army Green Berets, 2 percent of Navy SEALs; and only 0.6 percent of the Air Force's power rescue jumpers are Black.

Structural racism still exists in our military formations. Fifty-three percent of minority servicemembers report they have seen examples of white nationalism or racism within the ranks. These issues didn't happen suddenly, but festered unchecked by a culture of indifference or intolerance.

This culture extends to gender disparities we still see in our Armed

Forces. We have made progress and, this year, witnessed historic barrier-breaking firsts:

Chief Master Sergeant JoAnne Bass was selected as the first woman to serve as the highest ranking non-commissioned officer in a service component;

Lieutenant Junior Grade Madeline Swegle became the Navy's first Black female tactical jet pilot;

The U.S. Army just welcomed its first female Green Beret.

However, there is more work to be done:

Women have never exceeded 27 percent of nominations made by Members of Congress to the prestigious service academies;

In 2009, more than 6,000 cases of sexual assault in the military were reported. The Pentagon estimates these reports amount to just 30 percent of assaults, primarily against women.

Women and men, whose trust in their fellow soldiers has been shaken, need our support and for this Congress to step up.

This year's NDAA takes important steps to create a more diverse and inclusive military. It builds on the work in 2008 of Majority Whip JIM CLYBURN, Representative HANK JOHNSON, and former Members of this Chamber Elijah Cummings and Kendrick Meek. As members of the Congressional Black Caucus, they recognized years ago that the military was not living up to the potential unlocked in 1948 when President Truman signed the executive order removing racial segregation in the Armed Forces.

Together, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. Cummings, and Mr. Meek led the effort to create the Military Leadership Diversity Commission, whose recommendations in 2011 are the basis for many of the diversity and inclusion provisions found in this year's NDAA, which are some of the most significant steps towards diversity and inclusion

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H3615

that Congress itself has taken since the desegregation of the Armed Forces in 1948.

It seeks to foster opportunities for women and minorities.

We bring new visibility to congressional nominations to our service academies to train a more diverse next generation of leaders.

We create a special investigator to review and investigate racial disparities in the military justice system and personnel practices.

We create a special prosecutor for sexual assault committed at our military academies.

We foster and train a greater number of minorities within the special forces and aviation communities.

We tap into the talent at our historically Black colleges and universities and other minority-serving institutions.

We hold the Secretary of Defense and service component leadership accountable for progress and give them the tools to make it happen.

This package updates workplace and climate surveys to include experiences with supremacist and extremist activity, anti-Semitism, and racism, allowing leadership to understand the full extent of these beliefs and better tailor responses and disciplinary action.

Finally, after decades of inaction, we reckon with one of the darkest periods of our history, the institution of slavery. This NDAA bans the display of the Confederate flag on Department of Defense property and directs the removal of the names from military installations of those men who betrayed their country—our country—and who fought a war to defend the institution of slavery.

The culture we create in our armed services matters. Diversity and inclusion in our armed services matters. It enhances unit cohesion and it improves military effectiveness. We have known this since 1950.

Our work is far from finished, but this year's NDAA represents an important step toward this pivotal moment.

HONORING MAJOR GENERAL BILL BLAND

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember and honor the life of Major General Bill Bland of Georgia's First Congressional District, who passed away peacefully at his home surrounded by family at 84 years old.

General Bland is the former Adjutant General for the State of Georgia and a beloved husband, father, and a good friend.

He enlisted in the Georgia Air National Guard in 1958 and received his pilot's wings in 1962 at Moody Air Force Base.

General Bland served faithfully in a variety of assignments which took him

all over the world. He was a command pilot with more than 8,000 hours, flying in nine different types of aircraft. He also served in the position of Adjutant General until his retirement in 1999, after more than 40 years of service in the U.S. Air Force and Air National Guard.

I had the honor and privilege of attending church with General Bland and his lovely wife, Harriet, at Wesley Monumental United Methodist Church. It was evident Jesus Christ was the Lord and savior of Bill's life, and he used all the gifts God gave him to serve others and bring glory to God. He was an active and faithful member of the church, where he served on the board of trustees for 17 years.

General Bland will surely be missed by his friends, family, our church community, and all who knew and loved him. His legacy of selfless devotion to our country and those in need will remain for countless years to come.

CELEBRATING THE FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT TRAINING CENTER'S 50TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center's, or FLETC's, 50th anniversary.

Since the Consolidated Law Enforcement Training Center was created in 1970 before becoming the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center, they have continued the mission of safeguarding our homeland and serving as America's enterprise resource for Federal law enforcement training.

In its first year, FLETC graduated 2,200 students. Last year, FLETC welcomed more than 67,000 students. They have grown to manage more than 850 training programs across the training sites, including one in Brunswick, Georgia.

For the past 50 years, FLETC has been a critical program to ensure our officers of tomorrow receive the proper training to protect the communities in which they serve.

FLETC has done a great job at adapting throughout their existence from hurricanes, government shutdowns, to a worldwide pandemic. Whatever they have faced, FLETC has done a remarkable job at getting invaluable Federal law enforcement personnel to the front lines.

Now, more than ever, is an important time to honor their five decades as the Nation's producer, resource, and steward of Federal law enforcement training.

Mr. Speaker, I thank all who work tirelessly at FLETC, especially those at Glynn County in Georgia's First Congressional District.

REMEMBERING KYLE STEVEN HUGUNIN

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember and honor the life of Mr. Kyle Steven Hugunin.

Friends, family, and members of Kyle's community recently recognized the 1-year anniversary of his passing at the youthful age of 30. He was from Savannah, in Georgia's First Congressional District, and was an out-

standing, kind, and loving individual, who was a friend to all.

Kyle was employed by Industrial Conveyor Belt Services for 10 years and worked hard in all he did.

While reminiscing on Kyle's abundance of joy that he brought to all family, friends, and others, they recalled that "he had one of the best smiles ever." He represented what it looks like to truly live life to the fullest and not take any day for granted.

Kyle was a 2007 graduate of Benedictine Military School and loved the outdoors, hunting, fishing, golf, and baseball.

My thoughts and prayers go out to all who knew and loved him during this difficult time.

CONGRATULATING BRUNSWICK-GOLDEN ISLES CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Brunswick-Golden Isles Chamber of Commerce for the U.S. certification at the highest five-star level.

Accreditation with the U.S. Chamber of Commerce is the only program of its kind. It defines excellence in chamber planning and recognizes chambers for outstanding contributions toward positive change in their communities. There are currently only 204 chambers across the country that have earned the accreditation designation, and only 128 are five-star.

The Brunswick-Golden Isles Chamber of Commerce has been the voice of the business community and a leader among community programs.

I applaud all members of the chamber for their hard work throughout the years to excel above other chambers throughout the Nation and their efforts to lead by example.

In part due to the chamber's hard work and dedication, our community is an exceptional place to live, work, and visit. I look forward to seeing the positive future of the chamber and the communities they help serve and grow.

CRITICAL INITIATIVES INCLUDED IN FISCAL YEAR 2021 NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the House passed H.R. 6395, the William M. (Mac) Thornberry National Defense Authorization Act.

The passage of this year's NDAA in the House was a bipartisan achievement done under extremely difficult circumstances, and I would like to congratulate Chairman ADAM SMITH, and particularly Ranking Member MAC THORNBERRY, as this will be his final NDAA before his retirement at the end of this year.

I wanted to take a few moments to highlight some of the provisions in this legislation which I am grateful were included.

These include provisions which will strengthen manufacturing in my home

State, protect the employment rights of our Nation's servicemembers, help to improve maternal and mental healthcare for servicemembers and their families, and strengthen ties with one of our Nation's oldest allies.

The Southern New England Regional Commission, H.R. 5124, which this bill included, establishes a regional commission that will facilitate the investment of Federal funds in southern New England, including my home State of Rhode Island, to build upon our regional strengths, such as defense manufacturing, shipbuilding, and renewable energy. This initiative will generate critical economic growth in the region to reduce poverty, unemployment, and out-migration in counties that were hit hardest by the Great Recession and now by COVID-19.

Mr. Speaker, I acknowledge Congressmen JOE COURTNEY, JOE KENNEDY, STEPHEN LYNCH, JOHN LARSON, and BILL KEATING, who are cosponsors of this legislation, and I thank them for their support of this critical initiative which will benefit all of our districts.

This year's NDAA also includes the Justice for Servicemembers Act, H.R. 2750, which I authored, clarifying that the statutory rights of servicemembers and their families under the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act cannot be waived through forced arbitration unless it is agreed to after a dispute arises.

American servicemembers, veterans, and their families have sacrificed much in service of our country. They have fought to protect the fundamental idea that we are a nation of laws and institutions that guarantee the rights and prosperity of every American.

Since the Second World War, Congress has created many laws, including the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act, to provide essential protections and guarantee every veteran and Active-Duty servicemember, including the Reserves and National Guard, the right to be free from workplace discrimination on the basis of their military service and their right to their day in court to enforce these protections. But for too long, forced arbitration has eroded these fundamental protections by funneling servicemembers' claims into a private system set up by corporations without the same procedural safeguards of our justice system.

Buried deep within the fine print of everyday contracts, forced arbitration clauses block the brave men and women in uniform, as well as their family members, from having their day in court to hold corporations accountable for breaking the law. This bipartisan provision ends this shameful practice by clarifying that arbitration clauses are only enforceable if agreed to by servicemembers or their families after a dispute arises.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues, Congressman JARED GOLDEN, Congresswoman SUSAN DAVIS, and Congressman GUY RESCIENTHALER, for their strong bipartisan support for this provision to

protect our men and women in uniform.

□ 0915

Also included in this year's NDAA is a provision which will require the Department of Defense to provide a report to Congress on the maternal healthcare, in particular mental healthcare, that is available to our Nation's servicemembers, as well as the spouses of servicemembers.

According to the CDC, 1 in 8 women nationwide experience symptoms of postpartum depression, and in some States that percentage can be high as 1 in 5.

Yet, according to the What to Expect Project, data related to instances of postpartum depression and other mental health conditions associated with pregnancy and childbirth is not widely available.

This report required by the amendment will require the Department of Defense to outline the care that is currently available for servicemembers and their spouses who may experience symptoms of postpartum depression.

Finally, this year's NDAA will include a provision which will encourage greater investment and trade between the United States and Portugal.

Last year, I introduced the Advancing Mutual Interests and Growing Our Success, or the AMIGOS Act, H.R. 565, which makes Portuguese nationals eligible for E-1 and E-2 nonimmigrant visas if the Government of Portugal provides similar nonimmigrant status for U.S. nationals, legislation which passed the House without opposition in December of last year.

Access to these investor visas will allow Portuguese investors to support projects in the U.S., benefiting our economy as well as that of Portugal.

As one of the first countries to recognize the United States after the Revolutionary War, Portugal is one of our closest economic partners and strongest allies.

Today, the United States maintains that longstanding relationship as the fifth largest export market for Portugal, and its largest trading partner outside the European Union.

The AMIGOS Act will strengthen this trade partnership and strengthen ties with our longtime NATO ally, Portugal.

I would like to acknowledge Congressman BILL KEATING and Congressman DEVIN NUNES for their support of this provision, and the instrumental role they played in securing its inclusion in this year's NDAA during the House Armed Services Committee markup.

I would, once again, like to thank Chairman SMITH and Ranking Member THORNBERRY for supporting these provisions, and for their work on this year's National Defense Authorization.

THE CONVERSATION ON STATUE REMOVAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from

North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, it is time, yet again, to correct the record.

For years, my colleagues across the aisle and the mainstream media have been spouting off unfounded claims that Republicans are complicit with the presence of statues in the Capitol that memorialize figures who had ties to the Confederacy.

Democrats seem to have forgotten that members of their own party on the State and Federal levels are the ones responsible for these statues in the first place.

Since 1870 statues have been present in the Capitol, and since then, Democrats retained a majority in the House 39 times. They had ample opportunities to remove controversial statues from the Capitol, yet, they did nothing. Why has it taken this long for them to even broach the issue?

We can all agree that racism, in any shape or form, must be denounced and rejected. But it is odd that my colleagues across the aisle want to skew the narrative, do everything they possibly can to rewrite history, and insert themselves into a conversation where they lean on conjecture more than they do on facts.

For years, I have advocated that both of North Carolina's statues of Charles Aycock and Zebulon Vance be removed based on their ties to the Confederacy.

I have suggested that two statues of people that all North Carolinians and Americans can be proud of be put in their place. I am proud that the first Republican majority in North Carolina's legislature in 140 years voted in 2015 to replace the Aycock statue with a statue of Reverend Billy Graham.

For years, the North Carolina Democrat Party has used former Governor Aycock's name, along with Governor Vance, for major fundraisers, and have held meetings in buildings named after him. Where was the initiative then?

North Carolina's former Democrat Governor, Bev Perdue, sidestepped questions about buildings named after former Governor Aycock in press conferences. Instead, she pivoted to his impact on public education in North Carolina. Again, I say, where was the initiative to remove the statues then?

Even in 2007, in a Democrat primary for Governor in North Carolina, it was said that addressing controversial statues was not the answer and that "the issue of equality is one that North Carolina must deal with on a more broader level."

If our colleagues across the aisle want to have a meaningful discussion on this issue with us, we welcome it.

The decision to replace these statues goes beyond bipartisan collaboration. It is about doing what is right, in an expeditious manner, as opposed to exploiting a situation to score cheap political points.

Mr. Speaker, describing the vote we will hold today as "political showmanship" would be an understatement.

Maybe it is to compensate for the fact that Democrats are responsible for the statutes having been placed in the Capitol and the times Democrats failed to act in the past. You be the judge.

**WE HAVE BEEN WARNED; NOW
WHAT DO WE DO?**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. HIMES) for 5 minutes.

Mr. HIMES. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday night, Christopher David, a veteran of the United States Navy, was walking in Portland when he came upon an odd sight: Federal agents, in full tactical gear, heavily armed, looking for all the world like the operators that we drop into terrorist havens in Afghanistan, patrolling the streets of an American city; detaining Americans; hustling them, unexplained, into rented minivans.

Now, is Mr. David a masked ninja of anarchy? No.

Was he throwing rocks or carrying bottles of gasoline? No.

Mr. David was curious, and he stood there, clearly unarmed, clearly not a threat, curious.

And here is where it gets interesting, and any American who hasn't seen the video needs to look at it right now.

A Federal agent, gas mask, body armor, camouflage, bristling with weapons and tactical gear, approaches Mr. David, winds up, and beats Mr. David repeatedly with his truncheon.

Mr. David doesn't move. His hand has been broken by a Federal agent, but he doesn't move, not a muscle.

Well, the agent is confused by this and he hesitates. But backup arrives. Another Federal agent sprays Mr. David repeatedly in the face with pepper spray. Now this is heartening to the first agent, so he winds up and hits Mr. David again with his bat.

Now, I don't care how cynical you have become about our country. I don't care whether you have signed over your time, your talent, your treasure, your integrity to the support of Donald J. Trump. If you have a drop of American blood in your veins, your soul dies a little as you watch the heavily armed Federal agent beat a United States Navy veteran.

So what are combat-ready Federal agents doing in the streets of a city which does not want them there in a State which did not ask for them?

Are there bodies piling up in the streets of Portland?

Are there 150,000 dead—just to choose a number—Americans in Portland? No. There is not a single fatality. Of course not.

Like so many cities, Portland boiled over in rage at the murder of George Floyd at the hands of the Minneapolis Police Department. And, yeah, regrettably and illegally a minority of protestors have committed acts of vandalism; bottles and rocks have been thrown, windows broken, threats made. That is not okay, ever.

But protecting property in Portland or anywhere else is the job of the local police department, the State police and, in a worst-case scenario, the National Guard. Why?

First, while Federal agents are legally entitled to protect Federal property, they are not authorized to patrol municipal streets to enforce State and local law. That is an idea that goes back to our dissatisfaction with King George, and it is an idea that my Republican friends used to care about.

Second, operationally, agents of the Border Patrol and the Marshals Service are not trained to manage protests. They are trained to patrol borders and to chase fugitives. A heavily armed individual with no identification or insignia trundling people, without explanation, into an unmarked van is likely to be misunderstood in a way that could lead to violence, particularly in a heavily armed society.

Finally, there is the question of the President's intentions, which are pretty clear. We have seen how the President responds to real crisis; almost 150,000 Americans dead of COVID-19, denial, misinformation.

We have 5 percent of the world's population and 25 percent of the COVID-19 deaths on the planet. That is a disgrace. It is a lethal disgrace.

George Floyd, an unarmed Black American, dies at the hands of the police, like so many before him. That is a lethal crisis.

The President was asked about Black Americans dying at the hands of police and he says: "So are White people; so are White people. What a terrible question to ask."

And now the President threatens to send heavily armed Federal agents to New York, Chicago, Detroit, Baltimore. Do we have a problem? No, we do not.

Take it from an unclassified Office of Intelligence and Analysis report by the Department of Homeland Security: "The regularity of violence amidst lawful protests in Portland since 26 May contrasts with national trends, which reflect a steady decline in violence during the last 2 weeks"—"a steady decline in violence during the last 2 weeks."

Mr. Speaker, this is important because democracies die, but they don't die fast. They die because people come to believe that the media is the enemy of the people. They die because a President's supporters are more given over to that President than they are to the rule of law; and they die because citizens become used to the sight of Federal agents acting, not to protect them, but to attack them.

We have been warned. The question is: Now what do we do?

RECOGNIZING THE HEROIC SERVICE OF DETECTIVE JOSH SIMMONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from

North Carolina (Mr. BUDD) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BUDD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the excellent law enforcement personnel who serve North Carolina's 13th District. I would like to specifically mention a heroic act that happened on July 14 in Rowan County.

A detective named Josh Simmons saw a burning car as he drove down Highway 52. When he approached, he found an elderly woman unable to get out. He pulled her from the car just minutes before it went up in flames.

Detective Simmons said of his actions: "The way I was raised, you take care of people. I didn't know who was in the car. It didn't matter who they were. They just needed help."

Mr. Speaker, this is a great example for all of us. Our community is truly lucky to have such courageous folks serving and protecting us.

HEALTHY SKIES ACT

Mr. BUDD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to put forward a new proposal to help reopen our country with speed and with safety.

Between business, leisure, and tourism, air travel is a mode of transportation that must be trusted if our country can fully reopen. In fact, before the pandemic, commercial aviation drove 5 percent of our GDP and helped support more than 10 million American jobs.

Unfortunately, there are currently no concrete proposals to lessen the fear that has gripped air travelers and crippled the aviation industry. And that is why I am proposing a bipartisan bill called the Healthy Skies Act, along with Congressman RALPH NORMAN and JOHN LARSON.

This bipartisan legislation instructs the TSA Administrator to create a pilot program that would temporarily screen the temperature of all travelers going through TSA security before they reach the gate area.

Having the TSA temporarily screen passengers for elevated temperatures has a number of practical advantages. It ensures that each passenger experiences a consistent nationwide process to prevent infected individuals from boarding planes and spreading the virus. This will give travelers the peace of mind they need to confidently start flying again, while discouraging folks who might be sick from even attempting to come to the airport in the first place.

Reopening America should be the top priority of our government. Making sure air travelers are healthy enough to fly is a commonsense way to boost passenger confidence and jump-start economic activity. And that is how we can stop the spread of COVID-19 and continue a great American comeback.

CONGRATULATIONS TO THE CLASS OF 2020

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MALINOWSKI) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MALINOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, over the last 3 months, the people in my State of New Jersey have pulled together in extraordinary ways to fight the coronavirus. Our leaders made good decisions. But, more important, all of us understood that public health had to come first.

The sacrifices we made were worth making. Today, all our numbers are looking good. The rate of spread of the infection, testing positivity are way, way down. If all of America were New Jersey, we could stand here today and say that America is beating COVID-19. But that doesn't make the sacrifices any less hard to bear.

And among those who sacrificed were our young people who were looking forward to graduation; not just the formal ending of their high school education, but the celebration of it with family and friends, the dances, the big games, the rites of passage that all of us experienced when we were their age and that we want for our kids.

□ 0930

Many of our graduating seniors did end up having outdoor graduations, but they came late and with social distancing. And let's face it, a socially distanced graduation is kind of an oxymoron. But we have also seen our communities come together in creative ways to celebrate the accomplishments of our young people, and I want to recognize those efforts today.

In Hunterdon County in my district, the parents, teachers, and school administrators implemented an Adopt a Senior program, where volunteers adopted a graduating student to send a letter, a card, or a gift to let them know their communities are rooting for them.

In Berkeley Heights, the light poles downtown are decorated with seniors' pictures, announcing what college they will be attending in the fall.

In Bridgewater, an administrator visited the home of every senior in a bus with a banner celebrating the class of 2020, dropping off a graduation package and a personalized Bridgewater-Raritan High School lawn sign for each senior.

In Mount Olive, posters celebrating the graduating class were placed throughout town.

In Springfield, the school surprised students with a display of personalized banners on the fence outside of the high school, each one bearing the name and photo of a member of the graduating class.

In Westfield, a video slideshow played in the window panels of the historic Arcanum Hall, with montages of senior portraits, pictures from school events, and a countdown clock to graduation.

These efforts from our communities are wonderful to see and, I am sure, are tremendously appreciated by the recipients.

During my time in Congress, I have worked hard to reach out to young peo-

ple to encourage their interests and involvement in the conversations that are happening every day here in Congress. I have visited dozens of schools throughout the 75 towns of my district and have hosted two classes of my youth advisory council.

This year, about 170 kids in my youth council spent the entire year breaking up into congressional committees and proposing legislation. I intend to introduce some of their proposals in this body this year. Their questions are always thoughtful, and they are always eager to get involved and make a difference.

It is tough to see them graduate in a time of so much uncertainty and fear, but throughout the many crises our country has faced in recent months, I have seen our young people step up and lead time and time again. If the students in New Jersey's Seventh District are any indication of young people around the country, the future of America is in good hands.

Congratulations to all of our 2020 graduates. I can't wait to see everything they are going to accomplish in the years ahead.

CALLING FOR TEMPORARY PAYROLL TAX HOLIDAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SPANO) for 5 minutes.

Mr. SPANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank those Members who have joined me in standing with millions of struggling Americans by calling for the adoption of the Keep Employees' Earnings Protected Act, also known as the KEEP Act, and to encourage my colleagues who haven't done so to do so and stand with us.

As this body debates another relief package, a keystone of such legislation should be a temporary payroll tax holiday. I introduced this bill to allow our workers to keep more of the money that they have already earned, thus infusing critical capital into our economy without involving Federal bureaucracy.

It is now more critical than ever to ensure that families have the funds, their funds, to reinvest back into our economy and to continue our economic comeback by buying locally and supporting each other. Employers, too, can use their tax savings to invest in their businesses and in their workforces.

No government program, no matter how generous, can replace a strong, functioning economy. President Trump has called on Congress to deliver this bill to his desk for signature, and the time to deliver is now. The American people are waiting and watching.

HOLDING CHINA ACCOUNTABLE

Mr. SPANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to lend my voice to House efforts to hold China accountable for their role in the spread of the coronavirus.

China lied; Americans died. It is really that simple.

China's socialist government not only misled the international community in what they knew and when they knew it, but they also colluded with the World Health Organization to cover for them. China's irresponsible behavior led to a worldwide COVID-19 pandemic, which has brought about death and economic mayhem across our planet. As the evidence mounts, China is now censoring those speaking out.

Congress must stand together, shoulder to shoulder, to ensure the Chinese Government is held responsible for the damage they have caused and to explore avenues to promptly bring manufacturing back to the U.S., including pharmaceuticals.

I also commend President Trump for pulling the United States out of the WHO until they, too, have been held accountable for their actions. Not a penny of taxpayer dollars should ever go toward international organizations that look the other way solely for political or economic interests, especially one that operates in the public health arena.

The time for answers is now.

HONORING SERGEANT ANDREW BOSKO

Mr. SPANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. Andrew Bosko, a Lakeland, Florida, World War II veteran who is 98 years young.

Andy was born in Ohio, raised in Pennsylvania, and is one of 13 children of immigrant parents from Austria and Czechoslovakia.

He entered the Army Air Corps in 1943, assigned to the Seventh Fighter Command in Hawaii. In 1945, the command was reassigned to Iwo Jima to provide emergency landing fields supporting bombing operations against Japan.

Meanwhile, Andy's wife and true love, Sophia, was supporting the war as a Rosie the Riveter. Yet, they still found time to write each other every single day.

Following the war, Andy worked as a machinist in New York and later participated in several other businesses.

Andy, you, together with your bride of 74 years, represent the greatest of our Greatest Generation.

They experienced economic and social turmoil and a world war, and then they helped rebuild our Nation into the greatest on Earth.

It is an honor to serve Andy, as he, for so many years, has served us.

REESTABLISH LAW AND ORDER

Mr. SPANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the House minority and Trump administration's efforts to reestablish law and order in our country and to stop mob rule.

For almost 2 months, communities throughout our country, particularly Democrat-led urban centers, have experienced levels of lawlessness and civil unrest unseen for decades. I am not referring to those who have exercised their First Amendment rights to peaceably assemble and protest. No. I am talking about those who vandalize, destroy, and knowingly break the law,

stirring havoc and instilling fear into families and business owners.

From San Francisco to Portland, from Minneapolis to New York City and everywhere in between, we have seen the consequences of protecting the mob over innocent civilians. This cannot be, and it cannot continue.

Law and order must be brought back to our neighborhoods, and we must hold cities and their leaders accountable for failing to adequately protect those whom they have sworn to serve.

All Americans, regardless of ZIP Codes, have a right to feel safe in their homes and on their roads. Mob rule will not be tolerated. We must reestablish law and order in America, and we must do it now.

REQUIRE FEDERAL CORONAVIRUS PREPAREDNESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHNEIDER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, our Nation is in crisis. Yesterday, the United States added more than 1,000 names to the already unbearably long list of 140,000 people killed by COVID-19. There have been nearly 4 million confirmed cases in the United States, and the CDC believes the number is many times greater. There are hotspots around the country, most notably in Southern States.

Many States like California and my State of Illinois that have taken measures to reopen are now looking at rolling back these measures and reinstating greater restrictions to keep their citizens safe.

The pandemic has affected all of us, putting our loved ones at risk, keeping our kids from school, overwhelming our healthcare systems, and devastating our businesses while costing 40 million people their jobs and pushing State and local governments to the brink.

With so many people and communities suffering, we desperately need a national strategy to beat back this virus. Unfortunately, while families, students, community leaders, and citizens are all making great sacrifices, and local governments are being forced to cut vital services, leadership and support from the administration have repeatedly fallen short. The American people deserve better.

All the sacrifices made since March were and are meant to buy us time to bend the curve, knock down this virus, and, ultimately, stand up our economy. But the sacrifices are only valuable if we are using the time to prepare for what many experts believe will be a spike come the fall.

Sadly, around the country, testing capacity remains below where it needs to be. Hospitals in many States are over capacity in their ICUs, understaffed, and anxious about still looming shortages of personal protective equipment, or PPE.

Six months into this pandemic, it is simply unconscionable that there are

still shortages of PPE, the masks, gloves, and gowns we need to safely treat patients, protect workers and residents in our nursing homes, confidently open our schools, and get our economy on the road to recovery.

In Illinois, we have lost nearly 7,500 lives to this disease already. With concerns that the disease may get worse this fall, and with conditions already worsening as States struggle to reopen, I am calling on Congress and the administration to take urgent action to address our immediate needs while at the same time preparing for the challenges that lie ahead.

It has been nearly 10 weeks since the HEROES Act passed the House and was sent on to the Senate. States and local governments, hospitals and nursing homes, and schools and businesses need the aid provided by the HEROES Act. The Nation needs the supply chain czar included in the HEROES Act. We all need the testing capacity funded by the HEROES Act.

Yet, after 10 weeks, the Senate still has neither taken up our legislation nor offered a plan of their own. Instead, they are delaying the Federal response to an urgent national crisis.

Ending this pandemic should not be a partisan issue. We need to move forward together, Democrats and Republicans.

That is why I am asking my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support the COVID PREPARE Act. I introduced this commonsense, bipartisan legislation with my colleague, JOHN KATKO, to assure the American people that their Federal Government is prepared to address this ever-changing public health crisis.

This legislation would require Federal agencies to submit to Congress their plans for addressing COVID-19 in the fall, anticipating a potential increase in infections and even greater demands on our healthcare system and pressure on our economy.

The COVID PREPARE Act will provide bipartisan oversight and full transparency into both the planning and execution of our national response. We all certainly hope for the best, but we must responsibly prepare for the worst.

HONORING COLONEL CHARLES POWELL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of my friend, Colonel Charles Powell, who passed away peacefully on July 2, 2020, in his home in San Angelo, Texas, at the age of 89.

Charles was a true American hero who devoted his life to serving others, and his passing is a loss that will understandably reverberate throughout the community. His genuine love for God and others, dedication to his family, and service to his country and

community set the gold standard of excellence that we should all strive for. Although he is leaving this Earth, his legacy will live on through countless lives he has impacted during his lifetime.

Charlie was born in Nashville, Arkansas, on May 7, 1931, where he grew up and met his future wife, JoAnne. The two graduated together from Nashville High School in 1949.

Charles went on to attend the United States Naval Academy in Annapolis, Maryland, and graduated, in 1954, with a bachelor's degree in general engineering. He was then commissioned into the United States Air Force and launched his 30-year career in military service.

After graduating from pilot training, Charles took to the skies, supporting transatlantic and transpacific deployments of tactical forces; refueling missions supporting reconnaissance activities in the Cuban Missile Crisis; and, finally, volunteering to serve in Vietnam as a rescue crew commander and airborne mission commander. He also participated in the planning and execution of the Son Tay POW camp raid.

Over the course of his career as a pilot, Colonel Powell logged over 67,000 flying hours, flew 168 combat missions, is credited with 14 combat saves, and was awarded a multitude of military honors.

In addition to flying missions, Colonel Powell served in a variety of leadership capacities in the Air Force, from flight instructor of the Air Command and Staff College, chief of staff of Air University, and, finally, the wing commander of the technical training wing at Goodfellow Air Force Base in San Angelo, Texas.

At the center of Charlie's world was JoAnne, and their love story is one for the ages. From meeting in grade school to graduating high school together and raising their daughter, Terri, as Charles' missions took him around the globe, their commitment to each other never wavered.

San Angelo was forever changed when these two spitfires flew into town in 1980. Charles was appointed as the wing commander at Goodfellow Air Force Base, which was slated for closure at the time. Charles and JoAnne immediately leapt into action, developing the relationship between Goodfellow and the community of San Angelo and completely transforming the mission of the base. After Charles' 4 years as wing commander, Goodfellow was removed from the closure list. Today, the connection between the base and San Angelo stands as the premier example of effective military-civilian partnership.

Thankfully, after Charlie retired from the service, the Powells never left San Angelo. Instead, they immediately set to work planting deep roots in the community and making San Angelo a better place to live. These two have been some of the most dedicated public servants our community has ever seen.

Through their innumerable service initiatives, they have been Goodfellow's most dedicated champions who served as the bridge between San Angelo and Goodfellow.

Through it all, Charles and JoAnne stood together, side by side and hand in hand. They transformed countless lives, not the least of which was my own. I had the pleasure of meeting the Powells when I ran for Congress in 2004, and in 2005, I hired JoAnne on as the first member of my staff. At that point, I could never have imagined the depth of the impact that Charlie and JoAnne would have on me, my family, and every member of my team over the years to come.

JoAnne is the most longstanding member of my staff, and she and Charlie have seen me through the ups and downs, all while tirelessly serving the constituents of the Concho Valley.

Within my office, JoAnne took on the responsibility of shepherding young men and women through the congressional nomination process for applying to the United States military academies, while Charles chaired the board responsible for vetting and recommending them to me for nomination.

□ 0945

Their teamwork resulted in many young men and women from my district receiving appointments to these prestigious institutions of higher learning, further extending the tradition of service to our country to future generations.

I cannot put into words the immense honor that it has been to have Charles and JoAnne as a part my family. My wife, Suzanne, and I feel tremendously lucky to have the opportunity to learn from them and to count them among our closest friends.

Colonel Powell will be greatly missed, and I take comfort knowing his legacy will continue through the people he loved and the community he was so proud to call home.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOH0).

PUBLIC APOLOGY TO THE HONORABLE
ALEXANDRIA OCASIO-CORTEZ

Mr. YOH0. Mr. Speaker, I stand before you this morning to address the strife I injected into the already-contentious Congress.

I have worked with many Members in this Chamber over the past four terms, Members on both sides of the aisle,—and each of you know that I am a man of my word. So let me take a moment to address this body.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to apologize for the abrupt manner of the conversation I had with my colleague from New York. It is true that we disagree on policies and visions for America, but that does not mean we should be disrespectful.

Having been married for 45 years, with two daughters, I am very cognizant of my language. The offensive name-calling words attributed to me by the press were never spoken to my

colleagues, and if they were construed that way, I apologize for their misunderstanding.

As my colleagues know, I am passionate about those affected by poverty. My wife, Carolyn, and I started out together at the age of 19 with nothing. We did odd jobs, and we were on food stamps. I know the face of poverty, and for a time, it was mine. That is why I know people in this country can still, with all its faults, rise up and succeed and not be encouraged to break the law.

I will commit to each of you that I will conduct myself from a place of passion and understanding that policy and political disagreement be vigorously debated with the knowledge that we approach the problems facing our Nation with the betterment of the country in mind and the people we serve.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot apologize for my passion or for loving my God, my family, and my country.

THE WAY WE TREAT ONE ANOTHER MATTERS

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the words of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOH0). They were appropriate because the language we use matters. The way we treat one another matters.

Mr. YOH0 needed no apology for his passion about poverty and for the downtrodden, but he ought to remember and acknowledge that the person to whom he spoke so inappropriately was one of the strongest fighters in this Congress for those with the least, those who are downtrodden, those who are forgotten.

Mr. Speaker, the apology was appropriate. I hope that Mr. YOH0 feels that apology sincerely, and I hope all of us will take a lesson to think before we speak so harshly to one another.

This country is a divided country. There are some of us who believe that our Chief Executive uses harsh language and inappropriate language directed at some of our citizens. We ought not to replicate that conduct.

The apology was appropriate. I know that our colleague, ALEXANDRIA OCASIO-CORTEZ, appreciates that apology, but let us treat one another with the respect and dignity each of us deserves not only as a Member of this body, but as a human being.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 10 a.m. today.

Accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 49 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1000

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. DINGELL) at 10 a.m.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: Lord our God, thank You for giving us another day.

We ask Your blessing on all the Members of the people's House during these rare days of coming together in this Chamber. The coronavirus has changed so many forms and patterns of gathering, as family, community, and here in Congress.

Send out Your spirit that those who find themselves at odds with their colleagues might continue the productive work that must be done, but which does not draw contentious attention, and address as well the issues which are pressing upon our Nation. Lord, have mercy.

Continue to bless the men and women who attend to those who are sick—the number continuing to grow throughout our country. Keep our healthcare professionals safe and inspire those who labor to find treatments and cures for this dangerous virus.

May all that is done be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 4(a) of House Resolution 967, the Journal of the last day's proceedings is approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. TAKANO led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

SENATE SHOULD PASS THE HEROES ACT

(Mr. CICILLINE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CICILLINE. Madam Speaker, it has been more than two months since the House passed the HEROES Act. In

that time, there have been more than 50,000 new coronavirus deaths, bringing the total to more than 140,000 Americans and more than 2.5 million more cases. Yet the Senate has done nothing.

This important legislation provides much-needed relief to States and cities experiencing lost revenue, to support our heroes on the front lines.

It ensures our first responders and essential workers are entitled to hazard pay and guarantees up to \$200 billion for those who have risked their lives working during the pandemic.

It expands testing, tracing, and treatment to all Americans.

It puts money back in the pockets of struggling Americans with a second round of stimulus payments up to \$6,000 per household.

It preserves health coverage by protecting the more than 5.4 million Americans who have lost their employer-provided health insurance.

It extends the weekly \$600 Federal unemployment benefit through January, providing a vital safety net for a record number of Americans who are unemployed. Right now, that expires in just 9 days.

It helps worried families afford a safe place to live, assisting renters and homeowners with rent, mortgage, and utility payments and other housing-related costs.

I urge the Senate to pass this bill immediately.

IN SUPPORT OF THE GREAT AMERICAN OUTDOORS ACT

(Mr. GIANFORTE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GIANFORTE. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the Great American Outdoors Act.

My friend, Senator DAINES, deserves a lot of credit. He has successfully advanced this historic legislation, historic because of its long-term dedication to our public lands.

People from around the world come to tour our outstanding National Parks, including millions of visitors every year to Yellowstone and Glacier. Unfortunately, too many of our parks have fallen into disrepair. This bill begins to rebuild and repair our parks.

It is also a fitting complement to our successful efforts to permanently reauthorize the Land and Water Conservation Fund. It provides dedicated funding to increase public access to public lands across Montana.

I know how important LWCF is to Montana, and I will continue working to keep public lands in public hands and increase access.

I urge my colleagues to join me today in voting for the Great American Outdoors Act.

STUDENT LOAN DEBT CRISIS

(Ms. DEAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DEAN. Madam Speaker, our student loan debt crisis predates the pandemic. We encourage high school students to attend college, to claim their education, yet too many graduates are shackled with a mountain of debt that limits their future, impedes their financial freedom, and diminishes their purchasing power. The pandemic has only worsened this problem.

During this pandemic, we owe it to a generation of debt-laden young people, veterans, and transitioning adults to take bold action, to pass meaningful debt forgiveness. Freeing up the ability to claim an education without crushing debt will be a relief to so many Americans and our economy.

An educated public should enrich us all, not create unsustainable debt. So I call upon this body to pass bold and meaningful debt forgiveness for millions of bright young people so that their futures are determined not by the debt they incurred but by the knowledge they gained.

NATIONAL FRAGILE X AWARENESS DAY

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I rise today on National Fragile X Awareness Day to raise awareness of this genetic disorder.

Fragile X is caused by mutations in the gene known as FMR1. These mutations can result in behavioral, developmental, cognitive, and reproductive conditions, often leading to delayed development of speech and language. In the most severe cases, fragile X can cause potentially fatal neurodegenerative conditions.

Fragile X syndrome affects an estimated 100,000 Americans. But more than 1 million Americans have a variation of the fragile X mutation, meaning they either have or are at risk of developing one of the associated conditions.

This means each Member of this House, on average, represents 230 constituents living with fragile X syndrome, and countless more parents, grandparents, siblings, and caregivers love someone with fragile X.

Each person living with fragile X syndrome, and any other intellectual and developmental disability, makes our world a better place.

EXTENDING UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS

(Mr. TAKANO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TAKANO. Madam Speaker, I rise today because supplemental Federal unemployment benefits expire next

week, and Republicans in the Senate refuse to extend these benefits for the American people.

Average daily expenses are weighing heavily on millions of families as our economy struggles and unemployment is at a record high, with over 17 million still unemployed.

Rent is due, bills are due, loan payments are due, but people are still out of work. Americans are fighting against financial hardships and the housing affordability crisis. Failure to extend unemployment benefits in the midst of this pandemic would be cruel and inhumane. It would cause financial ruin for millions who are already struggling.

Our communities need the additional \$600 weekly unemployment benefits. It could be the difference between getting evicted or making rent for another month.

I urge the Senate to pass the HEROES Act to extend Federal unemployment benefits. Millions of Americans are depending on it.

IN SUPPORT OF THE CITIZENS OF JAMMU AND KASHMIR

(Mr. WATKINS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WATKINS. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of democracy around the world and, in particular, in Jammu and Kashmir.

The human rights violations there are already alarming. And now with COVID-19 plaguing the world, people there and everywhere must have access to the tools necessary to fight this disease.

As telecommunication blackouts, suppression of media reports, human rights abuses, and mass detentions continue in Jammu and Kashmir, COVID-19 concerns are amplified. There have already been disturbing reports that PPE and critical equipment are being blocked from entering the region.

Without adequate resources and internet access, hospitals and medical centers don't stand a chance. And lives being lost are lost to the world.

I urge the global community and actors in the region to work together to ensure that citizens of Jammu and Kashmir have access to the care, services, and resources needed to defeat this disease.

IN SUPPORT OF THE NO BAN ACT

(Mr. CARSON of Indiana asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the NO BAN Act, which I was honored to coauthor. I urge my colleagues to swiftly pass this landmark legislation today.

More than 3 years ago, President Donald Trump's Muslim ban put into action the xenophobic and racist agenda that he promised during his campaign.

It immediately led to chaos at our airports, where I was honored to stand in solidarity with our incoming immigrants and those cruelly ripped apart from their families.

The Muslim ban became the cornerstone of President Trump's dangerous agenda. It has made America less respected around the world. And our country is not any safer.

This isn't the only time America has shamefully shut our doors based on race, ethnicity, or nationality. But we can make it the last time.

That is why we must pass the NO BAN Act and end the Muslim ban and make sure history does not repeat itself. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation today.

THE WORDS OF A BLACK POLICE OFFICER

(Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Madam Speaker, for those wondering what it is like to be a Black police officer amid the violent demonstrations that continue in cities across our country, consider what Portland Police Officer Jakhary Jackson said about the rioters in his own words.

"It's been very eye-opening. It says something when you're at a Black Lives Matter protest and you have more minorities on the police side than you have in a violent crowd, and you have White people screaming at Black officers."

Let me repeat Officer Jackson's words once more, because you will not hear any of this from our national media. Once again, here are the words of a Black police officer facing a violent mob of predominantly White anarchists.

"It's been very eye-opening. It says something when you're at a Black Lives Matter protest and you have more minorities on the police side than you have in a violent crowd, and you have White people screaming at Black officers."

FEDERAL OFFICERS IN PORTLAND

(Mr. BLUMENAUER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, it was sad to hear my colleague with his recent comments. Let me tell you what it is like on the ground in Portland.

This is a serious problem in Oregon where people are attempting to peacefully demonstrate their opposition to a whole range of racist practices by law enforcement. There are, to be sure, occasionally a few people who are doing things that they shouldn't, and they should be arrested, tried, and convicted. But the vast majority of people are peaceful.

And it is no fault, frankly, of what has happened with the Trump administration, who have moved in with what can only be described as an occupying force, making the situation worse. They were unwanted, unwelcome, and unprepared. Nonetheless, they have moved in, been involved with episodes that people can watch on YouTube, where peaceful demonstrators were attacked.

One of my constituents, asking a simple question, was beaten with a baton, breaking his wrist, and pepper sprayed in the face. This is outrageous. This is a made-for-TV initiative by the Trump administration and should stop.

□ 1015

PROVIDING ASSISTANCE TO SMALL DEFENSE MANUFACTURERS

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, I am grateful that the House Armed Services Committee included my amendment, the Small Manufacturer Cybersecurity Enhancement Act, in the National Defense Authorization Act, which passed yesterday by bipartisan vote.

This crucial amendment will provide much-needed assistance to small defense manufacturers with cyber compliance, and it will enhance the cybersecurity through our defense supply chain by expanding DOD cyber initiatives with the manufacturing extension partnership centers. The MEP national network is ideally situated to assist the Department to help strengthen our national defense.

This bipartisan legislation was supported unanimously by all members of the House Armed Services Committee. It is especially important to the communities I represent adjacent to the Army Cyber Command at Fort Gordon. The potential to create jobs is encouraged.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

RECOGNIZING ESCALATION OF VIOLENCE ALONG ARMENIAN-AZERBAIJANI BORDER

(Mr. COSTA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COSTA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to call attention to the escalating violence that is occurring in the Armenian-Azerbaijani border.

Beginning July 12, the Azeri soldiers approached the Armenian border, a place that has been one of contention, and opened fired on Armenian civilians in the Tavush Province.

Since then, the conflict, sadly, has escalated. The Azeri armed forces have

been indiscriminate in attacking Armenian schools and factories, factories producing personal protective equipment that is essential during this pandemic.

Azerbaijan must be held accountable. In the midst of this global pandemic, where supplies and resources are already stretched, it is critical now more than ever that we work toward peace with Artsakh.

We must reevaluate the U.S. security assistance to Azerbaijan immediately—they are not being appropriate in their actions—as well as increase aid to Armenia to counter Azeri aggression.

In the appropriations bill yesterday, a \$20 million augmentation was made to the country of Armenia. I urge my colleagues to support that and urge immediate action condemning Azerbaijan's disgraceful actions.

RECOGNIZING RADIO STATION WHUB

(Mr. ROSE of Tennessee asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ROSE of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, on July 20, 1940, Judge Luke Medley started a small radio station in Cookeville, Tennessee, my hometown. And for the last 80 years, WHUB Newstalk 101.7 and 1400, the Hub, has stood the test of time and been a haven for community events and local news.

WHUB's motto is: "Where community always comes first." They have always implemented that motto for the citizens of the Upper Cumberland in Tennessee, and they always will. WHUB has been the winner of numerous awards in the last 80 years from the State of Tennessee and the National Association of Broadcasters.

Congratulations to owner Jerry Zimmer, program director Brent Carl Fleshman, news director Shawn Jacobs, and general manager John Monk for their constant hard work to keep WHUB the number one news talk radio station in the Upper Cumberland.

Happy 80th anniversary to WHUB. God bless Tennessee, and God bless America.

LAUNCHING JUSTICE IN POLICING WEBSITE

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, it has been nearly 4 weeks since the House passed the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act. Leader McCONNELL and the Republican-led Senate, however, refuse to call it up for consideration or a vote. Meanwhile, the problem of racial injustice is not going away on its own.

For millions of Americans, this issue is deeply personal, having experienced racial bias in our justice system firsthand. Most police officers, Madam Speaker, are trying hard to do their job

professionally and serve their communities well, and there are so many exemplary officers committed to addressing head-on the inherent bias and the problems in the culture of policing that lead some to commit acts of misconduct.

Still, millions of people live in fear simply because of the color of their skin and because of the history of police misconduct against African Americans in our country.

Madam Speaker, we must never accept this norm. Indeed, in his last public appearance, John Lewis visited Black Lives Matter Plaza in Washington and then encouraged Americans to stand up for social justice. He said this: "We must continue to be bold, brave, courageous, push and pull till we redeem the soul of America and move closer to a community at peace with itself."

His wise words continue to inspire Americans to be courageous in standing up, speaking out, and working to lift our country up to the highest of our ideals.

In order to make sure that all voices are being heard in Congress and in this national discourse, I launched a website to make it easier for Americans to share their own stories, learn about the legislation we passed, and share their thoughts on our bill. It is a platform for people to contribute to this work of redeeming the soul of America, as John Lewis urged us to do. That site is JusticeinPolicing.us.

Already, Madam Speaker, thousands of Americans from nearly every State have visited the site, and many have shared their own wrenching stories about why we need to pass this bill.

One woman in my district wrote about how, as the mother of 2 young Black men, she worries every day about them encountering the police. That should not be the case in America. That isn't good for families. It isn't good for the police. It isn't good for our communities. And as I said, it is not good for our country.

Another wrote about how her elderly parents were pulled over in Oklahoma because the officer couldn't believe that her African-American father was married to her White mother. Both were in their eighties. That was just 3 years ago.

One person from Iowa posted about being a lifelong Republican who is tired of her party's failure to tackle police misconduct and systemic racism in our country. That person is right. And it is not Republicans alone whom I am sure she is concerned with.

The Senate could act today on the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act. The Senate ought to act today. But it is sitting on Leader McConnell's desk or someplace else gathering dust while our site continues to gather stories of real lives impacted by these injustices.

Madam Speaker, I hope Americans will continue to speak out and give compelling and concrete examples of why action is necessary.

And I might say, we need to speak out on the extraordinarily good actions that are taken by our law enforcement officers as well. We need to be balanced. But we do not need to be balanced to the extent of ignoring the carnage that has occurred because of the color of skin. These stories need to be told.

In his very powerful New York Times column last month on the five crises facing America at this moment in our history, the extraordinarily insightful David Brooks wrote: "All Americans, but especially White Americans, are undergoing a rapid education on the burdens African Americans carry every day. This education," he said, "is continuing, but already, public opinion is shifting with astonishing speed." It is right that it does so.

The more we hear of the stories of personal experiences with systemic bias, the better equipped we will be as a Nation to confront this challenge together. As more people visit JusticeinPolicing.us to speak up and support this bill, I will be sharing their names and stories with this House and its Members, making sure that Members hear from their constituents on this issue.

We are the people's House. We are the people's voice. We are the protectors of democracy, yes, of our Constitution and our laws, but the soul and character of our country are in our hands as well.

As long as people of color continue to face dangerous and deadly systemic bias in our country, we will not stop pushing for the reforms that are so sorely needed.

FOSTERING UNDERGRADUATE TALENT BY UNLOCKING RESOURCES FOR EDUCATION ACT

Ms. JAYAPAL. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 891, I call up the bill (H.R. 2486) to reauthorize mandatory funding programs for historically Black colleges and universities and other minority-serving institutions, with the Senate amendment thereto, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the Senate amendment.

Senate amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; REFERENCES.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This Act may be cited as the "Fostering Undergraduate Talent by Unlocking Resources for Education Act" or the "FUTURE Act".

(b) **REFERENCES.**—Except as otherwise expressly provided, whenever in this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.).

SEC. 2. CONTINUED SUPPORT FOR MINORITY-SERVING INSTITUTIONS.

Section 371(b)(1)(A) (20 U.S.C. 1067q(b)(1)(A)) is amended by striking "for each of the fiscal

years 2008 through 2019." and all that follows through the end of the subparagraph and inserting "for fiscal year 2020 and each fiscal year thereafter."

SEC. 3. SECURE DISCLOSURE OF TAX-RETURN INFORMATION TO CARRY OUT THE HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965.

(a) **AMENDMENTS TO THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1986.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Paragraph (13) of section 6103(l) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

"(13) **DISCLOSURE OF RETURN INFORMATION TO CARRY OUT THE HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965.**—

"(A) **INCOME-CONTINGENT OR INCOME-BASED REPAYMENT AND TOTAL AND PERMANENT DISABILITY DISCHARGE.**—The Secretary shall, upon written request from the Secretary of Education, disclose to officers, employees, and contractors of the Department of Education, as specifically authorized and designated by the Secretary of Education, only for the purpose of (and to the extent necessary in) establishing enrollment, renewing enrollment, administering, and conducting analyses and forecasts for estimating costs related to income-contingent or income-based repayment programs, and the discharge of loans based on a total and permanent disability (within the meaning of section 437(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965), under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965, the following return information (as defined in subsection (b)(2)) with respect to taxpayers identified by the Secretary of Education as participating in the loan programs under title IV of such Act, for taxable years specified by such Secretary:

"(i) Taxpayer identity information with respect to such taxpayer.

"(ii) The filing status of such taxpayer.

"(iii) The adjusted gross income of such taxpayer.

"(iv) Total number of exemptions claimed, or total number of individuals and dependents claimed, as applicable, on the return.

"(v) Number of children with respect to which tax credits under section 24 are claimed on the return.

"(B) **FEDERAL STUDENT FINANCIAL AID.**—The Secretary shall, upon written request from the Secretary of Education, disclose to officers, employees, and contractors of the Department of Education, as specifically authorized and designated by the Secretary of Education, only for the purpose of (and to the extent necessary in) determining eligibility for, and amount of, Federal student financial aid under programs authorized by parts A, C, and D of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (as in effect on the date of the enactment of the Fostering Undergraduate Talent by Unlocking Resources for Education Act) and conducting analyses and forecasts for estimating costs related to such programs, the following return information (as defined in subsection (b)(2)) with respect to taxpayers identified by the Secretary of Education as applicants for Federal student financial aid under such parts of title IV of such Act, for taxable years specified by such Secretary:

"(i) Taxpayer identity information with respect to such taxpayer.

"(ii) The filing status of such taxpayer.

"(iii) The adjusted gross income of such taxpayer.

"(iv) The amount of any net earnings from self-employment (as defined in section 1402), wages (as defined in section 3121(a) or 3401(a)), taxable income from a farming business (as defined in section 236A(e)(4)), and investment income for the period reported on the return.

"(v) The total income tax of such taxpayer.

"(vi) Total number of exemptions claimed, or total number of individuals and dependents claimed, as applicable, on the return.

"(vii) Number of children with respect to which tax credits under section 24 are claimed on the return.

"(viii) Amount of any credit claimed under section 25A for the taxable year.

“(ix) Amount of individual retirement account distributions not included in adjusted gross income for the taxable year.

“(x) Amount of individual retirement account contributions and payments to self-employed SEP, Keogh, and other qualified plans which were deducted from income for the taxable year.

“(xi) The amount of tax-exempt interest.

“(xii) Amounts from retirement pensions and annuities not included in adjusted gross income for the taxable year.

“(xiii) If applicable, the fact that any of the following schedules (or equivalent successor schedules) were filed with the return:

“(I) Schedule A.

“(II) Schedule B.

“(III) Schedule D.

“(IV) Schedule E.

“(V) Schedule F.

“(VI) Schedule H.

“(xiv) If applicable, the fact that Schedule C (or an equivalent successor schedule) was filed with the return showing a gain or loss greater than \$10,000.

“(xv) If applicable, the fact that there is no return filed for such taxpayer for the applicable year.

“(C) RESTRICTION ON USE OF DISCLOSED INFORMATION.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Return information disclosed under subparagraphs (A) and (B) may be used by officers, employees, and contractors of the Department of Education, as specifically authorized and designated by the Secretary of Education, only for the purposes and to the extent necessary described in such subparagraphs and for mitigating risks (as defined in clause (ii)) relating to the programs described in such subparagraphs.

“(ii) MITIGATING RISKS.—For purposes of this subparagraph, the term ‘mitigating risks’ means, with respect to the programs described in subparagraphs (A) and (B),

“(I) oversight activities by the Office of Inspector General of the Department of Education as authorized by the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, and

“(II) reducing the net cost of improper payments to Federal financial aid recipients. Such term does not include the conduct of criminal investigations or prosecutions.

“(iii) REDISCLOSURE TO INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION, STATE HIGHER EDUCATION AGENCIES, AND DESIGNATED SCHOLARSHIP ORGANIZATIONS.—The Secretary of Education, and officers, employees, and contractors of the Department of Education, may disclose return information received under subparagraph (B), solely for the use in the application, award, and administration of student financial aid or aid awarded by such entities as the Secretary of Education may designate, to the following persons:

“(I) An institution of higher education with which the Secretary of Education has an agreement under subpart 1 of part A, part C, or part D of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965.

“(II) A State higher education agency.

“(III) A scholarship organization which is designated by the Secretary of Education as of the date of the enactment of the Fostering Undergraduate Talent by Unlocking Resources for Education Act as an organization eligible to receive the information provided under this clause.

The preceding sentence shall only apply to the extent that the taxpayer with respect to whom the return information relates provides consent for such disclosure to the Secretary of Education as part of the application for Federal student financial aid under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965.

“(D) REQUIREMENT OF NOTIFICATION OF REQUEST FOR TAX RETURN INFORMATION.—Subparagraphs (A) and (B) shall apply to any disclosure of return information with respect to a taxpayer only if the Secretary of Education has provided to such taxpayer the notification re-

quired by section 494 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 prior to such disclosure.”.

(2) CONFIDENTIALITY OF RETURN INFORMATION.—Section 6103(a)(3) of such Code is amended by inserting “, (13)(A), (13)(B)” after “(12)”.

(3) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 6103(p)(4) of such Code is amended—

(A) by inserting “(A), (13)(B)” after “(13)” each place it occurs, and

(B) by inserting “, (13)(A), (13)(B)” after “(1)(10)” each place it occurs.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to disclosures made under section 6103(l)(13) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (as amended by this section) after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 4. NOTIFICATION OF REQUEST FOR TAX RETURN INFORMATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Part G of title IV (20 U.S.C. 1088 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 494. NOTIFICATION OF REQUEST FOR TAX RETURN INFORMATION.

“The Secretary shall advise students and borrowers who submit an application for Federal student financial aid under this title or for the discharge of a loan based on permanent and total disability, as described in section 437(a), or who request an income-contingent or income-based repayment plan on their loan (as well as parents and spouses who sign such an application or request or a Master Promissory Note on behalf of those students and borrowers) that the Secretary has the authority to request that the Internal Revenue Service disclose their tax return information (as well as that of parents and spouses who sign such an application or request or a Master Promissory Note on behalf of those students and borrowers) to officers, employees, and contractors of the Department of Education as authorized under section 6103(l)(13) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, to the extent necessary for the Secretary to carry out this title.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 484(q) (20 U.S.C. 1091(q)) is amended to read as follows:

“(q) reserved”.

SEC. 5. INCREASED FUNDING FOR FEDERAL PELL GRANTS.

Section 401(b)(7)(A)(iv) (20 U.S.C. 1070a(b)(7)(A)(iv)) is amended—

(1) in subclause (X), by striking “\$1,430,000,000” and inserting “\$1,455,000,000”; and

(2) in subclause (XI), by striking “\$1,145,000,000” and insert “\$1,170,000,000”.

SEC. 6. REPORTS ON IMPLEMENTATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than each specified date, the Secretary of Education and the Secretary of the Treasury shall issue joint reports to the Committees on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions and Finance of the Senate and the Committees on Education and Labor and Ways and Means of the House of Representatives regarding the amendments made by this Act. Each such report shall include, as applicable—

(1) an update on the status of implementation of the amendments made by this Act,

(2) an evaluation of the processing of applications for Federal student financial aid, and applications for income-based repayment and income contingent repayment, under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070 et seq.), in accordance with the amendments made by this Act, and

(3) implementation issues and suggestions for potential improvements.

(b) SPECIFIED DATE.—For purposes of subsection (a), the term “specified date” means—

(1) the date that is 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act,

(2) the date that is 120 days after the first day that the disclosure process established under section 6103(l)(13) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended by section 3(a) of this Act,

is operational and accessible to officers, employees, and contractors of the Department of Education (as specifically authorized and designated by the Secretary of Education), and

(3) the date that is 1 year after the report date described in paragraph (2).

MOTION TO CONCUR

Ms. JAYAPAL. Madam Speaker, I have a motion at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Ms. Jayapal moves that the House concur in the Senate amendment to H.R. 2486 with the amendments specified in section 4 of House Resolution 891.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 891, the question shall be divided among two House amendments.

AMENDMENT SPECIFIED IN SECTION 4(A) OF HOUSE RESOLUTION 891

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(a) of House Resolution 891, the portion of the divided question comprising the amendment specified in section 4(a) of House Resolution 891 shall be considered first.

The text of House amendment to Senate amendment specified in section 4(a) of House Resolution 891 is as follows:

In the matter proposed to be inserted by the amendment of the Senate, strike sections 1, 2, and 3 and insert the following:

TITLE I—NO BAN ACT

SEC. 101. SHORT TITLES.

This title may be cited as the “National Origin-Based Antidiscrimination for Non-immigrants Act” or the “NO BAN Act”.

SEC. 102. EXPANSION OF NONDISCRIMINATION PROVISION.

Section 202(a)(1)(A) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1152(a)(1)(A)) is amended—

(1) by inserting “or a nonimmigrant visa, admission or other entry into the United States, or the approval or revocation of any immigration benefit” after “immigrant visa”; and

(2) by inserting “religion,” after “sex,”; and

(3) by inserting “, except if expressly required by statute, or if a statutorily authorized benefit takes into consideration such factors” before the period at the end.

SEC. 103. TRANSFER AND LIMITATIONS ON AUTHORITY TO SUSPEND OR RESTRICT THE ENTRY OF A CLASS OF ALIENS.

Section 212(f) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(f)) is amended to read as follows:

“(f) AUTHORITY TO SUSPEND OR RESTRICT THE ENTRY OF A CLASS OF ALIENS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), if the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Secretary of Homeland Security, determines, based on specific and credible facts, that the entry of any aliens or any class of aliens into the United States would undermine the security or public safety of the United States or the preservation of human rights, democratic processes or institutions, or international stability, the President may temporarily—

“(A) suspend the entry of such aliens or class of aliens as immigrants or non-immigrants; or

“(B) impose any restrictions on the entry of such aliens that the President deems appropriate.

“(2) LIMITATIONS.—In carrying out paragraph (1), the President, the Secretary of

State, and the Secretary of Homeland Security shall—

“(A) only issue a suspension or restriction when required to address specific acts implicating a compelling government interest in a factor identified in paragraph (1);

“(B) narrowly tailor the suspension or restriction, using the least restrictive means, to achieve such compelling government interest;

“(C) specify the duration of the suspension or restriction; and

“(D) consider waivers to any class-based restriction or suspension and apply a rebuttable presumption in favor of granting family-based and humanitarian waivers.

“(3) CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Prior to the President exercising the authority under paragraph (1), the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Homeland Security shall consult Congress and provide Congress with specific evidence supporting the need for the suspension or restriction and its proposed duration.

“(B) BRIEFING AND REPORT.—Not later than 48 hours after the President exercises the authority under paragraph (1), the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Homeland Security shall provide a briefing and submit a written report to Congress that describes—

“(i) the action taken pursuant to paragraph (1) and the specified objective of such action;

“(ii) the estimated number of individuals who will be impacted by such action;

“(iii) the constitutional and legislative authority under which such action took place; and

“(iv) the circumstances necessitating such action, including how such action complies with paragraph (2), as well as any intelligence informing such actions.

“(C) TERMINATION.—If the briefing and report described in subparagraph (B) are not provided to Congress during the 48 hours that begin when the President exercises the authority under paragraph (1), the suspension or restriction shall immediately terminate absent intervening congressional action.

“(D) CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term ‘Congress’, as used in this paragraph, refers to the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate, the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate, the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives.

“(4) PUBLICATION.—The Secretary of State and the Secretary of Homeland Security shall publicly announce and publish an unclassified version of the report described in paragraph (3)(B) in the Federal Register.

“(5) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, an individual or entity who is present in the United States and has been harmed by a violation of this subsection may file an action in an appropriate district court of the United States to seek declaratory or injunctive relief.

“(B) CLASS ACTION.—Nothing in this Act may be construed to preclude an action filed pursuant to subparagraph (A) from proceeding as a class action.

“(6) TREATMENT OF COMMERCIAL AIRLINES.—Whenever the Secretary of Homeland Security finds that a commercial airline has failed to comply with regulations of the Secretary of Homeland Security relating to requirements of airlines for the detection of

fraudulent documents used by passengers traveling to the United States (including the training of personnel in such detection), the Secretary of Homeland Security may suspend the entry of some or all aliens transported to the United States by such airline.

“(7) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section may be construed as authorizing the President, the Secretary of State, or the Secretary of Homeland Security to act in a manner inconsistent with the policy decisions expressed in the immigration laws.

“(8) CLARIFICATION.—For purposes of paragraph (1), the term ‘public safety of the United States’ includes efforts necessary to contain a communicable disease of public health significance (as defined in section 34.2(b) of title 42, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulation)).”.

SEC. 104. TERMINATION OF CERTAIN EXECUTIVE ACTIONS.

(a) TERMINATION.—Presidential Proclamations 9645, 9822, and 9983 and Executive Orders 13769, 13780, and 13815 shall be void beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) EFFECT.—All actions taken pursuant to any proclamation or executive order terminated under subsection (a) shall cease on the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 105. VISA APPLICANTS REPORT.

(a) INITIAL REPORTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State, in coordination with the Secretary of Homeland Security and the heads of other relevant Federal agencies, shall submit a report to the congressional committees referred to in section 212(f)(3)(D) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended by section 103 of this title, that describes the implementation of each of the presidential proclamations and executive orders referred to in section 104.

(2) PRESIDENTIAL PROCLAMATION 9645 AND 9983.—In addition to the content described in paragraph (1), the report submitted with respect to Presidential Proclamation 9645, issued on September 24, 2017, and Presidential Proclamation 9983, issued on January 31, 2020, shall include, for each country listed in such proclamation—

(A) the total number of individuals who applied for a visa during the time period the proclamation was in effect, disaggregated by country and visa category;

(B) the total number of visa applicants described in subparagraph (A) who were approved, disaggregated by country and visa category;

(C) the total number of visa applicants described in subparagraph (A) who were refused, disaggregated by country and visa category, and the reasons they were refused;

(D) the total number of visa applicants described in subparagraph (A) whose applications remain pending, disaggregated by country and visa category;

(E) the total number of visa applicants described in subparagraph (A) who were granted a waiver, disaggregated by country and visa category;

(F) the total number of visa applicants described in subparagraph (A) who were denied a waiver, disaggregated by country and visa category, and the reasons such waiver requests were denied;

(G) the total number of refugees admitted, disaggregated by country; and

(H) the complete reports that have been submitted to the President every 180 days in accordance with section 4 of Presidential Proclamation 9645 in its original form, and as amended by Presidential Proclamation 9983.

(b) ADDITIONAL REPORTS.—Not later than 30 days after the date on which the President

exercises the authority under section 212(f) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(f)), as amended by section 103 of this title, and every 30 days thereafter, the Secretary of State, in coordination with the Secretary of Homeland Security and heads of other relevant Federal agencies, shall submit a report to the congressional committees referred to in paragraph (3)(D) of such section 212(f) that identifies, with respect to countries affected by a suspension or restriction, the information described in subparagraphs (A) through (H) of subsection (a)(2) of this section and specific evidence supporting the need for the continued exercise of presidential authority under such section 212(f), including the information described in paragraph (3)(B) of such section 212(f). If the report described in this subsection is not provided to Congress in the time specified, the suspension or restriction shall immediately terminate absent intervening congressional action. A final report with such information shall be prepared and submitted to such congressional committees not later than 30 days after the suspension or restriction is lifted.

(c) FORM; AVAILABILITY.—The reports required under subsections (a) and (b) shall be made publicly available online in unclassified form.

TITLE II—AFFORDABLE PRESCRIPTIONS FOR PATIENTS ACT OF 2020

SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Affordable Prescriptions for Patients Act of 2020”.

SEC. 202. PRODUCT HOPPING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 41 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 26 (15 U.S.C. 57c–2) the following:

“SEC. 27. PRODUCT HOPPING.

“(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) ABBREVIATED NEW DRUG APPLICATION.—The term ‘abbreviated new drug application’ means an application under subsection (b)(2) or (j) of section 505 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 355).

“(2) BIOSIMILAR BIOLOGICAL PRODUCT.—The term ‘biosimilar biological product’ means a biological product licensed under section 351(k) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 262(k)).

“(3) BIOSIMILAR BIOLOGICAL PRODUCT LICENSE APPLICATION.—The term ‘biosimilar biological product license application’ means an application submitted under section 351(k) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 262(k)).

“(4) FOLLOW-ON PRODUCT.—The term ‘follow-on product’—

“(A) means a drug approved through an application or supplement to an application submitted under section 505(b) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 355(b)) or a biological product licensed through an application or supplement to an application submitted under section 351(a) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 262(a)) for a change, modification, or reformulation to the same manufacturer’s previously approved drug or biological product that treats the same medical condition; and

“(B) excludes such an application or supplement to an application for a change, modification, or reformulation of a drug or biological product that is requested by the Secretary or necessary to comply with law, including sections 505A and 505B of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 355a, 355c).

“(5) GENERIC DRUG.—The term ‘generic drug’ means a drug approved under an application submitted under subsection (b)(2) or (j) of section 505 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 355).

“(6) LISTED DRUG.—The term ‘listed drug’ means a drug listed under section 505(j)(7) of

the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 355(j)(7)).

“(7) MANUFACTURER.—The term ‘manufacturer’ means the holder, licensee, or assignee of—

“(A) an approved application for a drug under section 505(c) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 355(c)); or

“(B) a biological product license under section 351(a) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 262(a)).

“(8) REFERENCE PRODUCT.—The term ‘reference product’ has the meaning given the term in section 351(i) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 262(i)).

“(9) SECRETARY.—The term ‘Secretary’ means the Secretary of Health and Human Services.

“(10) ULTIMATE PARENT ENTITY.—The term ‘ultimate parent entity’ has the meaning given the term in section 801.1 of title 16, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor regulation.

“(b) PROHIBITION ON PRODUCT HOPPING.—

“(1) PRIMA FACIE.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), a manufacturer of a reference product or listed drug shall be considered to have engaged in an unfair method of competition in or affecting commerce in violation of section 5(a) if the Commission demonstrates by a preponderance of the evidence in a proceeding initiated by the Commission under subsection (c)(1)(A), or in a suit brought under subparagraph (B) or (C) of subsection (c)(1), that, during the period beginning on the date on which the manufacturer of the reference product or listed drug first receives notice that an applicant has submitted to the Commissioner of Food and Drugs an abbreviated new drug application or biosimilar biological product license application and ending on the date that is 180 days after the date on which that generic drug or biosimilar biological product is first marketed, the manufacturer engaged in either of the following actions:

“(A) The manufacturer engaged in a hard switch, which shall be established by demonstrating that the manufacturer engaged in either of the following actions:

“(i) Upon the request of the manufacturer of the listed drug or reference product, the Commissioner of Food and Drugs withdrew the approval of the application for the listed drug or reference product or placed the listed drug or reference product on the discontinued products list and the manufacturer marketed or sold a follow-on product.

“(ii) The manufacturer of the listed drug or reference product—

“(I)(aa) announced withdrawal of, discontinuance of the manufacture of, or intent to withdraw the application with respect to the drug or reference product in a manner that impedes competition from a generic drug or a biosimilar biological product, as established by objective circumstances; or

“(bb) destroyed the inventory of the listed drug or reference product in a manner that impedes competition from a generic drug or a biosimilar biological product, which may be established by objective circumstances; and

“(II) marketed or sold a follow-on product.

“(B) The manufacturer engaged in a soft switch, which shall be established by demonstrating that the manufacturer engaged in both of the following actions:

“(i) The manufacturer took actions with respect to the listed drug or reference product other than those described in subparagraph (A) that unfairly disadvantage the listed drug or reference product relative to the follow-on product described in clause (ii) in a manner that impedes competition from a generic drug or a biosimilar biological product that is highly similar to, and has no clinically meaningful difference with respect

to safety, purity, and potency from, the reference product, which may be established by objective circumstances.

“(ii) The manufacturer marketed or sold a follow-on product.

“(2) JUSTIFICATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (3), the actions described in paragraph (1) by a manufacturer of a listed drug or reference product shall not be considered to be an unfair method of competition in or affecting commerce if—

“(i) the manufacturer demonstrates to the Commission or a district court of the United States, as applicable, by a preponderance of the evidence in a proceeding initiated by the Commission under subsection (c)(1)(A), or in a suit brought under subparagraph (B) or (C) of subsection (c)(1), that—

“(I) the manufacturer would have taken the actions regardless of whether a generic drug that references the listed drug or biosimilar biological product that references the reference product had already entered the market; and

“(II)(aa) with respect to a hard switch under paragraph (1)(A), the manufacturer took the action for reasons relating to the safety risk to patients of the listed drug or reference product;

“(bb) with respect to an action described in item (aa) or (bb) of paragraph (1)(A)(ii)(I), there is a supply disruption that—

“(AA) is outside of the control of the manufacturer;

“(BB) prevents the production or distribution of the applicable listed drug or reference product; and

“(CC) cannot be remedied by reasonable efforts; or

“(cc) with respect to a soft switch under paragraph (1)(B), the manufacturer had legitimate pro-competitive reasons, apart from the financial effects of reduced competition, to take the action.

“(B) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in subparagraph (A) may be construed to limit the information that the Commission may otherwise obtain in any proceeding or action instituted with respect to a violation of this section.

“(3) RESPONSE.—With respect to a justification offered by a manufacturer under paragraph (2), the Commission may—

“(A) rebut any evidence presented by a manufacturer during that justification; or

“(B) establish by a preponderance of the evidence that, on balance, the pro-competitive benefits from the conduct described in subparagraph (A) or (B) of paragraph (1), as applicable, do not outweigh any anti-competitive effects of the conduct, even in consideration of the justification so offered.

“(c) ENFORCEMENT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—If the Commission has reason to believe that any manufacturer has violated, is violating, or is about to violate this section, the Commission may take any of the following actions:

“(A) Institute a proceeding—

“(i) that, except as provided in paragraph (2), complies with the requirements under section 5(b); and

“(ii) in which the Commission may impose on the manufacturer any penalty that the Commission may impose for a violation of section 5.

“(B) In the same manner and to the same extent as provided in section 13(b), bring suit in a district court of the United States to temporarily enjoin the action of the manufacturer.

“(C) Bring suit in a district court of the United States, in which the Commission may seek—

“(i) to permanently enjoin the action of the manufacturer;

“(ii) any of the remedies described in paragraph (3); and

“(iii) any other equitable remedy, including ancillary equitable relief.

“(2) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any provision of section 5, any manufacturer that is subject to a final order of the Commission that is issued in a proceeding instituted under paragraph (1)(A) may, not later than 30 days after the date on which the Commission issues the order, petition for review of the order in—

“(i) the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit; or

“(ii) the court of appeals of the United States for the circuit in which the ultimate parent entity of the manufacturer is incorporated.

“(B) TREATMENT OF FINDINGS.—In a review of an order issued by the Commission conducted by a court of appeals of the United States under subparagraph (A), the factual findings of the Commission shall be conclusive if those facts are supported by the evidence.

“(3) EQUITABLE REMEDIES.—

“(A) DISGORGEMENT.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—In a suit brought under paragraph (1)(C), the Commission may seek, and the court may order, disgorgement of any unjust enrichment that a person obtained as a result of the violation that gives rise to the suit.

“(ii) CALCULATION.—Any disgorgement that is ordered with respect to a person under clause (i) shall be offset by any amount of restitution ordered under subparagraph (B).

“(iii) LIMITATIONS PERIOD.—The Commission may seek disgorgement under this subparagraph not later than 5 years after the latest date on which the person from which the disgorgement is sought receives any unjust enrichment from the effects of the violation that gives rise to the suit in which the Commission seeks the disgorgement.

“(B) RESTITUTION.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—In a suit brought under paragraph (1)(C), the Commission may seek, and the court may order, restitution with respect to the violation that gives rise to the suit.

“(ii) LIMITATIONS PERIOD.—The Commission may seek restitution under this subparagraph not later than 5 years after the latest date on which the person from which the restitution is sought receives any unjust enrichment from the effects of the violation that gives rise to the suit in which the Commission seeks the restitution.

“(4) RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection may be construed as—

“(A) requiring the Commission to bring a suit seeking a temporary injunction under paragraph (1)(B) before bringing a suit seeking a permanent injunction under paragraph (1)(C); or

“(B) affecting any other authority of the Commission under this Act to seek relief or obtain a remedy with respect to a violation of this Act.”.

(b) APPLICABILITY.—Section 27 of the Federal Trade Commission Act, as added by subsection (a), shall apply with respect to any—

(1) conduct that occurs on or after the date of enactment of this Act; and

(2) action or proceeding that is commenced on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

(c) ANTITRUST LAWS.—Nothing in this section, or the amendments made by this section, shall modify, impair, limit, or supersede the applicability of the antitrust laws as defined in subsection (a) of the first section of the Clayton Act (15 U.S.C. 12(a)), and of section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 45) to the extent that it applies to unfair methods of competition.

(d) RULEMAKING.—The Federal Trade Commission may issue rules under section 553 of title 5, United States Code, to carry out section 27 of the Federal Trade Commission Act, as added by subsection (a), including by defining any terms used in such section 27 (other than terms that are defined in subsection (a) of such section 27).

(e) CONFIRMATION.—Upon the request of the Commission, the Secretary shall provide confirmation of—

(1) any request made by the Secretary to the manufacturer for an application or supplement to an application for a change, modification, or reformulation of a drug or biological product;

(2) any withdrawal by the manufacturer of an application for a drug or reference product; or

(3) any request made by a manufacturer to the Secretary for withdrawal of an approval of the application for a drug or reference product or a request for placement of a drug or reference product on the discontinued products list.

SEC. 203. TITLE 35 AMENDMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 271(e) of title 35, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)(C), in the flush text following clause (ii), by adding at the end the following: “With respect to a submission described in clause (ii), the act of infringement shall extend to any patent that claims the biological product, a method of using the biological product, or a method or product used to manufacture the biological product.”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(7)(A) Subject to subparagraphs (C), (D), and (E), if the sponsor of an approved application for a reference product, as defined in section 351(i) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 262(i)) (referred to in this paragraph as the ‘reference product sponsor’), brings an action for infringement under this section against an applicant for approval of a biological product under section 351(k) of such Act that references that reference product (referred to in this paragraph as the ‘subsection (k) applicant’), the reference product sponsor may assert in the action a total of not more than 20 patents of the type described in subparagraph (B), not more than 10 of which shall have issued after the date specified in section 351(l)(7)(A) of such Act.

“(B) The patents described in this subparagraph are patents that satisfy each of the following requirements:

“(i) Patents that claim the biological product that is the subject of an application under section 351(k) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 262(k)) (or a use of that product) or a method or product used in the manufacture of such biological product.

“(ii) Patents that are included on the list of patents described in section 351(l)(3)(A) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 262(l)(3)(A)), including as provided under section 351(l)(7) of such Act.

“(iii) Patents that—

“(I) have an actual filing date of more than 4 years after the date on which the reference product is approved; or

“(II) include a claim to a method in a manufacturing process that is not used by the reference product sponsor.

“(C) The court in which an action described in subparagraph (A) is brought may increase the number of patents limited under that subparagraph—

“(i) if the request to increase that number is made without undue delay; and

“(ii) if the interest of justice so requires; or

“(II) for good cause shown, which—

“(aa) shall be established if the subsection (k) applicant fails to provide information re-

quired under section 351(l)(2)(A) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 262(l)(2)(A)) that would enable the reference product sponsor to form a reasonable belief with respect to whether a claim of infringement under this section could reasonably be asserted; and

“(bb) may be established—

“(AA) if there is a material change to the biological product (or process with respect to the biological product) of the subsection (k) applicant that is the subject of the application;

“(BB) if, with respect to a patent on the supplemental list described in section 351(l)(7)(A) of Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 262(l)(7)(A)), the patent would have issued before the date specified in such section 351(l)(7)(A) but for the failure of the Office to issue the patent or a delay in the issuance of the patent, as described in paragraph (1) of section 154(b) and subject to the limitations under paragraph (2) of such section 154(b); or

“(CC) for another reason that shows good cause, as determined appropriate by the court.

“(D) In determining whether good cause has been shown for the purposes of subparagraph (C)(ii)(II), a court may consider whether the reference product sponsor has provided a reasonable description of the identity and relevance of any information beyond the subsection (k) application that the court believes is necessary to enable the court to form a belief with respect to whether a claim of infringement under this section could reasonably be asserted.

“(E) The limitation imposed under subparagraph (A)—

“(i) shall apply only if the subsection (k) applicant completes all actions required under paragraphs (2)(A), (3)(B)(ii), (5), (6)(C)(i), (7), and (8)(A) of section 351(l) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 262(l)); and

“(ii) shall not apply with respect to any patent that claims, with respect to a biological product, a method for using that product in therapy, diagnosis, or prophylaxis, such as an indication or method of treatment or other condition of use.”.

(b) APPLICABILITY.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to an application submitted under section 351(k) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 262(k)) on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This portion shall be debatable for 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

The gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Washington.

□ 1030

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. JAYAPAL. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on H.R. 2486.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise today to bring forward the No BAN Act amendment, and I thank Congresswoman CHU for her leadership on this bill.

In January 2017, President Trump issued the first Muslim ban, a xenophobic policy that has inflicted irreparable harm on Muslims here at home and around the world, a policy that says to Muslims that they are not to be trusted. This is hurtful, harmful to our global relationships, and deeply untrue.

When the ban was implemented, I rushed to the Seattle airport along with Chairman NADLER in New York City. We joined thousands of people in protest. Thanks to these efforts, we successfully secured the release in Seattle of two individuals. But the chaos and the pain that the ban cast upon American citizens, lawful residents, and international visitors can never truly be undone.

Today, new iterations of the Muslim ban and the most recent African ban have kept families separated; American businesses and research institutions can't recruit the best minds from abroad; and our Nation's doors are closed to people seeking safety from violence, war, and persecution.

The bans have hurt our relationships with other countries, harmed refugees, isolated us from our allies, and given extremists propaganda for recruitment. Most important, they do not make our country safer.

And let's be clear: A pandemic is not the time to push forward these xenophobic bans.

Citizens from Muslim-majority nations made up 4.5 percent of the U.S. physician workforce in 2019; and yet, between 2016 and 2018, the number of applicants to the Educational Commission for Foreign Medical Graduates from Muslim-majority countries decreased by 15 percent, a decrease that exacerbates existing gaps in the U.S. physician workforce which is so desperately needed in a time of COVID-19.

It is time to pass the No BAN Act to repeal President Trump's bans and stop any future President from implementing discriminatory bans that send the repugnant message that our foundational values of freedom of religion and liberty and justice for all do not apply.

Today is historic, as the No BAN Act is the first bill to pass the House that directly addresses Muslim civil rights. And we would not be here today without the courage of Muslims and allies across the country, especially the very important people at Muslim Advocates who work to repudiate the Muslim ban and move Congress to action.

This bill sends an important message to Muslims everywhere that America believes in liberty and welcomes people regardless of race or religion.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time, and I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) control the remainder of that time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. BIGGS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in opposition to this amendment to H.R. 2486. The majority is actually playing procedural games here by including a nongermane provision to satisfy certain requirements.

The two immigration bills that we are considering today are expensive, make no doubt about it. According to the CBO, the NO BAN Act will increase direct spending by \$290 million over the next 10 years and increase deficits by \$307 million over the same period. And a preliminary estimate from CBO notes that the Access to Counsel Act, which we will debate later today, will increase discretionary spending by at least \$1 billion over the next 5 years.

So the majority had to come up with a pay-for. They opted for prescription drug legislation, but chose to discard bipartisan committee past text to instead include a flawed prescription bill that will stifle investment and research, prevent new medications from coming to market, block truthful advertising, and disincentivize improvements in patient care.

This Congress has unanimously passed six bipartisan bills out of committee to address the costs of prescription drugs. But today, instead of using bipartisan-negotiated text, my colleagues across the aisle have made prescription drugs a partisan issue in an effort to pass partisan immigration bills.

Our President has consistently taken decisive action to help ensure the security of our immigration programs and, thus, the safety of our country. Every time he does so, my Democratic friends cry foul. They attempt to block the President's actions and threaten to take away the President's power.

The Department of Homeland Security has identified several types of information that it needs in order to make a reliable decision regarding the admissibility of a foreign country's nationals seeking entry to the United States. This includes things like:

Does the country report lost or stolen identity documents, including passports, to Interpol, and how often do they do so?

Does the country share information about their known or suspected terrorists or about their criminals with us?

Does the country issue modern electronic passports?

These are clearly important things to know when determining whether to let a foreign national enter our country.

Instead of expressing appreciation for what this President has been able to accomplish with regard to security, my colleagues have decided to consider this No BAN Act, which effectively eviscerates the ability of the administration to take quick and decisive action to protect our homeland when concerns arise, even action to prevent

entry of aliens based on a global health crisis like COVID-19.

Until the President signed the first travel executive order in January of 2017, very few had ever heard of the Immigration and Nationality Act section 212(f) authority. This provision provides the President broad latitude to impose restrictions on the entry of aliens or classes of aliens into the United States when such entry "would be detrimental to the interests of the United States." And this authority has been used successfully by Presidents Ronald Reagan, Barack Obama, and others.

Pursuant to the travel executive order, the President required the Secretary of DHS and Secretary of State, along with the Director of National Intelligence to determine what countries failed to meet international standards of information sharing or identity management or were at a risk of terrorism or public safety concern and to report their findings to him.

Based on that assessment and the recommendations of the Secretaries, the President placed travel restrictions on seven nations. Pursuant to the continued review of countries and an updated report in January, the President issued a proclamation imposing narrowly tailored travel restrictions on six additional countries: Burma, Eritrea, Kyrgyzstan, Nigeria, Sudan, and Tanzania.

It is important to understand that such restrictions are not permanent. When a country comes into compliance with the information sharing and other requirements, they can be removed from the list of restricted countries, and that has actually happened under this administration, for instance, Chad in 2018. And press reports note that the Government of Nigeria immediately began working to come into compliance.

The President's use of 212(f) authority has helped improve our security and the vetting of foreign nationals seeking entry into the United States. As the DHS Assistant Secretary for Threat Prevention and Security Policy testified last September: "One country reinstituted a dormant program to help identify convicted criminals. Three countries have adopted more secure e-Passports. Two countries obtained access to Interpol databases for the first time. And eight countries began reporting lost and stolen passports to Interpol for the first time or they improved the regularity of that reporting."

These are not insignificant improvements to the world's security. The No BAN Act would take 212(f) authority from the elected President and give it to an unelected subordinate who is not accountable to voters.

Under this bill, only the Secretary of State can determine that the entry of aliens is a threat to the U.S. This is problematic in instances where other Cabinet officials should be involved, such as Health and Human Services or Treasury.

The bill's undefined and broad terms, "least restrictive means" and the "notion of harm," are ripe for litigation, especially considering the bill's expansive judicial review provision and explicit class action allowance.

The No BAN Act also contains onerous reporting requirements, consultation with Congress before the President can act, and Federal Register publication of information about the action taken and the circumstances necessitating the action. But does it make sense for the U.S. Government to broadcast the deficiencies they have identified since those would likely be exploited by bad actors seeking to do us harm?

Perhaps the most ridiculous of the bill's provisions is section 4, which not only terminates the travel executive orders in place but, incredibly, ceases all actions taken pursuant to any proclamation or executive order terminated by the bill. That means that information sharing on terrorists, criminals, and other security threats that has developed between the United States and other countries with travel restrictions would end.

This bill is a knee-jerk response by my Democratic colleagues because of the disapprobation of President Trump, and it would undermine the safety and security of Americans.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the No BAN Act, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 2214, the National Origin-Based Antidiscrimination for Nonimmigrants Act, or the No BAN Act, is critical legislation that will stop executive overreach, defend Congress' role in establishing our Nation's immigration laws, and right one of the original sins of the Trump administration: the Muslim ban.

When the Trump administration issued its first version of the ban in January 2017, it was immediately apparent that it was unconstitutional, discriminatory, and morally reprehensible. Its chaotic rollout only magnified the cruelty underlying this policy.

When news first broke that people were being detained at the airports, I immediately rushed to JFK Airport that morning along with Congresswoman VELÁZQUEZ. Within hours, we were joined by hundreds of demonstrators demanding justice. What we found was chaos and heartbreak. Refugees, people with valid visas, and even legal permanent residents, people who had assisted American troops and saved their lives in Iraq were prevented from entering the country or even speaking with their attorneys.

We met people like Hameed Khalid Darweesh, an Iraqi who put his life on the line for 10 years to work with American and coalition forces as a translator. He underwent a years-long extensive vetting process to secure a

Special Immigrant Visa granted to people who assist our military in Iraq and Afghanistan. In return for his efforts, this hero was welcomed to the United States with a door slammed in his face and a grueling ordeal at the airport as he pleaded for his freedom.

I am pleased that Congresswoman VELÁZQUEZ and I were able to work with officials in New York and Washington to secure his release eventually, but we should never have had to do that. That is not the country we are proud to represent in Congress. We do not betray those who save American troops.

Although the President's initial Muslim ban was ultimately blocked by numerous courts, in 2018, after protracted litigation and several court injunctions, the Supreme Court unfortunately upheld the third version of the ban, Presidential Proclamation 9645.

The Court reached this decision based on its broad reading of section 212(f) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, which authorizes the President to "suspend the entry of all aliens or any class of aliens" when the President finds that such entry "would be detrimental to the interests of the United States."

I strongly disagree with the Court's broad interpretation of that provision. Section 212(f) was intended to give the President discretion to quickly address emergent issues involving public health, national security, public safety, or international stability. It was not intended to provide carte blanche authority to the President to ban large categories of individuals without justification or to rewrite immigration laws with which he disagrees.

That is why this legislation is so important. H.R. 2214 will repeal these shameful bans and stop executive overreach by amending 212(f) to prevent any President from using it in a manner that is unlawful or unconscionable.

The United States has always been and must continue to be a place that welcomes and embraces people of all religions and all nationalities. But as a result of the Muslim ban, our country's reputation as a beacon of hope, tolerance, and inclusion for those fleeing persecution, reuniting with their families, or simply seeking a better life has been forever tarnished.

I would like to thank my friend and colleague Representative CHU for introducing this legislation and for her leadership and commitment to this issue.

I also want to thank the NO BAN coalition, led by Muslim Advocates, and all of the many organizations whose support was vital to bringing this bill to the floor today. It is long overdue.

Madam Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support the NO BAN Act, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1045

Mr. BIGGS. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOODEN).

Mr. GOODEN. Madam Speaker, I thank Congressman BIGGS for yielding.

I rise today in opposition to the NO BAN Act, which would tie the hands of our executive branch, restricting our ability to act quickly and decisively to defend America from her enemies.

The President must have authority to act when our national security is at risk. When a situation demands we halt travel into our country, whether that be to protect us from a pandemic or other national security issue, the President must have the power to do so.

Democrats, on March 11 of this year, debated this very measure in the form of a bill, ironically, the same day that President Trump instituted his ban on European travel. Because they knew the optics would look bad, they pulled the bill down. If it was a bad bill then, it is a bad bill today.

Congress gave the President the authority we are discussing today when we passed, many decades ago, the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the years since, our courts have affirmed that authority on numerous occasions.

So why, then, do my Democratic colleagues want to take this critical authority away?

I would like to read an excerpt from a 1986 decision out of the D.C. Circuit, in which the court stated that the very authority we are debating today ensures that "the Executive would not be helpless in the face of such a threat" of an alien who posed a danger to the United States.

Furthermore, the court stated that "the President's sweeping proclamation power thus provides a safeguard against the danger posed" to our national security.

What far right extremist, ultra-conservative judge wrote those words? No other than Ruth Bader Ginsberg.

The safety and security of the American people should not be a partisan issue. It ought to be everyone's highest priority. We should not jeopardize the well-being of our citizens for the sake of political victories. If enacted, the NO BAN Act would put American lives and our country's national security at risk.

Madam Speaker, I will be opposing this dangerous policy, and I urge my colleagues to oppose it as well.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. JUDY CHU), the sponsor of the bill.

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Madam Speaker, I thank Chairman NADLER for his leadership in bringing the NO BAN Act for a vote on the floor today.

Three years ago, when President Trump first took office, within 1 week, he announced the first Muslim ban.

I will never forget that terrible day in January of 2017. I was on my way to a community event when I received a frantic call about 50 Muslims with green cards who were being detained at LAX for hours, with no end in sight.

At that moment, I decided to drop everything and help in any way I could. I rushed over to LAX to advocate for

these people. Once I arrived, I found out that, indeed, there were scores of people with a legal right to be here kept for hours without food and blocked from receiving legal advice from an attorney.

With this action, Trump was immediately creating chaos and separating families with no justification. It was outrageous. When I pressed Customs and Border Protection for answers, they resisted and blocked me. I even got them on the phone, only to have them hang up on me.

I had never been more disrespected as a Member of Congress, but disrespect and chaos is what this Muslim ban is all about. Since then, the administration has steadily worked to make it harder and harder for individuals to come to the United States, which has meant keeping families and loved ones apart.

Partners and spouses have been kept apart for years at a time. Children have missed parent's funerals. Parents have missed children's weddings, birthdays, and graduations. Families have been languishing, wondering when they will be reunited, all because of a policy born from prejudice. This is a cruel abuse of power that must be stopped.

The NO BAN Act repeals all versions of the Muslim ban, including the travel ban imposed in February of this year that includes many African countries. It limits the President's authority to ban people from entering the United States unless there is a clear justification. The President would have to consult with the Departments of Homeland Security and State before implementing a ban and would have to brief Congress within 48 hours.

Let me make clear that this bill would not have impacted our ability to fight the COVID-19 pandemic in any way, as it does not interfere with the ability of a President to restrict immigration due to public health concerns.

Madam Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to vote in favor of this historic legislation which sends a strong message to our communities that you cannot be discriminated against based on your religion or national origin.

Mr. BIGGS. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the Speaker of the House.

Ms. PELOSI. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I thank him for his leadership in bringing this legislation to the floor.

Madam Speaker, I pay special tribute to Congresswoman CHU, the chair of the caucus in the House that represents the Asian Pacific American community, and PRAMILA JAYAPAL, a member of the Judiciary Committee, instrumental in bringing this legislation as well, the NO BAN Act, and, again, the right to counsel legislation.

As I was thinking of this legislation today—I have a statement for the record, but I was thinking back to the

“rump” hearing that we had under the leadership of the Judiciary Committee at the time the NO BAN was announced. The distinguished chair, Ms. CHU, talked about how people reacted at the airports and the rest—among them, John Lewis—going to the airport.

But at this hearing, it was so remarkable, because people turned out. Diplomats showed up and spoke for their colleagues who were still in the diplomatic service, saying how wrong this was. They took professional risk as members of our diplomatic corps. There were around a thousand of them who signed a statement opposing this ban.

The military was there, our men and women in uniform. They were there saying: You are hurting us. We have made promises to interpreters and others who have helped us in Iraq and Afghanistan—they were Muslim—and now they can't come to the United States? It is wrong on its face, but we are not even keeping our word. Who will trust us? Who will trust us if we don't have respect for people?

Some military who were Muslim—actually Khizr Khan was there, a Gold Star father, he came and was very brief in his testimony. He had some good advice about what we could do about this.

But our men and women in uniform who are Muslim were hearing this, in Khizr Khan's case, a Gold Star family whose son had given his life for our country, a Muslim, and now we were saying there is going to be a Muslim ban.

What was interesting, though, was that a leader of the evangelical community was there. And this bill is sending a strong message. It is repealing all versions of the Muslim ban, the refugee ban, and the asylum ban, rescinding each cruel version of the President's discriminatory bans, including his executive order mandating extreme vetting for refugees and asylum seekers.

Well, the person who was there, and the record will show, representing the evangelicals, he said in his testimony that the United States Refugee Resettlement Program is the crowning glory of American humanitarianism, and here this President is rejecting that focus of who we are as a country and the model we should be.

In fact, all this administration has done is diminish the opportunities for those who would come here—some for fear of persecution, others because they had helped us, and others because of the Statue of Liberty, again, a beacon of hope to the world that is constantly undermined by this administration.

So, Madam Speaker, I salute the maker of this amendment, Chairwoman JUDY CHU. I salute PRAMILA JAYAPAL, who has been relentless, persistent on this matter, and I thank all of our colleagues who fought so hard.

Just to recall, we remember the day after the inauguration that women turned out in huge numbers not only in

Washington, but all over the country and all over the world. They knew the power of their presence.

So, when this came shortly thereafter, people understood the power of their presence, and people showed up at airports and wherever a manifestation of support for our Muslim community was needed. It was really quite a defining time for our country, because people knew their power and the power of their presence, being there, being there for everyone in our country.

So, Madam Speaker, I am very grateful to the makers of this motion, to the Judiciary Committee. And to Chairman NADLER, I thank him for giving us this opportunity to honor what the Statue of Liberty means to us and to the world.

Then just go look at Ronald Reagan's statements about the Statue of Liberty and the beacon of hope that it is to the world and contrast it to the attitude that we see coming out of this White House now.

I hope we have a good, bipartisan vote on this repeal of the Muslim ban and the access to counsel that goes with this legislation.

Madam Speaker, on the base of the Statue of Liberty, which is a beacon of freedom and hope for the world, are inscribed these words: “Give me your tired, your poor/ Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free/ Send these, the homeless, tempest-tossed to me.”

I rise to join my colleagues in support of the “NO BAN” Act to rescind the President's Muslim ban, which betrays everything the Statue of Liberty and our nation stand for.

I salute Congresswoman JUDY CHU, Chair of the Congressional Asian Pacific American Caucus, and the lead on this legislation—which is the first Muslim civil rights bill in our nation's history.

Thank you also to Congresswoman PRAMILA JAYAPAL for her leadership to ensure that those unjustly detained have access to legal counsel.

It is particularly senseless that the President continues to inflict his Muslim ban on the country as we face the COVID-19 pandemic.

These bans harm the economy and public health by depriving our nation of the researchers, scientists, physicians and other medical professionals desperately needed to crush the virus.

More than 100,000 medical professionals in our country are from just two of the countries included in the ban.

Overall, the ban has led to a 15 percent drop in new physicians from Muslim-majority countries coming to America.

These bans fuel anti-Muslim discrimination, which sadly, the White House is encouraging, when it misleads the public and says that the bans are needed to keep us safe—when in reality, the bans only weaken our response, by banning doctors and medical professionals from our shores.

At the same time, the bans erode our national security and devastate families: separating families and preventing thousands from attending loved ones' births, graduations, marriages and funerals. One study finds that these bans have prevented more than 9,000 family members of U.S. citizens from entering the country, including more than 5,500 children.

More than 400 national, state and local civil rights, faith-based, national security and community groups, from AFSCME and Amnesty International to United We Dream and Veterans for Peace, have spoken out to demand passage of the NO BAN Act to “end the harmful Muslim Ban and put in place vital protections against future discriminatory bans.”

“The NO BAN Act is a clear and unequivocal response to the Muslim Ban that would ensure no one can be banned from our country based on religious or nationality-based discrimination ever again.

“Regrettably, the Muslim Ban validates the worst stereotypes about Muslims; that they are inherently foreign and violent and pose such a threat to the United States they should be banned.

“The ban on Muslims comes after generations of politicians hostile to religious minorities have attempted to ban Jews, Catholics, and Latter-day Saints. Congress now has an opportunity to take action against the Muslim Ban and this troubling history by sending a strong message that our nation rejects religious bigotry.”

With this bill, Congress is sending that strong message. We are:

Repealing all versions of the Muslim ban, the refugee ban, and the asylum ban—rescinding each cruel version of the President's discriminatory bans, including his executive order mandating “extreme vetting” for refugees and asylum seeking;

Strengthening immigration law to explicitly prohibit discrimination based on religion—and ensuring that it applies to non-immigrant visas, entry into the U.S. and the approval of any immigrant benefit; and

Limiting executive authority to prevent any president from issuing future bans like the Muslim ban—imposing strict requirements before any future restrictions can be issued & enacting reporting requirements to Congress to create an oversight mechanism for the future.

The Democratic House will always stand up to defend our values. As Pope Francis said, “It's hypocrisy to call yourself a Christian and chase away a refugee or someone seeking help.”

I urge a strong bipartisan vote to put an end to this act of callousness and discrimination from the White House.

Madam Speaker, I urge a strong “yes” vote.

Mr. BIGGS. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the Speaker's invoking President Reagan, because in 1981, President Reagan used 212(f) authority to suspend entry of undocumented aliens from the high seas, so I appreciate her reminding us of the use of 212(f) by Reagan.

Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS).

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I thank Representative BIGGS for yielding.

Representative BIGGS just highlighted, frankly, the problem, Madam Speaker, that we see in this, and it has been reiterated over and over again.

This is not about a policy. This is about a person. It is about a person, the President, who the other side, and especially this committee that I have served as ranking member on and now

serve as a member of, has consistently gone after for, now, almost 19 months.

It has nothing to do with policies that at one point they did or did not believe in because, if this were true, we would have had a mass outcry in 2011 when President Obama used this authority to keep out folks because of human rights issues and other things.

So, again, the problem here is it is great to couch this in political terms; it is great to couch this in great, deep policy issues; but, for 18 months, this is all that we have heard.

I heard my chairman just a minute ago speak about how these policies that he disagrees with and doesn't like that are found under the law and that we are dealing with here today in this so-called NO BAN Act have tarnished us. Well, I will tell everybody what is tarnishing us in this country. It is acts like this and the constant back-and-forth.

There are times I have wondered—and I know my friend from Arizona has as well. We have talked about this a little bit. I have wondered why we have sort of kept the House locked down for the last 5 or 6 months, but if this is what we come back to do, maybe we should just stay away, because if this is what we are doing, it is, frankly, frustrating, because November 3 will be the chance to talk about this.

It is very policy and politically driven when we come to this floor on anything that really has to do with a political agenda, when there is a date on the calendar, as I talked about before, more than actually changing policy, because when you look at this, I will almost guarantee you that my friends currently in the majority, if they had a President of their party in the White House, they would come back on this very quickly and be very scared of messing with this power Presidentially.

This is a problem that we are seeing over and over and over and over again.

This NO BAN Act would strip the President of his ability to use the Immigration and Nationality Act to ban travel from certain countries that present national security concerns.

Ironically, as I said earlier, this is the very power that President Trump used in January to deal with the coronavirus in China. If this were in place, he may not have had the ability to actually work on what we know now as the pandemic early on to help stop the spread.

There are consequences to political legislation. This is one of them. We saved countless lives because of that, and now they want to strip the President of the authority to do that.

Now, others may say, well, we have got exceptions and we have got this. I am not taking anything from this committee on exceptions for this President. There have not been any. It is simply a partisan attack.

□ 1100

The Department of Homeland Security has identified several types of in-

formation that it needs in order to make a reliable decision regarding the admissibility of a foreign country's nationals to seek entry into the United States; things like: Does the country report lost or stolen identity documents, including passports, to Interpol, and how often they do so?

Does the country share information about their known or suspected terrorists or about their criminals with us?

And does the country issue modern electronic passports?

Why would we want to restrict the President, any President, from considering this information when determining whether to let a foreign national into our country?

Instead of appreciating what has been done here by this President with regard to our national security, like addressing the crisis on our border and China's increasingly hostile behavior, the Democrats have decided to move forward with this act, which we have talked about before in our committee and have pointed out many of the problems of this act. It eviscerates the ability of any administration to take nimble and decisive action to protect our homeland when cause for concern arises, like the threat of COVID-19.

What is even more ironic, and I touched on this when I first started, Madam Speaker, is that the very power that the majority wants to strip from this President was used successfully by President Barack Obama and also—as was pointed out by my friend from Arizona—by the Speaker of this House, currently, and Ronald Reagan.

When we understand this, this actually clarifies—it actually crystallizes it. So when you see every other President has used this in some form over the years, and it has only become a concern now because we do not like the current President, Donald Trump, and we have an election coming up very quickly, then we start seeing stuff like this.

In January 2017, President Trump signed an executive order to restrict travel from certain countries that were at a high risk of terrorism and were public safety concerns, based off recommendations from the Secretaries of DHS and State, along with the DNI.

It is important to understand these restrictions are not permanent. This is, again, another thing that permeates even some conversations I have heard already that we are making permanent changes. These are not permanent. They are there until the country gets it in order and are actually able to answer our security concerns, which is not going to be talked about today. We are not talking about security. We are trying to make it feel like it is something else against certain groups and ethnic groups. This is about security.

When you look at the law, and it says, when those public safety concerns are removed, they are removed from the restricted list, such as Chad was in 2018.

Let me be clear; there is no doubt the President's use of the 212(f) authority

has helped us improve our security and the vetting of foreign nationals seeking entry into the U.S. Some countries restricted by this order have taken positive steps to come into compliance with the information-sharing and public safety standards and have worked to participate in protecting international security.

Is that not what we would want? Or is what is being said by the majority today that we prefer lax standards for those coming here; we prefer less safety for our people of people coming here. Is that the standard being left here?

I don't think the majority wants to go there, but it is seemingly implied by what is being said. Because this is actually working with countries to come into modern-day compliance with known safety and international safety regulations.

This bill would take authority away from the President and give it to a subordinate. Again, strange move here; taking the Presidential authority. It goes back and shows the real intent of this bill is about this President, not about the law.

It would also outrageously terminate “all actions taken pursuant to any proclamation or executive order,” effectively shutting down the information sharing on terrorism, criminals, and security threats that have come from these restrictions. This is dangerous, Madam Speaker, and it is a bad policy.

This bill is just another response, knee-jerk response, by the majority because they don't like the President and they don't like the decisions he makes on behalf of the country. Unfortunately, their never-ending desire to take him down comes at the expense of American security and safety if this bill were to become law.

Fortunately, we know it will not; another day of political posturing on the floor of the House, wreaking havoc on our borders, backlogging our customs process. And here is the interesting one that nobody has talked about that I have heard so far. I may have missed it, but I don't think I did.

Me and the gentleman from Arizona, we understand something. Everything coming here today has a price tag. This one does as well, \$1 billion.

But then this is really where it gets concerning, Madam Speaker, because I have tried my best over the years to work with the majority, and I see some of my friends over there that we have passed legislation with that have made an impact in this country.

But here is what really bothers me. How do they pay for it? How does the majority pay for this?

The majority, Democrats, have decided to include in this bill a prescription drug measure that could have been by bipartisan, and was bipartisan, if only they had abided by the agreed-upon text negotiated by Members in both parties.

Instead, we are considering an old, partisan version of a prescription drug

bill that will undermine critical innovation. We negotiated bipartisan changes to stop gaming while preserving the research that benefits patients, but the Democrats in the majority have abandoned that and, with this bill, they have abandoned any hope of showing the American people they truly want to legislate, instead of just constantly attacking this President.

But what is of deeper concern here, especially when it comes to prescription drug costs—because I don't want to hear my friends in the majority now talk about how they want to save money, and how they want to encourage innovation. When they put this into this bill, they have torn down bipartisan work that could actually save money. They have got to pay for it somehow.

I know their counsel; I know they are struggling right now. We have to pay for it somehow.

Well, then why not go back to the bipartisan process of working on prescription drugs, instead of throwing it into this NO BAN Act?

The majority's moral underpinning is severely damaged when you look at the fact that they are trying to play games with the prescription drug issue in our country on this bill; when we know, for a fact, that bipartisanship was the way forward on this, and I had worked with, and others had worked to bring a bipartisan solution. And now we throw it out the door because we are so bent on making a political statement on this floor that bipartisanship is gone. We might as well pack it up and wait for November 3. That hurts this body.

As the chairman of this committee in this House talked about just a moment ago about tarnishing the work in the world standing by what the President has done, are we really not going to have a conversation, Madam Speaker, about what is happening?

And I know—Madam Speaker, you do as well—concern about what happens here, concern about actually getting something done, concern about the very people that are lifted up by the majority and the minority, saying we are here for the American people. But when I see pay-fors like this, when I see the pay-for happening here, I know that this is not anything but another day on the campaign trail.

We are here today, making a political statement, and you know who is going to suffer? The very ones—I don't want to hear it from anybody in the majority today talking about how they want to help healthcare; how they want to bring prescription drug costs down; how they want to get at the very issues that we are dealing with. Because today you are going to go on record when you vote for this, by saying we don't care about the American people's fixing prescription drugs and getting healthy in this country. This today proves you have nothing to do.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congresswoman CHU for this important statement that is necessary for the American people: In God, We Trust. And the God we trust is a merciful God.

144,000 people dead from COVID-19. It is important when an administration, no matter who it is, fails the American people, the United States Congress must be the one that deals with that failure, and that is what the NO BAN Act stands for. It stands for expanding the INA's nondiscrimination provision to prohibit discrimination based on religion and extends the prohibition on discrimination beyond the issuance of immigrant visas to include the issuance of nonimmigrant visas, entry, admission to the United States, and the approval or revocation thereof.

I had an amendment that is added to this that makes it a surety that the administration report to Congress on the impacts of positive, negative, and unintended actions by the President. We must have oversight.

I stand in the name of Ali, a 17-year-old. When I landed from Washington, I went straight to the terminal immediately on that Friday. My tears were coming to my eyes as I saw little Ali denied entry into the United States.

That is why I am here. I support the NO BAN Act.

Madam Speaker, as an original cosponsor and senior member of the Committee on the Judiciary, I rise in strong and enthusiastic support of H.R. 2214, the "National Origin-Based AntiDiscrimination For Non-Immigrants Act, or No BAN Act, which stops executive overreach by preventing the president from abusing his authority to restrict the entry of non-citizens into the United States under section 212(f) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA).

This legislation also repeals several of the President's section 212(f)-based executive actions, including his original Muslim ban as well as the most recent expansion of the ban announced in January 2020.

Madam Speaker, I support this legislation because the NO BAN Act amends section 212(f) of the INA to place checks and balances on the President's authority to temporarily suspend or restrict the entry of aliens or classes of aliens into the United States, when it is determined that such individuals "would undermine the security or public safety of the United States or the preservation of human rights, democratic processes or institutions, or international stability."

Specifically, the bill requires the President to find and document that any suspension or restriction: (1) is based on specific and credible facts; (2) is narrowly tailored; (3) specifies a duration; and (4) includes waivers.

The NO BAN Act expands the INA's nondiscrimination provision to prohibit discrimination based on religion and extends the prohibition on discrimination beyond the issuance of immigrant visas to include the issuance of nonimmigrant visas, entry and admission into the United States, and the approval or revocation of any immigration benefit.

The NO BAN Act terminates several of President Trump's proclamations and executive orders invoking section 212(f) authority, including Presidential Proclamation 9645, also

known as the "Muslim Ban," and Presidential Proclamation 9983, barring the entry of immigrants from Burma (Myanmar), Eritrea, Kyrgyzstan, and Nigeria, and suspending participation in the Diversity Visa program for nationals of Sudan and Tanzania.

Madam Speaker, I am pleased that the NO BAN Act includes an important amendment I offered during the committee markup of the legislation, which requires the Administration to report to Congress on the impacts—positive, negative, and unintended—of any action taken by the President pursuant to executive orders he has or will issue pursuant to section 212(f) of the INA.

I strongly support the provision in the legislation that nullifies the President's latest executive order which adds the countries of Belarus, Myanmar, Eritrea, Kyrgyzstan, Nigeria, Sudan and Tanzania to the President's new and offensive Muslim Ban.

As a co-chair of the Congressional Nigerian Caucus, the United States cannot afford to hamper diplomatic relations with Nigeria due to its importance in the region.

Nigeria is the largest economy and most populous country in Africa with an estimated population of more than 190 million, which is expected to grow to 400 million by 2050 and become the third most populous country in the world after China and India.

The United States is the largest foreign investor in Nigeria, with U.S. foreign direct investment concentrated largely in the petroleum and mining and wholesale trade sectors.

At \$2.2 billion in 2017, Nigeria is the second largest U.S. export destination in Sub-Saharan Africa and the United States and Nigeria have a bilateral trade and investment framework agreement.

In 2017, the two-way trade in goods between the United States and Nigeria totaled over \$9 billion.

Due to many of the residents of these countries practicing Islam, the President's executive order has been appropriately nicknamed the "Muslim Ban", and only exemplifies the xenophobic and prejudiced mindset that is unacceptable in this country.

With countries such as Nigeria, Sudan, Tanzania, and Eritrea, being considered as additions to the travel ban list, I strongly oppose this discriminatory act.

Tanzania is also an important partner of the United States, and through numerous presidential initiatives, the United States has provided development and other assistance to Tanzania for capacity building to address health and education issues, encourage democratic governance promote broad-based economic growth, and advance regional and domestic security to sustain progress.

Although Sudan has had some internal issues during the last decade, the U.S. was a major donor in the March 1989 "Operation Lifeline Sudan," which delivered 100,000 metric tons of food into both government and rebel held areas of the Sudan, thus, averting widespread starvation.

The United States established diplomatic relations with Eritrea in 1993, following its independence and separation from Ethiopia.

The United States supported Eritrea's independence and through a concerted, mutual effort that began in late 2017 and continues today, there are vast improvements to the bilateral relationship.

U.S. interests in Eritrea include supporting efforts for greater integration of Eritrea with

the rest of the Horn of Africa, encouraging Eritrea to contribute to regional stability and partner on shared peace and security goals, urging progress toward a democratic political culture, addressing human rights issues and promoting economic reform and prosperity.

Although the law contains a waiver program that allows residents of these countries to enter the country if they meet certain standards, this program is arbitrary and unfairly creates a separation of families, provides less work opportunities and greatly reduces the opportunity to apply for visas in the future, unless it is repealed.

A comprehensive and coordinated strategy needs to be developed in coordination with the United States Congress to ensure that each country affected by this law may peacefully have its residents enter the United States and complete visa and asylum applications.

We live in a nation of laws but we also live in a nation that seeks to establish and maintain diplomatic ties to these important African nations and imposing a discriminatory and arbitrary ban would adversely affect foreign relations with a critical continent for decades to come.

Madam Speaker, in light of the crisis presented by current COVID-19 pandemic, the NO BAN Act contains a provision to ensure that the President can use section 212(f) to protect the United States from the spread of communicable diseases, including the 2019 coronavirus, by suspending the entry of a class of individuals if the President determines their entry would undermine the public safety of the United States.

However, to remove any perceived ambiguity and avoid the propensity of this president to abuse delegated authority, the legislation includes language to clarify that the term “public safety” “includes efforts necessary to contain a communicable disease of public health significance.”

Madam Speaker, the NO BAN Act is supported by a bipartisan coalition of the nation's leading immigrants' rights organizations, faith-based organizations, and civil rights organizations, including the following:

American Civil Liberties Union; Church World Service; U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops; Muslim Advocates Immigration Hub; Asian Americans Advancing Justice Association; Americans United for Separation of Church and State; Bend the Arc; Center for American Progress; The Public Affairs Alliance of Iranian Americans; Interfaith Immigration Coalition; Human Rights Campaign; Franciscan Action Network; HIAS; Jewish and Muslims and Allies Acting Together; Religious Action Center of Reform Judaism; National Council of Jewish Women; National Iranian American Organization Action; National Immigration Law Center; International Refugee Assistance Project; Friends Committee on National Legislation; Engage Action; and Airbnb.

I urge all Members to vote for H.R. 2214 and send a powerful message to the President and the American people that this House will not stand idly by as this Administration tries to abandon America's well-earned and long-established reputation of being the most welcoming nation on earth.

Mr. BIGGS. Madam Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time is left?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Arizona has 11 minutes remaining. The gentleman from New York has 17½ minutes remaining.

Mr. BIGGS. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE), the minority whip.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Arizona for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this bill. And when you think about where we are as a country, we are in the middle of a global pandemic. And at the beginning of this, after China lied—and let's be very clear—China lied, not only to the United States, but to the entire world about this disease that started in Wuhan.

And what they did, while they were lying, they corrupted the World Health Organization, that entity that typically we all would look to for guidance, and WHO literally was regurgitating the Chinese Communist Party's talking points, saying it wasn't spread from human-to-human contact, which was a lie. And we now have evidence to show that they manipulated and deceived the rest of the world.

While they were doing that, Madam Speaker, they were hoarding PPE. They were not only buying it up around the world, they make most of it in China. We need to change that, by the way.

We should be spending our time here on the House floor, not limiting the President's ability to keep Americans safe, which, fortunately, President Trump was able to do. He did so effectively, properly; he stopped flights coming in from China when we knew the disease was coming from China, for goodness sake.

Why would you want to stop the President from being able to keep Americans safe?

What we should be spending our time on right now, Madam Speaker, is bringing more manufacturing back to America so we don't need to rely on China, because they told even American companies like 3M that were making PPE, you can't ship it back to the United States when our nurses and doctors need it.

So President Trump said, we are going to use the Defense Production Act. We are going to start making more of that here in America.

We need to put incentives to bring more of that back from China, so we are not relying on them.

But no, we are not spending our time on that today, Madam Speaker. We are spending our time with this bill that would limit and make it more difficult for the President of the United States, any President—just because some people don't like this President, they are going to make it harder for any President to keep Americans safe, whether it is from terrorists abroad, or whether it is for health pandemics that might break out again in the future.

This is lunacy that we would be trying to make it harder for a President to keep Americans safe. Thank good-

ness President Trump used his executive powers to act like he did to stop the disease from spreading more into this country. He saved thousands of lives.

If China wouldn't have lied to him, we would have had a few more weeks. There is data that shows scientifically that tens of thousands of lives would have been saved in America.

But at least the President was able to act when he had the proper information. I know people like Joe Biden said it was xenophobic, for goodness sake; criticized the President stopping people from coming in from the place where the disease started. And others criticized him for doing it as well. But it was the right thing to do. I am glad he took that action.

The last thing we need to be doing in the middle of this pandemic is making it harder for the President to keep Americans safe. I urge everybody to vote “no” on this bill.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES).

Mr. JEFFRIES. Madam Speaker, America is a Nation of immigrants; some voluntary, others involuntary. John Lewis would often remind us, however, that while we may have come over on different ships, we are all in the same boat now.

We are a gorgeous mosaic of people from throughout the world, different races, different regions, yes, different religions; that is what makes America a great country, not xenophobia.

Donald Trump's hateful Muslim ban is unacceptable, unconscionable, and un-American. It is inconsistent with the principles of religious freedom and tolerance embedded in the First Amendment of the United States Constitution. That is why we are going to make it unlawful.

Vote “yes” on the NO BAN Act.

Mr. BIGGS. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

Mr. CICILLINE. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2214, legislation that will repeal the President's shameful Muslim ban, and strengthen our immigration system by ensuring immigration decisions are not made on the basis of religious discrimination.

In the face of religious intolerance, Roger Williams established the great State of Rhode Island on the principles of religious liberty and separation of church and State. These are important principles that were ultimately incorporated into our founding documents.

In fact, President Washington, addressing the Hebrew congregation at Touro Synagogue, wrote in a famous letter in 1790, when they asked, Will we have religious freedom in this new country? He wrote those words: “For happily the Government of the United States gives to bigotry no sanction, to persecution no assistance.”

And what has been the result of this religious discrimination, this Muslim ban? It has resulted in mothers and fathers being separated from their American children. Foreign students are prevented from studying at our Nation's great universities; and doctors from countries under the ban aren't able to come here to provide care to patients in the United States, despite healthcare shortages across the Nation during a global health pandemic.

□ 1115

In addition to that, Madam Speaker, this legislation violates the founding principles of this country of religious freedom. I am very proud that this legislation is being brought to the floor so that we can reaffirm that important principle not only in the founding documents of our country but in the present immigration laws and their application.

In addition to that, there has been a lot of discussion about how we are paying for this. I am very proud that this legislation includes provisions of the Affordable Prescriptions for Patients Through Promoting Competition Act, which will save taxpayers over half a billion dollars in the form of lower prescription drug prices. All across the country, prescription costs are skyrocketing. People are going bankrupt and even dying because they can't afford prescription medication.

H.R. 2214 addresses product hopping, an anticompetitive tactic used by Big Pharma to protect and extend their monopolies over certain prescription drugs, leading to dramatically higher prices. This legislation expressly prohibits hopping under the FTC Act, and the bill is subject to the same equitable remedies, including restitution and disgorgement of profits. So, all this talk about folding into the pay-for would actually produce lower prescription drug prices for Americans, and somehow that is a bad idea? Give me a break.

This bill reasserts the prohibition against religious discrimination, one of the most important founding principles of this country, and it pays for it by delivering lower prescription drug prices for the American people.

Madam Speaker, I thank Chairman NADLER, Congresswoman CHU, and Congresswoman JAYAPAL for their great work, and I urge my colleagues to pass this bill.

Mr. BIGGS. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN).

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, let us not forget who we are. Our Framers rebelled against centuries of religious oppression, Inquisition, Holy Crusades, witchcraft trials, and state religion. They conceived America as a haven of refuge for people fleeing from religious and political persecution from all over the world. It would become an "asylum

for humanity," said Tom Paine—not an insane asylum, mind you, but an asylum for freedom.

The President's Muslim ban desecrates this vision with the kind of religious discrimination that our Nation was created to oppose.

The NO BAN Act now strikes down the President's infamous Muslim ban proclamation and restores the principle of no religious discrimination to the immigration process. It will be a proud day for this Congress when we invalidate the President's infamous and ugly attempt to scapegoat people based on their religion.

Mr. BIGGS. I reserve the balance of my time, Madam Speaker.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. CORREA).

Mr. CORREA. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, in January of 2017, when President Trump issued his first Muslim ban executive order, I immediately rushed to LAX to help those individuals who were being held at LAX. These were individuals who had been cleared by our State Department to enter the United States. Let me repeat: These were individuals who had been cleared by our State Department to enter the United States, and then they were blocked by the President's random order.

I immediately introduced my first bill, the DIRE Act, to provide due process guaranteed by our Constitution for Dreamers, immigrants, and refugees, due process that has been systematically denied by a President.

Our Nation is built by immigrants who dare to dream better, immigrants who came to this country with nothing but their dreams of a better life.

Madam Speaker, I urge passage of this bill.

Mr. BIGGS. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Colorado (Mr. NEGUSE).

Mr. NEGUSE. Madam Speaker, today, I rise in support of the NO BAN Act, a powerful bill that preserves the promise of America and rejects this administration's xenophobic and anti-Muslim immigration policies.

The President's reckless bans on majority Muslim and African countries do not align with our American values or the unique promise that this country has offered immigrants and refugees for centuries. It will not make us safer, and it is yet another example of this administration's haphazard and cruel immigration policies.

I am proud that I was able to successfully offer an amendment during the Judiciary Committee's markup, with the chairman's support, that added this President's latest ban to the underlying bill. It is not only the right thing to do for our country but also a matter very personal to me.

As many in this Chamber know, my parents came to America nearly 40 years ago as refugees from Eritrea, one of the very countries that this President has targeted in his latest ban. My parents' ability to start a new life in this country offered me and my family freedom, opportunity, and the privilege to truly experience the American Dream. There are countless success stories like my family's waiting to be told, stories that won't be written if this body does not pass this NO BAN Act today.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleague to support it.

Mr. BIGGS. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. ROSE).

Mr. ROSE of New York. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the NO BAN Act to finally repeal the racist and discriminatory Muslim bans that have stained our Nation for the past 3 years.

The Muslim ban undermines everything that this great country stands for, the greatest country in the history of the world.

It has torn apart my constituents' families and trapped their loved ones in war zones and refugee camps. It has made Muslim Americans feel like second class citizens in their very own country. They are Americans just as much as I.

This ban has done nothing to make us safe. Senator John McCain, in fact, once called the ban a self-inflicted wound in the fight against terrorism.

The administration's own officials admit this does absolutely nothing to protect our country. The State Department says that just one-tenth of 1 percent of the people blocked from this country under the Muslim ban was deemed a security risk. Those stats do not lie. DHS cannot point to a single threat that our existing immigration policies and systems would not have handled.

If we are going to fight for this country to fulfill its promise, this ban must be overturned.

Mr. BIGGS. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota (Ms. OMAR).

Ms. OMAR. Madam Speaker, it gives me great pride to rise today in support of the NO BAN Act.

Our friends on the other side of the aisle might try to obscure the reality here by pointing to the Muslim countries that are not on the ban. The White House has tried to wrap their hateful policy up in a false story about national security, but we know the truth.

I have spoken countless times, both before and since I have entered this office, about the hateful brutality of the Muslim ban.

Today, I want to celebrate the work that brought us to this point. I want to

celebrate the countless Americans who went to the airport the day the first ban was announced. I want to celebrate the thousands of State Department employees who signed the dissent memo and those who resigned in protest. I want to celebrate Congresswoman CHU and Senator COONS for their tireless work on overturning this ban.

Today's vote is a culmination of all of their work, starting at the grassroots level. We have been in the struggle together, and we will continue to be in it until this ban is in the dustbin of history.

Mr. BIGGS. I reserve the balance of my time, Madam Speaker.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL).

Mrs. DINGELL. Benjamin Franklin once famously said that those who would give up liberty for security deserve neither.

My home, Dearborn, Michigan, is home to the largest population of Arab Americans in this country. They are constantly targeted very irrationally. Yet, Michigan, unfortunately, also lays claim to the Michigan Militia, which was responsible for one of the worst acts of terrorism in this country.

Muslims, Arab Americans, are my neighbors. They are my friends. They are doctors, teachers, and pharmacists. They are part of this country.

Policies like the Muslim travel ban have no place in the United States of America. It disrespects freedom of religion, and it is unconstitutional.

National security experts have been clear that the Muslim ban has made our country less safe. In fact, strong national security policies include protecting the fundamental pillars of our democracy: freedom of religion, freedom of speech, compassion, and justice. We must stand together as Americans against unjust policies like this.

Mr. BIGGS. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. LEE of California). Both sides have 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MALINOWSKI).

Mr. MALINOWSKI. Madam Speaker, when President Trump first announced the Muslim ban, we were told it was temporary, 90 days, according to the executive order, or until we "figure out what the hell is going on," in the President's own words.

It has been 3½ years. Hundreds of thousands of Americans, including many of my own constituents, are still cut off from their loved ones, missing births, missing weddings, and missing funerals.

We are still not admitting refugees to this country for the first time since we turned back Jews fleeing Hitler before World War II. And by now, we know exactly what is going on.

It has nothing to do with national security, and it never did. There has never been a deadly terrorist attack carried out in America by someone from any of these countries. One of them is Iran, after all, a country whose people have themselves been targeted for extinction by ISIS.

How many times do we hear from the administration that we stand by the people of Iran even as we ban them from visiting our country?

These good people were sacrificed for a cheap campaign promise. They were hurt, and our country's ideals were betrayed, because someone decided it would be easier to seek scapegoats than solutions to our country's problems. It is wrong, and it should stop.

Mr. BIGGS. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Speaker, I thank Chairman NADLER for yielding and for his tremendous leadership. Also, I want to thank Congresswomen Chu and Jayapal for their tremendous and steady leadership and strong support of H.R. 2214, the NO BAN Act.

This important legislation would end the Muslim ban and prohibit discrimination and migration on the basis of religion and national origin.

Let me be clear. This is a landmark piece of civil rights legislation not only for Muslims but for our country's values. Our Nation was founded by, shaped by, and continues to be influenced by our immigrant communities who contribute so much to this country. Equating Muslims with terrorists is against our values as a nation. It is despicable.

Make no mistake, the NO BAN Act would help ensure that this kind of discrimination ceases, prevents future such discrimination, and promotes our core values of religious freedom.

Madam Speaker, we cannot allow President Trump's White nationalist agenda to continue. We must ensure that our country is open to everyone, not just those whom Trump deems acceptable. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. DINGELL). Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

□ 1130

Mr. BIGGS. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. ESPAILLAT).

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Madam Speaker, when we heard of the Muslim ban being implemented, many New Yorkers, including our chairman, Congressman NADLER, rushed to JFK Airport to help families. What I witnessed there in many cases was, in fact, Muslim mem-

bers of our Armed Forces were trying to be reunited with their mother, with their spouse, and they were being denied.

As I entered the space, I was surrounded by Customs and Border Patrol officers, and we fought to make sure that these folks could unite. And so we witnessed the pain of a spouse without a husband, a son without a mother, a father without a child.

Madam Speaker, this is not American. This is not American at all. But what was witnessed there and across the country was the best of our Nation, the spirit of our Nation, the fact that we would not be split along racial, ethnic, or religious lines.

Mr. BIGGS. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. TLAIB).

Ms. TLAIB. Madam Speaker, I rise today to declare loudly and clearly to every Muslim and every African person in Michigan's 13th District, in America, and around the world that the United States House of Representatives is taking action to end this administration's racist ban.

Madam Speaker, I rise to send a message to marginalized communities everywhere that, in repealing the Muslim and African ban, we are also preventing discriminatory bans from ever happening again.

Madam Speaker, I rise as a mother of two wonderful Muslim-American boys, Adam and Yousif, to say that Muslims and Muslim Americans are our family members, our friends, and our neighbors—and, yes, they are Members of Congress.

Madam Speaker, it appears that this White House might not like that fact very much because this racist ban is a Federal endorsement of anti-Muslim rhetoric and discrimination in our country, but today we are coming together to finally put a stop to this.

End the Muslim and African ban.

End all discriminatory bans forever.

Mr. BIGGS. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ).

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of the NO BAN Act.

I remember when the Muslim ban was first implemented in January 2017, I went to JFK Airport with Chairman NADLER to demand the release of travelers being detained there. One of them was an Iraqi translator who had risked his life working for the U.S. Army in Iraq. His reward was being caught up in this hateful Trump administration policy.

At the airport that day, I saw two Americas: Inside the airport was an America characterized by prejudice, weakness, and fear; but outside, where

thousands gathered to oppose this hateful policy, I saw the America I know, an America of strength and compassion.

Madam Speaker, today, as we vote on this bill, we are being asked to choose between these two visions. We can choose a weak, bigoted America that says there is no place for our Muslim brothers and sisters or for Black people, or we can choose an America that lives up to its highest ideals, that welcomes those from around the world seeking a better life.

Mr. BIGGS. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER).

Mr. BEYER. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of JUDY CHU's NO BAN Act.

In the words of John Lewis: "When you see something that is not right, not fair, not just, you have to speak up; you have to do something."

The NO BAN Act is doing something. It is stating in clear, powerful legislation that America will never again let racism or religious intolerance be a barrier to lawful immigration. We will not allow ignorance or xenophobia to dictate America's immigration policies.

Our strength has always—always—been our diversity.

A functional Muslim ban or a ban of entire countries simply because they comprise a race or a religion that some President does not like is not just evil, it is stupid. Watch which American communities recover most quickly from the pandemic—those with the most diverse populations.

Madam Speaker, I stand here today, as I stood at the airport at the onset of the ban, to ensure our immigration system cannot be hijacked by hatred.

Mr. BIGGS. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI).

Ms. MATSUI. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the NO BAN Act.

Today is about our commitment to the most sacred of American ideals: to celebrate our diversity. But this administration has embarked on a crusade to demonize immigrants and our Muslim-American community.

Americans and their families have been targeted because of their religious beliefs, their race, and their ethnicity. Because of this bigotry, families and loved ones have been separated, unable to celebrate milestones or face hardships together.

Madam Speaker, I stand here today because one of the greatest and most beautiful things about our country is the diversity of people, views, and perspectives. We cannot allow an administration to upend our immigration system and upend our ideals. We must always stand up and speak out.

Madam Speaker, I remember my grandparents' and parents' stories about World War II, when they were ostracized and ultimately removed to internment camps. Let's not forget this past xenophobic history.

Madam Speaker, I am proud to support this bill, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. BIGGS. Madam Speaker, I am prepared to close, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, you have heard a lot of incendiary language regarding the travel restrictions. The most incendiary language is always calling it "incendiary," "a white nationalist agenda," "racist," "hateful," et cetera.

Was it xenophobic, was it racist, was it hateful when the Obama administration implemented travel bans to the same seven nations?

Was it?

No. Nor is it here either.

Madam Speaker, that kind of language is meant to incite public ridicule and distract from the real issue here.

As the Supreme Court noted, the text in this bill says nothing about religion. And as they went on to say: "The policy covers just 8 percent of the world's Muslim population and is limited to countries that were previously designated by Congress or prior administrations"—read, Obama administration—"as posing national security risks."

That is not a Muslim ban. This is a legitimate travel restriction implemented for the safety of this Nation.

Additionally, I heard from multiple friends across the aisle a straw man argument, a true straw man argument here, that this ban was religious in nature. But if that were the case, they would have stopped it after inserting religion with other proscriptions. But instead, they built up a huge bureaucratic apparatus to limit the authority of the President of the United States. So it is a straw man argument.

Madam Speaker, the chairman mentioned that the Supreme Court ruling, in his opinion, was without justification, and so I am going to read what the Supreme Court said: "The President lawfully exercised that discretion based on his findings—following a worldwide, multiagency review—that entry of the covered aliens would be detrimental to the national interest."

The sole prerequisite, they said, is for the President to find that the entry of the covered aliens "would be detrimental to the interests of the United States."

But the President fulfilled that requirement by first ordering DHS and other agencies to conduct a comprehensive evaluation of every single country's compliance with the information and risk assessment baseline.

That is what this policy was built upon. It is consistent with the Obama administration and the previous administrations.

But for whatever reason, and I think we all can surmise what that may be,

when this President conducts an even more thorough evaluation of these nations and their processes and then issues a proclamation setting forth those extensive findings describing deficiencies in those practices—and, by the way, I am going here based on the Supreme Court decision again—in the practices of select foreign governments, several of which are state sponsors of terrorism, it is somehow xenophobic, a white nationalist agenda, racist, and hateful. But when the previous administration did it and actually came back to Congress and added three more nations, it wasn't.

The only ad hominem attack I would ever make here is that it surely seems potentially hypocritical to me. No visas would be revoked pursuant to P.P. 9645 or 9983. Individuals subject to those Presidential proclamations who possess a valid visa or valid travel document were permitted to travel and continue to be admitted to travel in this country.

To call it a Muslim ban is meant to incite—and I will say, we do terrible on this side of the aisle. My friends across the aisle, when you find that peg to hang your hat on, heck of a great job, because everybody uses it. It is very effective, but it is highly misleading.

What this bill does is it emasculates the very notion of executive power in the President. It really does. The idea, because you want to emasculate the power of President Trump.

But what it does is it gives more power to the bureaucratic state, more power to the bureaucratic state. So the timeline is also going to prevent the President from acting quickly on this.

These are the issues that we have just been distracted from, because it certainly appears—and I will say, my friend from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), when she talked about symbolism in her speech, she is right. This is symbolic. This bill is symbolic. It is symbolic, if you will, of a hatred of this President. Because when the previous President's administration did this, not a peep. This administration does the same thing, and it is outrageous.

Madam Speaker, the implementation was not great. They have admitted the implementation was not great, but that is an implementation problem, not a policy problem. And you want to change the entire policy and the entire structure not because the policy was bad—if it were, we would have heard about it the last 40 years—but, instead, because the original implementation was bad.

The Supreme Court has upheld what this administration did because what they did was conduct a thorough vetting of their own policy regarding these nations and those nations' policies in implementing safety mechanisms, and so they fulfilled that. Here we are today, saying: You know what? Because it is President Donald Trump, this is bad.

Madam Speaker, they are going to pass this bill. There is no doubt they

are going to pass this amendment. But never forget the inherent inconsistency with the act that you are going to do on this bill with what you have done in the previous administrations.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1145

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I find it extremely disingenuous to deny the nature of the Muslim ban. You know why? Because the President told us so. He told us he was going to institute a Muslim ban, and then he did it. And every country he put on the list was Muslim. Every country he has added to the list was Muslim.

Only Muslims and Muslim countries pose threats to the United States of any nature; no one else in the world does? How stupid does he think we are?

This is a Muslim ban. It has been. It is an abuse of his office. It is an abuse of the law. It must be repealed. The honor of the United States must be redeemed. And that is why this dishonorable, hateful policy must be repealed. And that is why we must vote for this bill, to redeem the honor of the United States from the disgusting religious bigotry supported by the President and instituted by the President in this ban.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2214 the "National Origin-Based Antidiscrimination for Non immigrants Act," or NO BAN Act. I wish this bill was not necessary, but unfortunately, it is now more imperative than ever.

As a result of the President's relentless attempts to rewrite our immigration laws, we must take immediate steps to rein in his repeated abuse of executive authority.

As a candidate for president, Donald Trump promised to ban all Muslims from entering the United States, suggesting—without any evidence—that it would somehow make our country safer. Immediately upon entering office, he tried to make good on that promise.

Ultimately, it took the President 10 months, 3 attempts, and the inclusion of a sham waiver process to craft a ban that stood up to Supreme Court scrutiny.

In a decision rightly criticized by Justices Breyer and Sotomayor—and many of us in this chamber—the majority concluded that despite statements calling for a "total and complete shutdown of Muslims entering the United States," the President's ban was somehow not inspired by blatant religious animus. Seeking to distance itself from these remarks, the Administration later claimed that the ban was necessary to keep our country safe from terrorist threats. And yet, a bipartisan coalition of more than 50 former national security officials found that rather than making our country safer, the ban actually undermines U.S. national security.

H.R. 2214 not only invalidates the various iterations of the Muslim Ban, it also amends

the authority the President relied on in invoking the ban—section 212(f) of the Immigration and Nationality Act. But rather than gutting it, as some of my Republican colleagues have claimed, H.R. 2214 maintains its basic structure, and incorporates checks and balances to ensure that it can no longer be so flagrantly abused.

H.R. 2214 will thus ensure that section 212(f) can only be used in a manner consistent with its intended purpose and historical norms, and that no President—Democratic or Republican—will be able to utilize it to usurp congressional authority.

I would like to thank my friend and colleague, Representative CHU for her leadership and steadfast commitment to this issue. Her efforts led to the introduction of this legislation and I urge all of my colleagues to support the NO BAN Act.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the No BAN Act.

This bill is being framed as a "religious freedom" initiative. I have fought for religious freedom throughout my career. I know what religious freedom means. This bill is not about religious freedom. It is about scoring cheap political points against President Trump.

The President is granted broad authority to take quick action to limit the entry of foreign nationals into the United States. This is needed for a variety of reasons, including national security and public health. Whether it is addressing shortcomings in a certain country's vetting and information sharing or limiting the potential influx of coronavirus cases, we entrust the Executive Branch to keep America safe.

President Trump's actions have been mislabeled as a "Muslim Ban." But that is not the case. There is no religious test anywhere in the President's travel restrictions. North Korea, an essentially religious-less society, is one of the countries included. Myanmar, another country affected, is more than 80 percent Buddhist. Indonesia, which was not included in the covered travel restrictions, has the largest percentage of the world's Muslim population at over 12 percent.

Rather than try to paint with a broad brush, we should look at the causes of these travel restrictions. Eritrea—Does not comply with the established identity-management and information-sharing criteria. Kyrgyzstan—Does not comply with the established identity-management and information-sharing criteria. Nigeria—Does not comply with the established identity-management and information-sharing criteria. And so on.

This isn't about religious freedom. It is only about convincing people it is.

In addition to the deficiencies of the underlying policy, the Majority has made a mistake in including the Senate version of pharmaceutical legislation as its pay-for.

Last year, the House Judiciary Committee worked on a bipartisan basis to advance two important bills. One to reduce the burdens of patent litigation when a company seeks to bring a complicated biosimilar drug to market. And another to create a new antitrust authority to prevent companies from playing games that could artificially suppress generic competition.

Chairmen JERROLD NADLER and DAVID CICILLINE were great partners to me and then-Hanking Member DOUG COLLINS in that effort. It was refreshing during a time of increasingly partisan hostility to work together in a thought-

ful manner to address drug pricing in the country.

Unfortunately, rather than take up that bill, the Majority has simply ignored our weeks of careful negotiation and has chosen instead to blindly attach the Senate language.

The shortcomings of this version of the legislation were already addressed in committee. The text included in the No BAN Act gives the FTC the authority to find a company liable even if all they do is introduce an improved version of a product and then make truthful and non-misleading statements about the new product. This will undoubtedly stifle innovation. Why would any company invest the necessary research dollars to introduce a new product, if they can be held liable for truthful marketing of that product? In Committee, we fixed that.

The bill we're voting on today is also out of step with current antitrust law. It would completely change the remedy and enforcement authority under traditional antitrust law, and for no obvious reason, apply those changes exclusively to just one industry. In Committee, we fixed that.

I find it troubling that the Majority is choosing to abandon the good faith negotiations and bipartisan work. The gentlemen from New York and Rhode Island worked with the Minority to come up with a good product that addresses drug pricing through regular order. The committee process works. We should be voting on the legislation that passed the Judiciary Committee by a voice vote. Not this version.

I oppose this legislation and urge my colleagues to do the same.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 891, the previous question is ordered on this portion of the divided question.

The question is: Will the House concur in the Senate amendment with the House amendment specified in section 4(a) of House Resolution 891?

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3 of House Resolution 965, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

AMENDMENT SPECIFIED IN SECTION 4(b) OF HOUSE RESOLUTION 891

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 891, the portion of the divided question comprising the amendment specified in section 4(b) of House Resolution 891 shall now be considered.

The text of House amendment to Senate amendment specified in section 4(b) of House Resolution 891 is as follows:

In the matter proposed to be inserted by the amendment of the Senate, strike sections 4, 5, and 6 and insert the following:

TITLE III—ACCESS TO COUNSEL ACT OF 2020

SEC. 301. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the "Access to Counsel Act of 2020".

SEC. 302. ACCESS TO COUNSEL AND OTHER ASSISTANCE AT PORTS OF ENTRY AND DEFERRED INSPECTION.

(a) ACCESS TO COUNSEL AND OTHER ASSISTANCE DURING INSPECTION.—Section 235 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1225) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(e) ACCESS TO COUNSEL AND OTHER ASSISTANCE DURING INSPECTION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall ensure that a covered individual has a meaningful opportunity to consult with counsel and an interested party during the inspection process.

“(2) SCOPE OF ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall—

“(A) provide the covered individual a meaningful opportunity to consult with counsel and an interested party not later than one hour after the secondary inspection process commences and as necessary throughout the inspection process, including, as applicable, during deferred inspection;

“(B) allow counsel and an interested party to advocate on behalf of the covered individual, including by providing to the examining immigration officer information, documentation, and other evidence in support of the covered individual; and

“(C) to the greatest extent practicable, accommodate a request by the covered individual for counsel or an interested party to appear in-person at the secondary or deferred inspection site.

“(3) SPECIAL RULE FOR LAWFUL PERMANENT RESIDENTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Homeland Security may not accept Form I-407 Record of Abandonment of Lawful Permanent Resident Status (or a successor form) from a lawful permanent resident subject to secondary or deferred inspection without providing such lawful permanent resident a reasonable opportunity to seek advice from counsel prior to the submission of the form.

“(B) EXCEPTION.—The Secretary of Homeland Security may accept Form I-407 Record of Abandonment of Lawful Permanent Resident Status (or a successor form) from a lawful permanent resident subject to secondary or deferred inspection if such lawful permanent resident knowingly, intelligently, and voluntarily waives, in writing, the opportunity to seek advice from counsel.

“(4) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(A) COUNSEL.—The term ‘counsel’ means—

“(i) an attorney who is a member in good standing of the bar of any State, the District of Columbia, or a territory or a possession of the United States and is not under an order suspending, enjoining, restraining, disbaring, or otherwise restricting the attorney in the practice of law; or

“(ii) an individual accredited by the Attorney General, acting as a representative of an organization recognized by the Executive Office for Immigration Review, to represent a covered individual in immigration matters.

“(B) COVERED INDIVIDUAL.—The term ‘covered individual’ means an individual subject to secondary or deferred inspection who is—

“(i) a national of the United States;

“(ii) an immigrant, lawfully admitted for permanent residence, who is returning from a temporary visit abroad;

“(iii) an alien seeking admission as an immigrant in possession of a valid unexpired immigrant visa;

“(iv) an alien seeking admission as a non-immigrant in possession of a valid unexpired non-immigrant visa;

“(v) a refugee;

“(vi) a returning asylee; or

“(vii) an alien who has been approved for parole under section 212(d)(5)(A), including

an alien who is returning to the United States in possession of a valid advance parole document.

“(C) INTERESTED PARTY.—The term ‘interested party’ means—

“(i) a relative of the covered individual;

“(ii) in the case of a covered individual to whom an immigrant or non-immigrant visa has been issued, the petitioner or sponsor thereof (including an agent of such petitioner or sponsor); or

“(iii) a person, organization, or entity in the United States with a bona fide connection to the covered individual.”

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) SAVINGS PROVISION.—Nothing in this title, or in any amendment made by this title, may be construed to limit a right to counsel or any right to appointed counsel under—

(1) section 240(b)(4)(A) (8 U.S.C. 1229a(b)(4)(A)),

(2) section 292 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1362), or

(3) any other provision of law, including any final court order securing such rights, as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This portion shall be debatable for 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS) each control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 5581, the Access to Counsel Act of 2020.

Last September, the Judiciary Committee and the House Foreign Affairs Committee held a hearing to explore the Muslim ban, including the chaos that unfolded at airports across the country when it was first announced.

I can personally attest to that chaos, based on my experience at JFK Airport immediately after the ban was implemented. Refugees, individuals with valid visas, and even lawful permanent residents of the United States were detained for hours and prevented from speaking with attorneys. Some even had their phones taken away and were unable to call their family members.

Although the issue grabbed the headlines then, it is unfortunately a problem that occurs daily. Due to the complexity of the U.S. immigration law and the fact-intensive nature of questions regarding admissibility, it is not uncommon for some people to spend hours undergoing inspection by U.S. Customs and Border Patrol.

During this time, individuals are often prevented from communicating with those on the outside. And if the individual is lucky enough to have a lawyer, CBP will often refuse to speak with them, even if they can provide critical information or correct a legal error.

Moreover, serious consequences can result from being refused admission. For example, an individual who is given an expedited removal order is barred from returning to the United States for 5 years.

H.R. 5581 will ensure that no one who presents themselves at a port of entry with valid travel documents is completely cut off from the world during inspection. H.R. 5581 allows such individuals, including U.S. citizens, to communicate with counsel and other parties if they are subjected to secondary inspection that lasts longer than one hour.

To be clear, this bill does not provide a right to counsel, nor does it impose any obligation on the Federal Government to pay for or otherwise provide counsel to individuals during CBP inspection proceedings. I wish it did, but it doesn't. This is confirmed by the fact that the Congressional Budget Office found that H.R. 5581 would have no effect on direct spending or revenues.

I would like to extend a special thanks to my colleague, Representative JAYAPAL, for her leadership on this issue and for championing this bill. I encourage my colleagues to support it, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BIGGS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to this amendment to H.R. 2486.

The Access to Counsel Act of 2020 is a way for the majority to test how far they can go toward their ultimate goal of taxpayer-funded counsel at every stage of the immigration process. I think we just heard that, that that is a stated goal.

Many immigration interest groups have made no mystery of the fact that they believe foreign nationals have a right to come to the United States and should all receive taxpayer-funded counsel at every stage of the process.

My colleagues across the aisle understand that it is currently a bridge too far to repeal outright the Immigration and Nationality Act provision that prohibits taxpayer-funded counsel during removal proceedings. But this amendment is a step forward in their march in that direction.

The bill mandates that the DHS Secretary shall ensure that an individual who has been selected by Customs and Border Protection for secondary screening at a port of entry has a meaningful opportunity to consult with counsel and an interested party during such screening.

It is important to understand exactly what secondary screening is, why it is used, and the ramifications that this bill would have on the port of entry operations.

My colleagues across the aisle provided the Judiciary Committee no opportunity to hear from DHS experts about any of these issues. There was no hearing on this legislation or even generally on the subject matter at hand.

CBP is extremely concerned about the impact the requirements of this

bill would have on processing at ports of entry. Many of us have been to airports and seen the long lines of passengers from abroad waiting to be processed. We have been to land ports of entry and seen lines of passenger vehicles and cargo trucks that literally wait for hours for the opportunity to enter the U.S. The Access to Counsel Act would exponentially increase those processing and wait times.

Secondary inspection is used at ports of entry to give CBP officials time for additional screening that may take longer than the normal case. It can include more in-depth questioning, additional database searches, and physical searches when an individual is suspected of carrying contraband.

Secondary inspection is done in an area near the primary inspection booths. It serves to remove those whose admissibility may be in question from the primary inspection line so as to not slow the line down.

The vast majority of the over 400 million people admitted the United States annually do not get referred to secondary inspection, but about 17 million do.

Most ports of entry buildings and other infrastructure are not equipped to allow multiple counsel consultations at the same time. That means longer wait times and backlogs for entry. Allowing 17 million people to consult with counsel or some other interested party will bring legitimate trade and travel to a grinding halt.

Of course, slowing down of trade and travel processing isn't the only concern with H.R. 5581. Under current regulations adopted in 1980, applicants for admission are not entitled to representation in primary or secondary inspections, unless the applicant has become the focus of a criminal investigation and has been taken into custody.

But this bill gives all applicants for admission to the U.S., including non-immigrants and lawful permanent residents, a new statutory right to counsel. This idea is based on the belief that everyone has a right to enter the U.S., and it is a first step toward what many of our Democrat colleagues ultimately want, taxpayer-funded counsel for foreign nationals.

In addition, there are serious concerns with what constitutes interested parties under the bill. The term is defined to include practically anyone, including any relative of the covered individual, the petitioner or sponsor of a visa, or anyone with a bona fide connection to the covered individual.

This could result in a scenario where a covered individual is referred for secondary inspection because he is believed to be smuggling drugs or some other contraband and then places a call to tip off his accomplices.

The Access to Counsel Act is a bad idea that would unduly hinder legitimate trade and travel. I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to

the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL).

Ms. JAYAPAL. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary for his tremendous work and leadership on bringing these important issues to the floor.

I am very proud that the House is considering my bill today, the Access to Counsel Act, H.R. 5581. It is a commonsense measure that would ensure that U.S. citizens, green card holders, and other people with legal status are able to consult with an attorney when Customs and Border Protection detains them for over an hour.

I introduced this bill, Madam Speaker, as my first bill when I got to Congress, and it was in the wake of the Muslim ban. It was in the wake of that chaos that was unleashed at airports across the country as people from seven Muslim-majority countries found themselves detained for hours, in some cases pressured to sign papers giving up their legal status, and in many cases deported.

More often than not, these people did not even have the opportunity to see an attorney or even call anyone. They did not even have the opportunity to use the restrooms or to get water and food.

Since then, however, Madam Speaker—it isn't just that moment—there have been numerous cases of students detained for long periods at airports and sent back, despite holding valid visas secured after undergoing rigorous vetting by the State Department. One student was detained and deported in spite of a court order saying that he should be allowed to stay until a court could review his case.

And earlier this year, we saw no less than 200 people of Iranian American descent detained at the northern border in Blaine, Washington, for up to 12 hours with no access to counsel. These lengthy detentions occurred while CBP repeatedly denied that Iranian Americans were being targeted for different treatment.

Many of the people impacted were U.S. citizens, as well as elderly people and children. Some had even undergone extra vetting to participate in a program designed for trusted travelers at the northern border.

A month later, CBP Acting Commissioner Mark Morgan said that border officials "got a little overzealous in their actions," but the damage, Madam Speaker, had already been done. There were children of U.S. citizens—they themselves U.S. citizens—who watched their parents be detained and treated in a way that no American citizen should go through. No person should go through that type of indignity and disrespect.

If my bill were enacted into law, it would ensure that any time CBP detains people with lawful status, then those individuals would simply have the right to call a lawyer and receive assistance. It does not stop CBP from doing its job; it does not create a right

to counsel for everyone. This is just a simple phone call to their attorney.

So I would like to thank those who bravely came forward to share their stories, to make clear the Access to Counsel Act is desperately needed, and I urge my colleagues to vote "yes."

Mr. BIGGS. Madam Speaker, just to point out, this bill does not say anywhere this contact will be limited to a simple phone call. Nowhere does it say that.

Madam Speaker, I will reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume again to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL).

Ms. JAYAPAL. Madam Speaker, I just wanted to quote directly from section 2 of my bill: "The Secretary of Homeland Security shall provide the covered individual a meaningful opportunity to consult with counsel and an interested party not later than one hour after the secondary inspection process commences and as necessary throughout the inspection process, including, as applicable, during deferred inspection."

So again, this could be a phone call. "Meaningful access" is a broad term and it takes into account my colleague from the other side's concerns.

Mr. BIGGS. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I am prepared to close.

□ 1200

Mr. BIGGS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I am interested in the interpretation of the term "meaningful opportunity." I tried a lot of cases in my career. I did both prosecution and criminal defense extensively. I can tell you what a meaningful opportunity would be as counsel. It would be sitting there with my client face-to-face, getting all the information possible.

If the intention was to include, specifically, a simple phone call, that is what should have been put in here. That is what should have been put in this bill, but it wasn't. So, when I read it, I think of places I have been to all along the border, having grown up in southern Arizona, and I have taken and led many congressional delegations over the last 3½ years.

I think of the Antelope Wells Port of Entry. I think about that being about a 4-hour drive for the Customs and Border Protection officers that manned that or worked there, that staffed that. I think, well, what is the communications like there? It is not good. It is not good. It is extremely remote. The nearest town on the Mexican side of the border is 60 miles away. The nearest town on the New Mexico side of that border is Lordsburg, which is about a good 1.5- to 2-hour drive away itself.

If you really wanted to get to narrow this, this bill should have been narrowed, but it wasn't narrowed.

I think of Naco, that little port of entry in southern Arizona. I think of Douglas. I am telling you, the problem that this bill has is it doesn't—if that is the goal. There are other problems, but if that is the goal, this language has not been specific enough.

I also have talked with those who have had the secondary inspection. If we are referring to the implementation of the travel restriction—and I think the world, including the administration, admitted that it was rolled out poorly—that is a different animal than what happens on a normal basis.

I think of the San Luis Port of Entry or the Nogales Port of Entry, but, particularly, San Luis. It gets so much traffic through there. I can't imagine what will happen when you try to bog down everything by allowing everyone who moves to a secondary inspection have counsel or some other interested party, who we don't really know who that is. That is not defined very well, either.

I think of all the commercial truck traffic that comes through Nogales. We don't inspect but a small fraction of vehicles coming through there. It is very difficult to move traffic. The infrastructure itself is not conducive to this.

I will just say, the one thing I was reminded of as I was reviewing this bill for this debate today—and it really kind of came out in the debate when someone was talking about this notion of where we are now, which is if you become a focus of a criminal investigation, you do get counsel. You get that opportunity for counsel.

I started thinking that, yes, exactly, this is what we are doing. We are saying now, in a civil administrative function, we are going to give you a right to counsel. Are we going to expand that to every area where there are civil administrative regulatory violations or potential violations? The answer is that would be absolutely, totally bizarre. It would be unworkable, just as this will be unworkable.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY).

Mr. KENNEDY. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman for moving this legislation forward and to our colleague, Ms. JAYAPAL, for extraordinary work on this legislation.

Madam Speaker, you can learn an awful lot about a country by its approach to justice. You learn about its values, about the people it protects first, about the arc of its history, about the injustice it tolerates and the inequities it reinforces.

When you aim that spotlight on our Nation, what it reveals is not pretty. It is not something to be proud of. Because for millions of people who call this Nation home, justice is not a guarantee. It is something withheld. It is something far too many will never experience.

Very few battle that injustice more frequently than immigrants who arrive on our shores and at our border because they believe in the promise of our Nation. If we believe in that same promise as fiercely as they do, we shouldn't be scared to provide them with justice, with, at the very least, access to legal counsel.

Madam Speaker, we need to pass this bill to, at the very least, take a small step forward in living up to those ideals, and we need to do it today.

Mr. BIGGS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I will just say this, I appreciate the sponsor of this indicating that, in their interpretation, a simple phone call would suffice. I don't think that is the way CBP is interpreting this. I think they are interpreting this that they are going to have to build out infrastructure so there can be private facilities for counsel to meet with these folks.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I have no other speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BIGGS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, I just want to go back to this and indicate there are a multiplicity of issues with this bill, but some things that I want to reiterate.

I think the bill is a step forward to providing state-funded counsel for folks who are here getting a secondary inspection, which in the vast majority of cases is almost perfunctory and incidental and is very quick, in the normal case.

Again, I think it is bad facts—or, actually, good facts to make the argument. It is not going to make good policy. You are, again, arguing implementation of the travel restriction, which wasn't great.

But the norm—the norm—if you get down to the border and spend time, as I have many times, you are going to see these secondary inspections are short, perfunctory. There is no need of counsel. They almost always turn out well for the person that is delayed, except for when they are a danger. Then, it becomes a problem, and they get an opportunity for counsel because now you have a criminal focus on them. That is the key here.

So, expanding this to civil cases, which is exactly what you are doing here, and putting us in line to walk down to where we ultimately are going to pay for that, that is not great policy. That is bad policy, and I am urging my folks to oppose this.

Madam Speaker, I yield the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, I find it bizarre to suggest that you shouldn't vote for a bill because some other bill may do something that you don't like. This bill does not provide—I personally think maybe it would be a good idea,

but that is not this bill. This bill does not provide for funded counsel in any way. It doesn't do that. Maybe I should introduce a bill to do that. That is not this bill, so let's forget about that.

This bill simply says that if an individual is held—an individual who may be an America citizen, who may be a green card holder, who if improperly, by mistake, is sent out of the country and may be forbidden from applying to come back in for 5 years, with all kinds of problems, who may be a cancer researcher who is supposed to work at Rockefeller Institute or Johns Hopkins or wherever and would be denied his or her talents because of a mistake.

All this bill says is that if someone is held in secondary inspection for at least an hour, they must be given an opportunity to call counsel, to call other people, to call their brother-in-law, to call whoever, and to communicate. That is all the bill says.

I fail to understand why it is at all controversial. It will prevent the kind of tragic mistakes that have been made in the past. It will prevent the kind of confusion that we saw, that I personally saw at the airport when people were held for hours and hours and weren't permitted to talk to counsel standing outside the door, when I physically had to prevent the door from closing and dared them to arrest a Member of Congress in order to allow an immigrant with valid papers to speak to an attorney who was standing on the other side of the door.

That is what this bill is. It is simple. It is humane. It is commonsensical and ought to be adopted. I urge everyone to vote for this bill.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, as an original cosponsor and senior member of the Committee on the Judiciary, I rise in strong and enthusiastic support of H.R. 5581, the "Access to Counsel Act of 2020," which ensures that certain individuals who are subjected to prolonged inspection by U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) at ports of entry have a meaningful opportunity to communicate with counsel and other interested parties.

This important legislation amends section 235 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA) to require the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) to ensure that certain individuals can communicate with counsel and other interested parties if they are subjected to prolonged inspection by CBP.

The protections afforded by the Access to Counsel Act of 2020 would apply to individuals who possess valid travel documents, but who are pulled out of the "primary" inspection line and referred to "secondary" inspection for extended processing.

If such individuals are held in secondary inspection for at least one hour, they must be permitted to communicate with counsel and other interested parties.

Counsel and interested parties would be able to provide information and documentation to the inspecting officer to facilitate the inspection process and offer support and assistance to the individual subject to inspection.

Madam Speaker, the stakes can be high for a person wrongfully refused admission and the consequences of being denied admission to the United States can be significant.

For example, a U.S. research institution may lose the opportunity to employ a next generation cancer researcher if that researcher is denied admission despite possessing a valid nonimmigrant visa.

Individuals who are refused admission may be unable to reunite with their families, receive critical medical care unavailable in their home country, or pursue higher education at a U.S. college or university.

Although some individuals may be permitted to withdraw their application for admission and return home without long term consequences, others may be ordered removed without a hearing or further review under “expedited removal.”

An individual who receives an expedited removal order is barred from returning to the United States for five years.

Communication protocols are inconsistent across ports of entry and CBP provides no public guidance on an individual’s ability to communicate with counsel and other individuals during the inspection process.

According to an American Immigration Council report, CBP policies and practices on access to counsel vary from one office to another.”

While some ports of entry completely bar counsel in primary or secondary inspection,” others provide specific procedures for interacting with counsel or provide the inspecting officer with broad discretion to decide whether and with whom to communicate.

Madam Speaker, the Access to Counsel Act of 2020 ensures that no one is cut off from the world due to the Administration’s hasty and mismanaged rollout of the Muslim ban and the widespread chaos that it engendered at airports across the nation.

Affected individuals were detained at airports for hours, and many were sent back to their home countries without the ability to contact their families or receive the assistance of counsel.

Reports of similar treatment surfaced in January 2020, as tensions between Iran and the United States escalated and up to 200 individuals of Iranian descent were detained and questioned in secondary inspection at the Peace Arch Border Crossing in Blaine, Washington.

These individuals—many of whom were U.S. citizens or permanent residents, including seniors and children—were held for several hours, with some reportedly held for up to 12 hours.

Madam Speaker, although complications in the inspection process can arise in response to sweeping changes in immigration policy or shifting world events, the greatest impact on individuals comes from the consistent lack of access to counsel and other assistance at ports of entry on a day-to-day basis.

All individuals—including U.S. citizens—who seek to lawfully enter the United States are subject to inspection by CBP officers at ports of entry.

Without access to counsel and other parties, many individuals are refused admission or issued an expedited removal order instead of being provided the chance to vindicate their rights and lawfully enter the country.

The Access to Counsel Act will ensure individuals who are seeking to lawfully enter the United States are treated fairly and with dignity.

The bill permits counsel and interested parties to appear in person at the port of entry, but also gives DHS and CBP enough discretion to determine—based on operational and other practical limitations—how the consultation takes place.

The bill provides extra protection for lawful permanent residents (LPRs) by prohibiting DHS from accepting a Record of Abandonment of Lawful Permanent Resident Status from an LPR without first providing the LPR a reasonable opportunity to consult with counsel.

Madam Speaker, the Access to Counsel Act of 2020 is supported by an impressive coalition of highly respected organizations, including: Amnesty International; American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU); America’s Voice; American Immigration Lawyers Association (AILA); Coalition for Humane Immigrant Rights; Immigration Hub; and National Iranian American Council (NIAC).

I urge all Members to join me in voting to pass H.R. 5581, the Access to Counsel Act of 2020.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5581, the “Access to Counsel Act of 2020”, a bill that will ensure that individuals who lawfully present themselves at our ports of entry are treated fairly and allowed to communicate with counsel and other parties if they are subjected to prolonged inspection.

The Immigration and Nationality Act provides individuals in removal proceedings the right to representation at no expense to the government. Although federal regulations extend this right to immigration-related “examinations,” applicants for admission—specifically those in primary or secondary inspection—are excluded unless they become the focus of a criminal investigation.

However, our immigration laws are complex, and so are some questions regarding an individual’s admissibility.

Access to outside assistance is important to ensure that CBP has a complete understanding of the facts and the law before deciding admissibility. That is because grave consequences can result from being refused admission—consequences that extend well beyond simply turning around and getting back on a plane.

Individuals who are refused admission may be unable to reunite with their families or receive critical medical care unavailable in their home country. They may be turned away from a U.S. employer who desperately needs their skills. Or they may be denied the opportunity to pursue higher education at a U.S. college or university.

If that weren’t enough, they could also be subject to a 5-year bar to returning to the United States if they are issued an expedited removal order.

That is why this legislation is so critical.

By allowing individuals who lawfully present themselves for inspection at a port of entry to communicate with counsel or other interested parties with information relevant to their request for admission, CBP will be better equipped to correctly resolve legal uncertainties and individuals will be treated more equitably.

I would like to thank my friend and colleague, Representative JAYAPAL for her leadership and commitment to this issue. Her efforts led to the introduction of this legislation, and I urge all my colleagues to support the Access to Counsel Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 891, the previous question is ordered on this portion of the divided question.

The question is: Will the House concur in the Senate amendment with the House amendment specified in section 4(b) of House Resolution 891?

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3 of House Resolution 965, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Byrd, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 3989. An act to amend the United States Semiquincentennial Commission Act of 2016 to modify certain membership and other requirements of the United States Semiquincentennial Commission, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Ms. Mariel Ridgway, one of his secretaries.

□ 1215

TAXPAYER FIRST ACT OF 2019

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1053, I move to take from the Speaker’s table the bill (H.R. 1957) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modernize and improve the Internal Revenue Service, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendments thereto, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SCHNEIDER). The Clerk will designate the Senate amendments.

Senate amendments:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Great American Outdoors Act”.

SEC. 2. NATIONAL PARKS AND PUBLIC LAND LEGACY RESTORATION FUND.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle II of title 54, United States Code, is amended by inserting after chapter 2003 the following:

“CHAPTER 2004—NATIONAL PARKS AND PUBLIC LAND LEGACY RESTORATION FUND

“Sec.

“200401. Definitions.

“200402. National Parks and Public Land Legacy Restoration Fund.

“§200401. Definitions

“In this chapter:

“(1) ASSET.—The term ‘asset’ means any real property, including any physical structure or grouping of structures, landscape, trail, or other tangible property, that—

“(A) has a specific service or function; and

“(B) is tracked and managed as a distinct, identifiable entity by the applicable covered agency.

“(2) COVERED AGENCY.—The term ‘covered agency’ means—

“(A) the Service;

“(B) the United States Fish and Wildlife Service;

“(C) the Forest Service;

“(D) the Bureau of Land Management; and

“(E) the Bureau of Indian Education.

“(3) FUND.—The term ‘Fund’ means the National Parks and Public Land Legacy Restoration Fund established by section 200402(a).

“(4) PROJECT.—The term ‘project’ means any activity to reduce or eliminate deferred maintenance of an asset, which may include resolving directly related infrastructure deficiencies of the asset that would not by itself be classified as deferred maintenance.

“§200402. National Parks and Public Land Legacy Restoration Fund

“(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the Treasury of the United States a fund to be known as the ‘National Parks and Public Land Legacy Restoration Fund’.

“(b) DEPOSITS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), for each of fiscal years 2021 through 2025, there shall be deposited in the Fund an amount equal to 50 percent of all energy development revenues due and payable to the United States from oil, gas, coal, or alternative or renewable energy development on Federal land and water credited, covered, or deposited as miscellaneous receipts under Federal law in the preceding fiscal year.

“(2) MAXIMUM AMOUNT.—The amount deposited in the Fund under paragraph (1) shall not exceed \$1,900,000,000 for any fiscal year.

“(3) EFFECT ON OTHER REVENUES.—Nothing in this section affects the disposition of revenues that—

“(A) are due to the United States, special funds, trust funds, or States from mineral and energy development on Federal land and water; or

“(B) have been otherwise appropriated—

“(i) under Federal law, including—

“(I) the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act of 2006 (43 U.S.C. 1331 note; Public Law 109–432); and

“(II) the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 181 et seq.); or

“(ii) from—

“(I) the Land and Water Conservation Fund established under chapter 2003; or

“(II) the Historic Preservation Fund established under chapter 3031.

“(c) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—Amounts deposited in the Fund shall be available to the Secretary and the Secretary of Agriculture, as provided in subsection (e), without further appropriation or fiscal year limitation.

“(d) INVESTMENT OF AMOUNTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may request the Secretary of the Treasury to invest any portion of the Fund that is not, as determined by the Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Agriculture, required to meet the current needs of the Fund.

“(2) REQUIREMENT.—An investment requested under paragraph (1) shall be made by the Secretary of the Treasury in a public debt security—

“(A) with a maturity suitable to the needs of the Fund, as determined by the Secretary; and

“(B) bearing interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration current market yields on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States of comparable maturity.

“(3) CREDITS TO FUND.—The income on investments of the Fund under this subsection shall be credited to, and form a part of, the Fund.

“(e) USE OF FUNDS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Amounts deposited in the Fund for each fiscal year shall be used for pri-

ority deferred maintenance projects in the System, in the National Wildlife Refuge System, on public land administered by the Bureau of Land Management, for the Bureau of Indian Education schools, and in the National Forest System, as follows:

“(A) 70 percent of the amounts deposited in the Fund for each fiscal year shall be allocated to the Service.

“(B) 15 percent of the amounts deposited in the Fund for each fiscal year shall be allocated to the Forest Service.

“(C) 5 percent of the amounts deposited in the Fund for each fiscal year shall be allocated to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service.

“(D) 5 percent of the amounts deposited in the Fund for each fiscal year shall be allocated to the Bureau of Land Management.

“(E) 5 percent of the amounts deposited in the Fund for each fiscal year shall be allocated to the Bureau of Indian Education.

“(2) LIMITATIONS.—

“(A) NON-TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS.—Over the term of the Fund, within each covered agency, not less than 65 percent of amounts from the Fund shall be allocated for non-transportation projects.

“(B) TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS.—The amounts remaining in the Fund after the allocations required under subparagraph (A) may be allocated for transportation projects of the covered agencies, including paved and unpaved roads, bridges, tunnels, and paved parking areas.

“(C) PLAN.—Any priority deferred maintenance project funded under this section shall be consistent with an applicable transportation, deferred maintenance, or capital improvement plan developed by the applicable covered agency.

“(f) PROHIBITED USE OF FUNDS.—No amounts in the Fund shall be used—

“(1) for land acquisition;

“(2) to supplant discretionary funding made available for annually recurring facility operations, maintenance, and construction needs; or

“(3) for bonuses for employees of the Federal Government that are carrying out this section.

“(g) SUBMISSION OF PRIORITY LIST OF PROJECTS TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary and the Secretary of Agriculture shall submit to the Committees on Energy and Natural Resources and Appropriations of the Senate and the Committees on Natural Resources and Appropriations of the House of Representatives a list of projects to be funded for fiscal year 2021 that—

“(1) are identified by the Secretary and the Secretary of Agriculture as priority deferred maintenance projects; and

“(2) as of the date of the submission of the list, are ready to be implemented.

“(h) SUBMISSION OF ANNUAL LIST OF PROJECTS TO CONGRESS.—Until the date on which all of the amounts in the Fund are expended, the President shall annually submit to Congress, together with the annual budget of the United States, a list of projects to be funded from the Fund that includes a detailed description of each project, including the estimated expenditures from the Fund for the project for the applicable fiscal year.

“(i) ALTERNATE ALLOCATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Appropriations Acts may provide for alternate allocation of amounts made available under this section, consistent with the allocations to covered agencies under subsection (e)(1).

“(2) ALLOCATION BY PRESIDENT.—

“(A) NO ALTERNATE ALLOCATIONS.—If Congress has not enacted legislation establishing alternate allocations by the date on which the Act making full-year appropriations for the Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies for the applicable fiscal year is enacted into law, amounts made available under subsection (c) shall be allocated by the President.

“(B) INSUFFICIENT ALTERNATE ALLOCATION.—If Congress enacts legislation establishing alternate allocations for amounts made available under subsection (c) that are less than the full amount appropriated under that subsection, the difference between the amount appropriated and the alternate allocation shall be allocated by the President.

“(j) PUBLIC DONATIONS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary and the Secretary of Agriculture may accept public cash or in-kind donations that advance efforts—

“(A) to reduce the deferred maintenance backlog; and

“(B) to encourage relevant public-private partnerships.

“(2) CREDITS TO FUND.—Any cash donations accepted under paragraph (1) shall be—

“(A) credited to, and form a part of, the Fund; and

“(B) allocated to the covered agency for which the donation was made.

“(3) OTHER ALLOCATIONS.—Any donations allocated to a covered agency under paragraph (2)(B) shall be allocated to the applicable covered agency independently of the allocations under subsection (e)(1).

“(k) REQUIRED CONSIDERATION FOR ACCESSIBILITY.—In expending amounts from the Fund, the Secretary and the Secretary of Agriculture shall incorporate measures to improve the accessibility of assets and accommodate visitors and employees with disabilities in accordance with applicable law.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of chapters for subtitle II of title 54, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to chapter 2003 the following:

“2004. National Parks and Public Land Legacy Restoration Fund200401”.

(c) GAO STUDY.—Not later than 5 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall—

(1) conduct a study on the implementation of this section and the amendments made by this section, including whether this section and the amendments made by this section have effectively reduced the priority deferred maintenance backlog of the covered agencies (as that term is defined in section 200401 of title 54, United States Code); and

(2) submit to Congress a report that describes the results of the study under paragraph (1).

SEC. 3. PERMANENT FULL FUNDING OF THE LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 200303 of title 54, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“§200303. Availability of funds

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Any amounts deposited in the Fund under section 200302 for fiscal year 2020 and each fiscal year thereafter shall be made available for expenditure for fiscal year 2021 and each fiscal year thereafter, without further appropriation or fiscal year limitation, to carry out the purposes of the Fund (including accounts and programs made available from the Fund pursuant to the Further Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2020 (Public Law 116–94; 133 Stat. 2534)).

“(b) ADDITIONAL AMOUNTS.—Amounts made available under subsection (a) shall be in addition to amounts made available to the Fund under section 105 of the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act of 2006 (43 U.S.C. 1331 note; Public Law 109–432) or otherwise appropriated from the Fund.

“(c) ALLOCATION AUTHORITY.—

“(1) SUBMISSION OF COST ESTIMATES.—The President shall submit to Congress detailed account, program, and project allocations of the full amount made available under subsection (a)—

“(A) for fiscal year 2021, not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of the Great American Outdoors Act; and

“(B) for each fiscal year thereafter, as part of the annual budget submission of the President.

“(2) ALTERNATE ALLOCATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Appropriations Acts may provide for alternate allocation of amounts made available under subsection (a), including allocations by account, program, and project.

“(B) ALLOCATION BY PRESIDENT.—

“(i) NO ALTERNATE ALLOCATIONS.—If Congress has not enacted legislation establishing alternate allocations by the date on which the Act making full-year appropriations for the Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies for the applicable fiscal year is enacted into law, amounts made available under subsection (a) shall be allocated by the President.

“(ii) INSUFFICIENT ALTERNATE ALLOCATION.—If Congress enacts legislation establishing alternate allocations for amounts made available under subsection (a) that are less than the full amount appropriated under that subsection, the difference between the amount appropriated and the alternate allocation shall be allocated by the President.

“(3) RECREATIONAL PUBLIC ACCESS.—Amounts expended from the Fund under this section shall be consistent with the requirements for recreational public access for hunting, fishing, recreational shooting, or other outdoor recreational purposes under section 200306(c).

“(4) ANNUAL REPORT.—The President shall submit to Congress an annual report that describes the final allocation by account, program, and project of amounts made available under subsection (a), including a description of the status of obligations and expenditures.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 200302(c) of title 54, United States Code, is amended by striking paragraph (3).

(2) Section 200306(a)(2)(B) of title 54, United States Code, is amended by striking clause (iii).

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 2003 of title 54, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to section 200303 and inserting the following:

“200303. Availability of funds.”.

MOTION TO CONCUR

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Grijalva moves that the House concur in the Senate amendments to H.R. 1957.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of July 21, 2020, the motion shall be debatable for 80 minutes, with 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources and 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the majority leader and minority leader or their respective designees.

The gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) each will control 30 minutes. The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on H.R. 1957.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

In February of 2019, I flew to Arizona from Washington to speak about my bill to permanently protect the Grand Canyon from uranium mining. We wanted to publicly release the legislation on the rim of the canyon to show firsthand the lands that we were attempting to protect.

Unfortunately, the weather had other ideas. That night, before the event, it snowed more than it had in decades. But by some small miracle, the roads were clear, and we found an easy pathway into the park. We made it in time and even found some rangers to help us set up in the snow.

Tribal leaders representing people who have called that land their home for a millennia joined us at the event. Standing there with them on the edge of the amazing canyon millions of years in the making and glistening in the snow, it was hard not to be moved.

Looking out over the Grand Canyon, you are reminded why we as a Nation have dedicated ourselves to protecting the unique and enduring landscapes around us. Nowhere else on Earth is there a sight quite like the Grand Canyon, or, for that matter, like Yosemite Valley or Yellowstone National Park. These places are gems of our National Park system, and they show who we are as a people.

We are judged on what we choose to pass on, and today we have an opportunity to reaffirm our commitment to preserving these lands for the future and for future generations.

In a few short minutes we will vote on the Great American Outdoors Act, a bill to significantly increase conservation spending in the United States. For too long we have allowed our National Parks to fall into disrepair. We have underfunded maintenance while park visitation has skyrocketed. At the same time, we have failed to meet the full promise of the Land and Water Conservation Fund. We have been diverting half of this conservation funding stream to other uses for which this money was never intended.

Today, we take the opportunity to remedy both those failures. The Great American Outdoors Act provides \$1.9 billion per year to maintain our National Parks and public lands, ensuring that special places like the Grand Canyon are accessible to all Americans as they were to me on that February morning.

The law will also make an enduring commitment to protecting green and flourishing open spaces by providing \$900 million annually to the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

This funding will mean more parks for inner city families. It will allow us to protect forests, wetlands, and marshes from the destruction of climate change. It will help protect lands around the National Parks from inappropriate development and will expand recreational access and opportunity for all Americans. Combined, these two major programs amount to one of the biggest wins for conservation in decades.

We all know that not everyone here agrees about the value of these pro-

grams. In fact, we disagree almost daily on how best to protect the landscapes of our Nation.

But I hope today we can move past those political differences and to honestly consider the value of conservation and the importance of stable, predictable funding.

We have a generational opportunity to ensure America's crown jewels are protected. We have a unique chance to ensure that every tool is available to help us respond to the climate crisis, so that we can protect those landscapes that best protect clean water, clean air, and healthy green spaces.

This bill is a major win for the American people, decades in the making. I might add. I have pursued it for years. Some of my colleagues have pursued it for years. This didn't happen overnight.

Now, during a time of national disillusionment, it is perhaps more necessary than ever to demonstrate that we can still bridge the divide.

When it comes to passing along this Nation to our children and to theirs, we can still work together to find common ground.

This bill goes beyond politics. It is about ensuring that we pass along a legacy of public lands stewardship and conservation to future generations, so they, too, can marvel at the Grand Canyon covered in snow.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support this important measure.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let's get a couple of things very clear.

First of all, this is not about the Land and Water Conservation Fund. We reauthorized permanently the Land and Water Conservation Fund in the last Congress, and in doing that, in a House Republican bill, I might add, we took the State-side projects—these are the kinds of things like easements and picnic grounds and roads and parks that your constituents are all telling you that they like, those are called the State-side projects—and we actually increased the funding for those programs.

We also put in that act a limitation on the amount of money that could be used to buy more land. This bill is about that concept, the limitation of land acquisition. The special interest groups have been putting pressure on you and are giving you misinformation about this particular thing. They simply want to circumvent the limits that were pushed in that bill that was there earlier.

This is two bills merged together. The first one was the old H.R. 1225, the backlog maintenance bill that Mr. GRIJALVA referred to in his speech. We

wanted to see if we could actually help parks and other public lands who are having a maintenance backlog that is near \$20 billion today.

Many people, 330 people, cosponsored that bill. Obviously, it was popular. But for 1½ years, Democratic leadership failed and refused to move that bill. One of their arguments was, this is key, there is no offset for a bill that scored \$7 billion. They refused to move it because there was no offset.

That bill would fund parks' maintenance backlogs by taking excess revenue from those that come from all the energy development, but primarily oil and gas, off-coast as well as on land, and after we pay our obligations, the first \$1 billion of the excess would be used to maintain our parks. That is still a decent bill.

You have added that, or the Democrats in the Senate have added that, to a second bill that is mandatory \$900 million of spending. That mandatory spending will be from now until eternity, but the goal of that is simply to increase the buying power to buy more lands, not to create the State-side projects which we increased.

We are spending trillions of dollars on coronavirus emergency spending. We still have to pay for that. If you really think that mandatory increasing of our debt is the right policy, I think there is a problem there because the CBO did say that this new concoction—bill scores at \$17 billion. And I want you to notice there is no offset for that in this bill.

Both House Republicans and House Democrats have rules that they will not bring a bill to the floor that is not offset. The Blue Dog Democrats unanimously wrote a letter to their leadership saying, Do not bring a bill to the floor that is not offset.

This violates the rules of both the Democrats and the Republicans clearly and adds \$17 billion to the debt, and the reason this is here is, well, because.

Both LWCF, as well as what we want to do with park maintenance, is paid for by royalties from those gas and oil explorations. The excess was to go to parks. We already have obligations with those royalties. GOMESA is an obligation. Historic preservation is an obligation. State reimbursement is an obligation. Those are priorities.

Now, we are also saying in this bill, the \$1 billion of money to buy more land is now also a priority above and beyond what is happening for the parks and what will get there for the parks, which may not in normal times be a concern, but in this era, CRS has already certified that we are 84 percent lower in the amount of activity and the amount of royalties coming in from our energy development than we were a year ago. That is 2 million barrels of oil a day less than we were producing and getting royalties from them last year.

So if buying more land is the priority, the maintenance of our backlog could be totally left out.

Now, this is not for want of what we are trying to do. There were amendments to try and fix this, but they were not allowed to be brought to this floor. There are amendments in the Senate to fix these problems, but they were not allowed to be brought to the floor. There will be many on both sides of the aisle, some on our side, who will support and defend this bill.

I will remind you we are having a heat wave here in Washington, D.C. For the first time in four years we are coming close to 100 degrees, but the heat index is well into three digits. There are a lot of people suffering from heat stroke.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CUNNINGHAM), a sponsor of the legislation, companion legislation to the Senate bill.

□ 1230

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of my bill, the Great American Outdoors Act, and to express my gratitude for so many of my friends and colleagues, including the 252 cosponsors from both sides of the aisle who are working with me to secure the greatest achievement for conservation in a generation.

Mr. Speaker, my bipartisan legislation gives Congress a chance to deliver a massive win not only for our irreplaceable parks and public lands, but also for this institution as a whole by showing the American people that we can work together and keep our promises.

The Great American Outdoors Act will honor our Nation's commitment to conservation in two important ways.

First, it fully and permanently funds the Land and Water Conservation Fund, our most important conservation program. LWCF preserves the best of America, ensuring hunting, fishing, boating, hiking, and other recreational access for all of our constituents.

It is the backbone of our \$778 billion economy, which accounts for over 5 million jobs across this country. It protects working forests and the jobs that they support in the woods and the mills. And here is the best part: It does it all without spending a dime of taxpayer money.

Despite this, we have consistently fallen short in utilizing the full amount of funds in LWCF. Over the past 55 years, we have only spent half the money that we have deposited in the fund, thereby creating an unsustainable backlog in the Lowcountry and across this Nation. This legislation will fix that, ensuring at long last that these funds are spent how they were intended.

Second, it will relieve the growing multibillion-dollar maintenance backlog in our national forests, parks, and other Federal public lands. From crumbling roads and eroding trails to aging water systems and deteriorating his-

toric sites and visitor centers, the widespread disrepair of our national treasures is only getting worse. The Great American Outdoors Act will address this as well by making essential investments to reverse the damage, while creating over 100,000 jobs in the process.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is grounded in two basic principles: that Congress should invest funding set aside for conservation towards the public good, and that we should pay the maintenance bills we have already accrued. It is time that we honor our promises.

In South Carolina, the LWCF has protected the hallowed ground of Fort Sumter, the living outdoor classroom of Congaree National Park, the Pitt Street Bridge in Mount Pleasant, the Folly Beach Boardwalk, and literally hundreds of other local and State parks.

In my district, LWCF protected the ACE Basin, which is the largest undeveloped estuary on the Atlantic Coast, providing a home for the area's incredible wildlife, a source of recreation for sportsmen and -women, and a natural safeguard for our coastal communities from devastating weather events.

Just this past week, I heard from our veterans about the important role that public lands play in the healing process for many men and women transitioning back to civilian life. They told me how access to nature and the outdoors has helped them find a sense of calm and peace.

The power of these places to heal and unite us reaches all the way back here to Washington, where my bill is supported by the Speaker, by the minority leader, and by a large bipartisan majority. Seventy-three Senators have already voted for this bill, and President Trump has specifically asked for us to send it to his desk.

In this current climate of division and discord, the Great American Outdoors Act is exemplary of the fact that Republicans and Democrats can still come together to pursue commonsense solutions, do right by our public lands, and keep our word.

Mr. Speaker, I invite all my colleagues to join me in supporting our communities, families, public lands, and economy by voting to pass the Great American Outdoors Act.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON) to explain why mandatory spending is good.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend from Utah for yielding. I know that was painful.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in favor of the Great American Outdoors Act. It makes sense to me that, if we are going to have public lands and preserve public lands for Americans, we should also take care of it. That is why the LWCF funding and deferred maintenance part of this bill are very important and a perfect combination.

With that in mind, I wrote the LAND Act in 2017, which funded these two

programs without using a dime of taxpayer money.

Fast-forward to 2020 and the President specifically asked Congress to send him a bill that funded both these programs and that he would sign it.

Thanks to Senator GARDNER, Senator DAINES, Senator HEINRICH, and Senator MANCHIN, the Great American Outdoors Act built upon the LAND Act and passed the Senate with 73 votes, which brings us to this historic day.

The Great American Outdoors Act creates 100,000 jobs, preserves public lands for future generations, and cares for our current national parks and trails. All this is funded by energy revenue and the existing \$20 billion fund—again, not taxpayer dollars.

The bill does not expand the Federal footprint because 99 percent of the LWCF purchases are within existing public lands.

The bill does not force anyone to sell their property since it is willing seller and willing buyer.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of this bill not for me and not for you, but for future generations so that they can enjoy our great outdoors.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. COX), a member of the Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. COX of California. Mr. Speaker, today is a great day for public lands, for land conservation, for outdoor recreation, and for every American who values these gifts that Mother Nature has provided for our country.

Last year, we made a promise to the American people to protect their public lands, our national treasures, by permanently reauthorizing the Land and Water Conservation Fund as part of the John Dingell Conservation, Management, and Recreation Act. Today, we are poised to make good on that promise by passing the Great American Outdoors Act, which will permanently and fully fund the LWCF. I am proud to be an original cosponsor of that bill.

These funds have not just protected our Nation's most well-known national parks, but, over the years, LWCF dollars have also created parks, ball fields, and other outdoor recreational spaces in every corner of our country from Alaska to Florida, from Maine to Hawaii.

This also includes many communities in my district, such as Mendota, Huron, Selma, Sanger, Parlier, Lemoore, Corcoran, Allensworth, Shafter, Buttonwillow, McFarland, and Arvin, just to name a few.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the bipartisan team of my colleagues and activists who have worked hard to make this legislation a reality.

There is an old East Asian proverb that says: One generation plants the trees for another generation to enjoy the shade. Today, we are replanting those trees.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote in support of this bill.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STIVERS).

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Great American Outdoors Act.

My district has 120 projects that benefit from the Land and Water Conservation Fund, from community parks to the Wayne National Forest, to the Hopewell Culture National Historical Park.

Public lands, forests, and parks give folks the opportunity to connect with the outdoors and with each other, especially in this time of the coronavirus.

I also represent a bunch of small businesses, like Rocky Boots in Nelsonville that employs 2,800 people and depends on a thriving outdoor recreation economy.

In my district last year, \$1.37 billion was spent on outdoor recreation. And at a time when there is such a backlog in maintenance, this maintenance support will create 100,000 jobs.

During a time when we have 11.1 percent unemployment, Congress should be taking every opportunity it can to create jobs.

Mr. Speaker, this bill isn't just about conservation, it is about jobs and the economy, and I urge my colleagues to vote "yes."

It is a Senate bill that passed the Senate 73-25. It is not perfect, but it is a good bill, and it is a bill we should support.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI).

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Great American Outdoors Act.

Protecting wilderness reflects the best values of Oregon: environmental protection, stewardship of our land, and community partnership.

The Land and Water Conservation Fund represents a bipartisan commitment to safeguarding natural areas and providing recreation opportunities in the prized outdoor areas that make places in northwest Oregon, like Ecola State Park and the Tualatin National Wildlife Refuge, so special. Unfortunately, the program has faced significant instability in recent years, limiting the long-term planning needed for meaningful conservation efforts.

Last month, I joined my colleagues on the Select Committee on the Climate Crisis in releasing a bold, comprehensive, science-based climate action plan. Our plan for solving the climate crisis recognizes the value of public lands and healthy ecosystems in sequestering carbon dioxide and promoting biodiversity, and it calls for a full and permanent funding for the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

The Great American Outdoors Act will help mitigate the climate crisis and protect the natural beauty and robust habitats that fish and wildlife depend on for survival.

At a time when our communities are struggling to recover from the economic consequences of the coronavirus pandemic, a time when there is heightened awareness about the inequities

and injustices in our society, including inequitable access to our wild places, this bill will boost rural economies and expand access to public lands for future generations.

I am also pleased that this bill takes steps to tackle our national park maintenance backlog to support treasured places like the Lewis and Clark National Historical Park. Oregonians care deeply about protecting our parks, forests, scenic areas, and wildlife refuges, and this bill takes important steps to safeguard them for future generations.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman GRIJALVA for his leadership, and I urge all of my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. WALORSKI).

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support the Great American Outdoors Act.

Our Nation's public lands have long been treasured sources of enjoyment and beauty available to every American. They also play a critical role in our economy, with the outdoor recreation industry supporting 5.2 million jobs.

The hardworking Hoosiers I represent know that better than anyone. Manufacturers in northern Indiana build products like boats, trailers, and 80 percent of the Nation's RVs. That is why Elkhart, Indiana, is known as the RV Capital of the World.

I am a proud cosponsor of the Great American Outdoors Act because it will support RV and boat manufacturers and their workers, promote conservation, and revitalize our national parks. By investing in long-delayed maintenance projects, it will ensure our national parks can continue to be enjoyed by all Americans for generations to come. By enhancing access to our public lands, it will boost tourism, strengthen our economy, and support good-paying jobs.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in voting for the Great American Outdoors Act.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA), the senior member of the Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for his efforts to bring this legislation to the House floor.

I rise today to speak on the Great American Outdoors Act and the importance of this legislation and why we should move on a bipartisan effort to pass it.

This bill tackles a tremendous deferred maintenance backlog on public lands, including our national parks, our treasures, the great American national parks.

This funding will contribute towards making our parks safe and enhance the recreational access, such as the great Yosemite National Park, the crown jewel in California, as well as Kings Canyon and Sequoia National Parks and many others—not only in California, but across our Nation—that are

part of America's heritage and a part of our lasting legacy for future generations to come.

This bill funds the Land and Water Conservation Fund annually at \$900 million and creates a \$9.5 billion fund for deferred maintenance on public lands.

We are way in arrears in terms of deferred maintenance that we need to do not only for our national parks, but for our public lands. That is why this is so important.

Let me respond to the issue of our deficit.

Our deficit is a problem. I am a Blue Dog. But let's be clear. After 16 years here, I have come to the conclusion that trying to address incremental issues as they relate to our national deficit is not going to get us there.

Until Republicans are willing to address the issues of revenues and Democrats are willing to address the issues of expenditures together and jump off that cliff holding hands to balance revenues and expenditures, we are just not going to get there. Okay?

So we should not use that as an excuse not to do what we should do for today's generation and future generations. The creation of this permanent funding highlights the need for Congress to address the deferred maintenance backlog.

I will admit that we are not doing more to provide funding for our aging Federal water infrastructure that also needs to be invested on.

So let me close. Let's take the moment of this bipartisan success to redouble our efforts to address the need for maintenance on federally owned projects.

□ 1245

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

This bill is actually extremely poorly drafted. It assumes basic things. But if, for instance, as we said, the royalties don't show up as we are anticipating, we don't have that \$1 billion to buy more land. How do you solve that? Do you prorate that money? Do you take it from other sources? Do you put this mandatory spending above other mandatory spending, like Social Security?

CRS said those are good questions, and they don't know because this bill is silent on all those questions.

It says the President is supposed to come up with \$900 million of projects. What if he only comes up with \$800 million? Who gets that extra \$100 million? Does that go to the Department of the Interior? Is that a slush fund?

Once again, CRS said, Good questions, and no one knows because this bill is silent on those types of questions.

BLM has no idea of how much money they have spent on this program or where the land is. The State portion is actually—they are okay because they are a percentage. But this is talking about a dollar figure.

So you are going to hear a lot of platitudes, but somebody, at some

time, has got to say how this money is going to actually be funded.

To help us with that, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY), a longtime member of this legislature, who can address those things.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for the time, and perhaps we can continue that discussion in another venue because today I am rising in support of this act.

Mr. Speaker, a while back I was at the Library of Congress and I met the famous filmmaker, Ken Burns and he taught me something. He spoke to us about the creation of the National Park System last century and how it represented a singular defining moment for America; our sense of vastness, openness, and endless opportunity, and regenerated for us an understanding of an American ethos, this great ideal of conservation, caring for what we have and transferring it into the future.

Mr. Speaker, our National Park sites are majestic places, great sources of national pride, and a living heritage for all Americans. But here is the problem: We have a backlog of maintenance, but we fix it today.

Along with providing certainty for the future of the Land and Water Conservation Fund, this all is a great boost to communities eager for innovation and conservation ideals.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. HAALAND), who is vice chair of the full Committee of Natural Resources and chair of the Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests, and Public Lands.

Ms. HAALAND. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Great American Outdoors Act.

From the day I became the chairwoman of the National Parks, Forests, and Public Lands Subcommittee, I have heard from constituents, colleagues, and advocates about fixing the maintenance backlog and fully funding LWCF and making it permanent.

LWCF has helped provide recreational opportunities for underserved and low-income communities in nearly every Congressional district, and last year, we passed an historic permanent authorization.

In my district, LWCF has supported the Valle del Oro National Wildlife Refuge, Petroglyph National Monument, Tingley Beach recreation area, the Elena Gallegos Open Space picnic area, and Martineztown Park.

The Great American Outdoors Act will ensure LWCF's full \$900 million is used every year for conservation and environmental protection, to boost local outdoor economies, and to protect intact ecosystems essential for adapting to climate change.

The bill also establishes the National Park Service and Public Land Legacy Restoration Fund to provide five Federal land management agencies with up to \$9.5 billion over 5 years to address

the deferred maintenance backlog on our public lands.

These agencies will now be able to aggressively address deferred maintenance, improve visitor services, and support Tribal communities in places like Carlsbad Caverns, White Sands National Parks, Chaco Culture National Historical Park, and El Malpais National Monument.

Repairing the crumbling infrastructure on our public lands today is critical so that future generations can enjoy them. I am proud of the work we did to get this bill to this point, and I urge my colleagues to invest in our National Parks and public lands, and vote "yes" on the Great American Outdoors Act.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HURD).

Mr. HURD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Teddy Roosevelt once remarked that:

We have fallen heirs to the most glorious heritage a people have ever received, and each one must do his or her part if we wish to show that the nation is worthy of its good fortune.

Passage of the Great American Outdoors Act proves we are worthy of the good fortune and glorious heritage of our National Parks.

Future generations have been counting on us to ensure these treasures can be visited for another 100 years and, with the funding secured in this bill, we aren't letting them down.

In 1893, Katharine Lee Bates was inspired hiking up Pikes Peak, and she penned the following lines:

O beautiful for spacious skies
For amber waves of grain
For purple mountain majesties
Above the fruited plain.
America, America
God shed His grace on thee
And crown thy good with brotherhood
From sea to shining sea.

Passage of this bipartisan bill is a triumphant act that will benefit countless generations to come.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. NEGUSE), a member of the Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to speak today in support of the Great American Outdoors Act. I would like to thank my colleague from Arizona, the distinguished chairman, Chairman GRIJALVA, for his leadership; and also thank my colleague from South Carolina, Representative CUNNINGHAM, for introducing this bill.

The Great American Outdoors Act, as you have heard today, Mr. Speaker, would provide full and permanent funding for the Land and Water Conservation Fund, and address the significant maintenance backlog on our Nation's public lands.

Since its inception, the LWCF program has established many of our Nation's most coveted and incredible public lands. The program has invested in over 41,000 parks, including Rocky Mountain National Park, Arapaho and Roosevelt National Forests, Lory State

Park, and so many other iconic parks in my district, the Second Congressional District of the State of Colorado.

Nearly 1,000 LWCF grants have leveraged over \$147 million dollars for local government and State park investments in Colorado. In my district alone, there have been 191 LWCF projects. Therefore, establishing permanent and full funding truly is critical.

Additionally, deferred maintenance, as you have heard my colleagues on both sides of the aisle discuss today, on our public lands is a mounting problem that we can no longer afford to ignore.

As one of our country's most popular National Parks, Rocky Mountain National Park faces a significant maintenance backlog of \$84 million. Our park employees are working incredibly hard, but they can't do it alone. We must address this by increasing funds designed to upkeep and rebuild infrastructure on our Federal public lands.

I have consistently urged Congress to fully fund LWCF and address these challenges, and I am so heartened to see this collaborative effort considered on the House floor today and, of course, grateful to the county commissioners, and to so many local officials, conservation groups, anglers and outdoor recreation businesses who have come together to contribute their time and dedication to this effort. Let's get this bill passed.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK).

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as the lead sponsor of the Great American Outdoors Act, and this is a very, very big day for this Chamber.

As my colleagues are aware, I have been pushing to both permanently reauthorize and permanently fund the Land and Water Conservation Fund literally since the day I entered this Chamber.

In addition to the LWCF, this legislation tackles the maintenance backlog that needs to be addressed on public lands and parks across our great Nation.

Mr. Speaker, this bill will have a positive impact on nearly every single Congressional District in this country, and the LWCF has already had a positive impact on many sites in my district alone, most notably, Nockamixon State Park.

Hundreds of businesses, recreation, and environmental groups have come together to endorse our legislation, including the Backcountry Hunters & Anglers, the League of Conservation Voters, the Audubon Society, the Natural Resources Defense Council, Ducks Unlimited, Clean Water Action, and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is historic; it is bipartisan; it is bicameral, with over 250 cosponsors in the House. It overwhelmingly passed the Senate, and it will be signed into law by the Presi-

dent. That is what is called bipartisan cooperation.

Mr. Speaker, for those of us who are strong advocates of our environment, this is a good day. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes."

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. LEVIN), a valued member of the Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. LEVIN of California. Mr. Speaker, I am extremely fortunate to represent a coastal district with many beloved beaches, lagoons, and State parks. In California's 49th Congressional District, our public lands bring outdoor recreation and joy to our residents, and also to many tourists and visitors looking to catch some of our famous waves or hike our scenic trails.

This defining aspect of California culture continues to make communities in my district not only economically stronger, but also active, healthier, and happier, with locals and tourists alike enjoying all the benefits and spaces that the great outdoors offer.

The LWCF is famously known as America's most successful conservation program. This historic bill is an all-around win for our communities, benefiting local economies, and protecting our planet for future generations.

Thus far, California has received approximately \$2.5 billion in LWCF funding over the last 50 years, which has helped to protect iconic places, like San Onofre State Beach, Carlsbad State Beach, San Clemente State Beach, Torrey Pines Beach and Nature Reserve, and several flourishing lagoons, all in my district.

We are not just protecting those iconic places with this bill; we are also investing in our fight against the climate crisis. By conserving natural resources across the country, we are safekeeping critical landscapes, fragile ecosystems, and important wildlife habitat which are all part of the ecosystem we depend on.

As we continue to invest in coastal conservation of wetlands, estuaries, dunes, and reefs, we are contributing to climate change adaptation planning and protecting our coastal communities from extreme weather events, sea level rise, and bluff erosion. These efforts to combat the climate crisis are incredibly important for the 50-plus miles of coastline in my district.

I am proud to support the Great American Outdoors Act, and I hope this historic conservation legislation will soon become law, as it is certainly among the biggest bipartisan environmental accomplishments we have had in many years.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY).

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for his friendship and his encouragement. Maybe not encouragement on this specific bill, but I am proud to support this bill because it

does help with the maintenance backlog in the National Parks, as well as assist with the long-term reauthorization of the Land and Water Conservation Trust, which is something I strongly support.

Since its inception over 50 years ago, the Land and Water Conservation Trust has done very important things for my State and our Nation in preserving access to public lands and to the great outdoors.

Also, for the maintenance backlog, I am proud to represent a piece of the Blue Ridge Parkway, which runs through my district and was the second most visited National Park last year. I think this year would be the same.

In North Carolina alone, we have over 260,000 jobs that are directly attributable to the great outdoors; and those millions of visitors that come to the State through the Blue Ridge Parkway, they are vital for our economy in western North Carolina.

Passage of this bill will help, both the backlog and with ensuring that we have long-term reauthorization on the Land and Water Conservation Trust. I encourage a "yes" vote.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL), an effective member and a leader on the Natural Resources Committee.

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank my wonderful chairman.

I rise in strong support of the Great American Outdoors Act. This historic legislation makes good on our commitment to preserve our Nation's environmental heritage for future generations.

This is an emotional moment for me. It provides full permanent funding for the Land and Water Conservation Fund, landmark conservation legislation that my late husband, John Dingell, wrote and helped establish in 1964.

The LWCF funding has protected Michigan and the Nation's critical natural resources, while supporting local economies, creating jobs, and providing opportunities for outdoor recreation throughout the country.

□ 1300

LWCF was permanently authorized in 2019 as part of the John D. Dingell, Jr. Conservation, Management, and Recreation Act but has received full funding only twice in its long history. The permanent full funding in this legislation is the culmination of decades of work by the conservation community; my late husband; and our wonderful current dean, DON YOUNG, who first advocated for this permanent funding through the Conservation and Reinvestment Act in 1999.

Additionally, the National Parks and Public Land Legacy Land Restoration Fund included in the legislation will allow us to finally address the \$22 billion deferred maintenance backlog in our Nation's public lands, a decades-long problem in the making.

I am proud today to stand with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to

continue that Dingell conservation legacy—I don't look like the greatest outdoors girl, but I know how important they are—which represents the boldest, most comprehensive conservation effort in decades.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN).

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for yielding. As an original cosponsor of this legislation, I would also like to thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in both Chambers for helping lead the charge to get this important victory across the finish line.

I represent the First Congressional District of New York. It is a district almost completely surrounded by water on the east end of Long Island. In my district alone, the Land and Water Conservation Fund has provided funding for over 65 parks, and that is just one example of the impact this program has made all across our great Nation. This supports public access, fishing, hunting, recreation, and our environment.

After securing permanent authorization last year, it is an honor to continue the fight today. I am not sure about everyone else, but being cooped up over the course of these last few months has probably given just about all of us more appreciation for the great outdoors.

This is an effective program that will go a long way in keeping our magnificent outdoors great for generations to come.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, before I yield to the next speaker, let me echo the words of Mrs. DINGELL. John Dingell was indeed a warrior on behalf of the Land and Water Conservation Fund. Today is a culmination of those efforts in which he played such a huge role, and I would be remiss in not thanking him and DEBBIE DINGELL.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON), who is a leader in conservation and access to our public lands.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of this historic legislation that I was proud to coauthor. It has been more than 55 years since the Land and Water Conservation Fund was enacted to establish recreation and conservation opportunities. Now is the time to ensure that LWCF is fully and permanently funded.

This bill will create jobs and boost local economies that are currently facing significant financial hardships due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

It also provides urgent funding of \$9.5 billion to fix broken park infrastructure and failing facilities. The bill supports parks in every State so hikers and anglers alike can visit and enjoy nature across our beautiful country.

This is desperately needed now for our communities' emotional and physical well-being.

Mr. Speaker, we need to protect and preserve our lands, and this bill does that at no expense to our taxpayers. I urge my colleagues to vote for this important legislation.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from the State of Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE).

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Utah for letting me weigh in on this important subject.

Mr. Speaker, the hunters and anglers, farmers and ranchers, and hikers and recreationists of central Washington are passionate advocates for access to public lands.

I strongly stand behind my constituents in supporting the restoration of our national parks, our public lands, and Federal infrastructure. That is why I am proud to cosponsor the Restore Our Parks and Public Lands Act to address our country's deferred maintenance backlog in those areas. If that bill were brought to the floor before us today, I would be a resounding "yes."

Unfortunately, that is not the bill that we are debating here this afternoon. So while I agree with many provisions within the Great American Outdoors Act, I fear that the sweeping nature of this legislation will have unintended consequences for rural communities like mine in Washington's Fourth District.

Mr. Speaker, just 2 weeks ago, I was honored to welcome Secretary of the Interior David Bernhardt to the north-central region of my district in central Washington. These were the two main takeaways from the conversations that we had with citizens in that region: one, a lack of trust with the Federal Government; and, two, the need for hope in the face of many challenges facing rural communities.

While I believe the intentions behind this legislation are grounded in the desire to improve our public lands, too many of my constituents think the approach within this bill is indicative of the same tired notion that we have all heard before: I am from the government, and I am here to help.

We have already determined the Federal Government's culpability in creating a \$20 billion maintenance backlog problem on our public lands. So the response is to permanently spend \$900 million a year, most of which will be spent on what? Get this, Mr. Speaker: purchasing more Federal land.

The farmers, ranchers, and hard-working men and women of my district support local management and control of our lands. We have seen firsthand the delinquency of the Federal Government, and I think we should work to continue to support our national parks but vote this bill down.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL).

Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL. Mr. Speaker, the Everglades, Dry Tortugas, and Biscayne National Parks are three of our south Floridian national parks that are magnificent parks that we cherish across our country. They are essential to preserving biodiversity, improving air quality, providing recreational opportunities, and sustaining our physical and mental well-being. They are also essential to our economy, bolstering local economies across our Nation, supporting countless jobs, and breathing life into our small businesses.

Unfortunately, our national parks are in need of help. Hiking trails are in disrepair, roads are crumbling, visitor centers are falling apart, and our lands are in need of protection.

That is why passing today's bill, the Great American Outdoors Act, is so crucial. It will permanently reauthorize the Land and Water Conservation Fund to address our severe maintenance backlog and ensure that these natural beauties will be there for our children and our grandchildren.

With the passage of this bill, Mr. Speaker, the ecotourism economies in both Miami-Dade and Monroe Counties will flourish. I urge support.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. KEVIN HERN).

Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I thank Ranking Member BISHOP for his work on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, in the wake of a global pandemic unlike anything we have seen in our lifetime, we have spent unprecedented amounts of money this year. We have already saddled the next generation with unthinkable debt. Digging our way out of this hole is going to take time and targeted effort. We cannot continue to spend as if our debts don't exist.

This legislation needlessly increases the deficit. The Land and Water Conservation Fund, which is already incredibly well-funded, does not need an additional \$900 million a year in perpetuity. With immediate health needs and economic recovery our top priorities, increasing the Federal real estate holding shouldn't be on anyone's to-do list.

A recent report showed that 40 percent of LWCF funds went to projects that failed to advance any agency objectives. The oversight and accountability of the fund is laughable, but this bill seeks to exacerbate the lack of transparency by removing elected officials from the situation altogether and handing unilateral power to political appointees and unelected bureaucrats.

There are more productive ways that we should spend our time this week, and I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this bill.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. RICHMOND).

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Speaker, let me say that the goal of the bill is positive, but how it is achieved is just flat wrong.

To pay for this legislation, what we do is go straight to Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Texas and take \$1.9 billion a year of potential revenue to those States to uplift their people to pay for this bill.

Let me be specific about Mississippi, Alabama, and Louisiana. They rank 48th, 49th, and 50th in terms of quality of life for their residents. They rank 1, 2, and 5 in terms of their African-American population.

So, what are we doing here, in this time of racial inequity? We are going to Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana and taking \$1.9 billion a year without sharing any of that revenue with their States where: they can improve education, where all three rank last; they can improve healthcare, where all three States rank last; and they can improve their environment, where all three States are in the bottom one-third.

So, all I am saying is, at some point, equity demands that those States get their fair share.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Ms. SHERILL).

Ms. SHERILL. Mr. Speaker, New Jersey might be the Garden State, but it is also the most densely populated State in this country. So, New Jerseyans know the importance of clean air, clean drinking water, and protecting our natural resources. That is why I am proud to lead the Great American Outdoors Act with my colleagues.

Grant funding from the Land and Water Conservation Fund has helped protect sites in my district and helped expand conservation efforts from the Great Swamp National Wildlife Refuge to Morristown National Historical Park. The Great American Outdoors Act will make the Land and Water Conservation Fund permanent, ensuring that future generations of Americans are able to access our natural wonders.

For too long, LWCF's promise of protecting our Nation's public lands has been broken as the funds have been diverted. The GAOA would, for the first time, mandate that such funds are used as intended to protect public lands and waters, support public access, and provide an economic boost to communities.

I am so glad Congress has stepped up to expand equitable access to the outdoors by investing in our parks and public lands at all levels.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES), who is an active member of our committee, is ranking member of another committee, and who can actually springboard on Mr. RICHMOND's comments about this particular issue.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the ranking member for yielding.

"Quick, there is a global pandemic. Let's spend billions of dollars repairing fences, putting up new signs, and fixing toilets at our wildlife refuges, parks, and forests," said no one ever. Ever.

I have been sitting here listening to this debate over the last several minutes, and I have no idea what planet people are on right now.

There is a global pandemic right now. What this legislation does is it takes everything else and puts it on the back burner. That is right. Unemployment assistance goes behind this; job opportunities go behind this; improving our schools and getting our kids actually educated go behind this; medical care for our seniors goes behind this because this is mandatory spending.

Mr. Speaker, I have heard Members sit here and say that we have a \$20 billion maintenance backlog. Do you know why that is? Because we failed to appropriate the money because we have determined it is not a priority in the appropriations process.

Why are we now stepping in and circumventing that whole process again, Mr. Speaker, in the middle of a pandemic to determine that this is the greatest priority?

Mr. Speaker, let me give you an analogy of what this bill really does. This is like someone going over to their neighbor's house, taking their credit card, and going out there and using that credit card to get a new address sign in their front yard and maybe to get a new coating of paint on their house. Meanwhile, that person who took the credit card has multiple cars and has an expansive real estate holding and never thought once about their own financial situation but instead took the credit card of their neighbor who is maybe up to their neck in medical bills because their spouse is on their deathbed. That is what this bill does.

□ 1315

I have heard people say: "Well, oh, this is not taxpayers' money."

Whose money is this? What dream world are you living in? This absolutely is funds that are taxpayer funds.

"Oh, but it comes from energy revenues."

Where do those go? They go into the general treasury. This isn't excess money. This isn't some money tree.

Mr. Speaker, let me tell you about one of the most offensive things about this bill that my friend CEDRIC RICHMOND, Congressman RICHMOND, talked about. And he tried to address this in committee by proposing a bipartisan amendment with Congresswoman SEWELL, with Congressman BENNIE THOMPSON, with Congressman SCALISE, with myself, and others, a bipartisan amendment to fix this.

Virtually all of the money that this bill is spending comes from energy production off the coast of Louisiana. This bill, as many have said, this goes on in perpetuity. In 5 years, we are spending \$1 billion a year; in 10 years, \$1 billion

a year; in 50 years, \$1 billion a year; in 100 years, \$1 billion a year.

Mr. Speaker, do you realize that today 28 percent of this country is owned by the Federal Government—28 percent?

The sensible thing to do is to look at those assets, determine which of, for example, the nearly 75,000 different National Park's units and assets still make sense today. You just heard my friend talk about how 40 percent of these funds historically have been used for projects that don't advance the mission of the very agency they are supposed to be advancing.

This is a tone-deaf piece of legislation. It is mandatory spending. It is putting this as a higher priority than everything else, including that we are in a global pandemic. We have record unemployment.

Whose idea was it to do this? This is absolutely crazy.

Mr. Speaker, I urge opposition to this legislation. I urge common sense, and I urge that we sit down and actually address some of the priorities.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the distinguished leader.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I came in at the end of my friend from Louisiana's discussion. I have great respect for Mr. GRAVES and I have great respect for his concern, but, very frankly, the things he talks about have been pending in the United States Senate for 60 days untended.

The leader of the Senate said the States can go bankrupt. The sense of priority apparently does not exist there, and that is regrettable.

This legislation that I rise in support of is an important piece of legislation. If, however, it displaced any of those priorities of which the gentleman spoke, I would perhaps share his opinion. We are waiting for some of those priorities to be attended to by the Senate, even if they defeat them.

We have talked about healthcare. We have talked about equal rights. We have talked about campaign finance reform. We have talked about energy. We have talked about so many subjects that are pending silently untended in the United States Senate. So the wringing of hands about this legislation pressing out other priorities I think is not accurate.

It is accurate that this is an important piece of legislation that will do much good. And I thank Chairman GRIJALVA on the Committee on Natural Resources for steering the legislation before us through his committee and working with the Senate to get it passed through that body.

Mr. Speaker, I also thank the ranking member for his concern about the maintenance and upkeep of our parks. He and I have spoken about that.

I would especially like to thank Representatives Cummings, SHERILL—

who just spoke before me—Congressman COX, Congresswoman TORRES SMALL, Congresswoman HORN, and Congressman GOLDEN for leading this legislation in the House, along with my good friend MIKE SIMPSON from the State of Idaho.

It should be noted that the bill before us today bears the name of our dear and departed friend John Lewis, who understood that conserving America's great outdoors and public spaces went part and parcel with protecting the legacy of civil rights.

Mr. Speaker, he was, as you know, instrumental in protecting the childhood home, neighborhoods, and church associated with Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., in Atlanta—one of America's great leaders—as part of our National Park System, using the Land and Water Conservation Fund as a critical tool in that process.

The Ebenezer Baptist Church and its visitor center are among the many sites in need of repair today. It was, of course, in Ebenezer in Atlanta, in 1957, that a young John Lewis joined Dr. King and other civil rights pioneers to create the Southern Christian Leadership Conference. What an eerie and poignant coincidence the bill before us is numbered 1957.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to think that John is still here with us, guiding us forward in spirit to continue on the good work he started in Congress some 30 years ago.

Last year, when we enacted a permanent reauthorization of the Land and Water Conservation Fund—a great accomplishment of this Congress and, yes, this President—we made it clear that doing so was only the first of a two-step process.

The second step was making sure that the Land and Water Conservation Fund is permanently paid for. That is what this bill does today, with nearly \$1 billion annually in mandatory spending to sustain the fund and support critical Federal, State, and local conservation projects across this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, not only that, but the bill creates a new fund that will help address the maintenance backlog in protecting some of our most iconic national parks. The impact of these investments will be felt not only in tourism and improved public access to our public lands, but also in a cleaner and healthier environment over the long term.

In my home State of Maryland, we have used the fund to protect some of our most historic sites, protecting nature so that every American might have the same opportunity to enjoy the sanctity of nature or contact with our history.

I was personally proud to have worked to protect the watershed and the viewshed of George Washington's Mount Vernon site permanently through the creation of Piscataway Park on our side, Maryland's side, of the river.

We also used the fund to protect the Patuxent Research Refuge established to support wildlife research, Douglas Point in Nanjemoy, and countless sites throughout the Chesapeake Bay region.

In all, Maryland has received, over the years, over \$230 million from the Land and Water Conservation Fund to preserve our State's most treasured landscape and historic places.

Mr. Speaker, this bill before us passed the Senate on a strong bipartisan vote 73–25—in other words, three-quarters of the United States Senate—and I believe we will demonstrate, hopefully, similar overwhelming support in the House later today.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to join in making this critical investment in America's public lands that will conserve them for the enjoyment of generations to come. I ask them to join me, as well, in helping to secure the legacy of our friend JOHN LEWIS.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ to the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. FULCHER).

Mr. FULCHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this legislation. While I understand the merits of the bill and while some of my colleagues support it, I still have concerns.

I spent a lot of time in the rural counties of Idaho. Residents and local governments, understandably, have serious concerns regarding additional Federal land acquisition, especially at a time when Federal resources are stretched so thin.

The Federal Government doesn't have the resources to manage the land and are often prevented from allowing local involvement. Translation: More Federal land equals less land being intelligently managed and, often, more wildlife.

Currently, about two-thirds of Idaho's land mass is controlled by the Federal Government. That means less property tax, more D.C. bureaucracy, reliance on grant programs like Secure Rural Schools, Payments in Lieu of Taxes, and the ramifications of associated strings inevitably attached.

I am also concerned about our growing national debt, now over \$24 trillion. And while I appreciate that this bill utilizes revenue streams from future oil and gas receipts, it is still ultimately taxpayer money. That authorizes permanent funding, and any time there is permanent funding, that also raises a red flag.

Mr. Speaker, to be a wise steward of the people's money, Congress should regularly reevaluate programs that it funds, not automatically renew appropriations.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), our distinguished Speaker, whom I thank for helping guide this important piece of legislation to the floor and to a vote today.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank

him for being a lifelong champion of environmental justice and environmental stewardship as chair of the Committee on Natural Resources.

Mr. Speaker, as a Californian, as an American, as Speaker of the House, I proudly rise in support of the Great American Outdoors Act, one of the most important conservation and public lands bills in decades.

This legislation builds on the progress made here by House Democrats and others earlier in our majority when we passed the John D. Dingell, Jr. Conservation, Management, and Recreation Act, named for our former colleague, a fitting testament to Chairman DINGELL's legacy, which made permanent the authorization for the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

Mr. Speaker, the Great American Outdoors Act—I love the title—takes the next step in our pro-conservation agenda, as it boldly protects our country's natural and cultural heritage for our children, our grandchildren, and generations to come.

This legislation reflects the energy and expertise of our freshmen, and I particularly salute and thank Congressman JOE CUNNINGHAM of South Carolina. Congressman CUNNINGHAM is a former ocean engineer, now serving on the Committee on Natural Resources, who was the lead author on this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, in passing this legislation, Congress is ensuring that America lives up to its conservation promises, as we finally permanently fund the Land and Water Conservation Fund at levels that were promised.

Over 55 years, the Land and Water Conservation Fund has provided over \$17 billion in funding for over 40,000 recreational and conservation initiatives in every county in the country, creating and protecting America's iconic landscapes like the Grand Canyon and historical sites like the Martin Luther King, Jr. National Historical Park.

Some of California's most treasured natural areas benefited from the protection provided by the Land and Water Conservation Fund, including Joshua Tree, Lake Tahoe, and the Golden Gate National Recreation Area in the San Francisco Bay Area.

The Land and Water Conservation Fund also addresses environmental injustice by creating green spaces near low-income communities and communities of color across the country, permanently. Funding the LWCF will ensure that we preserve our natural heritage in an equitable manner to ensure that all communities can benefit.

The Great American Outdoors Act—I love the name, as I said—also makes an urgently needed investment in our national parks, which face a crippling \$12 billion deferred maintenance backlog. Our parks are critical to preservation of our natural and cultural heritage, and we must ensure that they can be enjoyed for generations to come.

The Great American Outdoors Act enjoys overwhelming bipartisan support both in the Congress and across the country. Nearly 900 national, State, and local groups representing small businesses, ranchers, sportsmen, veterans, outdoor recreationists, and conservation organizations have written in support of this legislation sharing these thoughts:

“The Great American Outdoors Act will ensure a future for nature to thrive, kids to play, hunters and anglers to enjoy. National parks and public lands provide access to the outdoors for hundreds of millions of people every year and habitat for some of our country’s most iconic wildlife.”

□ 1330

It goes on: “These treasured places also tell the stories that define and unite us as a Nation. Funds provided in this bill will secure these vital resources while preserving water quantity and quality, sustaining working landscapes and rural economies, increasing access for recreation for all Americans no matter where they live, and fueling the juggernaut of our outdoor economy.”

Indeed, the Great American Outdoors Act supports good-paying jobs and grows the economy. Nationally, outdoor recreation supports more than 5 million jobs and adds nearly \$780 billion to the economy.

House Democrats are proud to pass this bill and send it on to the President’s desk. We hope to do so in the strongest possible bipartisan way, as it passed the United States Senate.

As we do, we will continue our work to protect our environment and natural heritage by including calling on the Senate to take up H.R. 2, the Moving Forward Act, which rebuilds America’s infrastructure, while investing in a clean energy future, including by modernizing our energy infrastructure, boosting our commitment to renewables, building a clean transportation sector, and more.

Also we want to implement the Select Committee on Climate Crisis’ action plan, Solving the Climate Crisis, the most sweeping and detailed climate plan in decades, which sets out a vision of 30 by 30, conserving at least 30 percent of land and ocean in America by 2030 to confront the threats of the climate crisis, which the Great American Outdoors Act advances.

And urging the Senate to take up H.R. 9, the Climate Action Now Act, our strong response to the American people who are demanding climate action by keeping us in the Paris Agreement.

That is not in this bill. We have a different bill here. We must invest in the future we want for our children.

I just want to put this in a little perspective, Mr. Chairman and Mr. Ranking Member. And thank you for your leadership in so many ways, Mr. BISHOP.

When our country was founded and when Thomas Jefferson became Presi-

dent, he tasked Secretary of the Treasury Gallatin to build the infrastructure of America, for an infrastructure plan that would follow the Lewis and Clark Expedition. It was Erie Canal, Cumberland Road, all kinds of things, and build into the Louisiana Purchase that would follow. It was a great undertaking. Gallatin was the Secretary of the Treasury, and so many things happened at that time to build the infrastructure into the manifest destiny of America and as we moved west.

You wonder why I am bringing that up. 100 years later, at the anniversary of that initiative, President Teddy Roosevelt did his own infrastructure initiative called the National Park Service. It was to build and respect and conserve the green infrastructure of America. It was quite remarkable. So much sprang from that initiative of Teddy Roosevelt, the great conservationist.

And now, over 200 years later, this is a tip of the hat to all of that. But so much more needs to be done. It is a recognition of the importance of the great outdoors, to the quality of life, but also the juggernaut of our outdoor economy.

So, I hope we will have a strong bipartisan vote. I once again thank the distinguished chairman, Mr. GRIJALVA, for his leadership in all of this over the years and for this bill. And I, again, salute Mr. CUNNINGHAM of South Carolina for bringing his expertise as an ocean engineer to bear as the lead author of this important legislation, the Great American Outdoors Act.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, the Dingell Act, 2 years ago, was bipartisan. If this were bipartisan, we would not be here.

But to illustrate that, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR).

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, today is a very swampy day, and I am not talking about the weather. Today, Congress will pass a bill that is, frankly, a demonstration of everything that is wrong with Washington.

The Great American Outdoors Act is a product of special interests, written not by committees, but in back rooms, full of special interest provisions, and now being forced through this Chamber without the opportunity for us to amend it.

This is permanent legislation, yet we can’t take an extra hour in the House to consider amendments to make this legislation better? Why? Because the special interests that have paid nearly \$100 million in lobbying can’t be denied another day from their victory. Well, I guess they got what they bought.

Are we not allowed to amend this bill because House leadership is afraid to offend the Senate? We can decide that the Senate isn’t perfect, their product isn’t wonderful, that the House can make amendments to make it better.

Let’s be clear. This bill is nearly nothing like the legislation introduced by the supporters in the House.

The gentleman from South Carolina may think he has got a great win, but the repeal of the 100th meridian provision, which is in this bill, allows the U.S. Forest Service to steer millions of Federal spending away from his State.

Like the Comptroller of the United States told us in December, left to their own devices, the U.S. Forest Service will spend 80 percent of their funding to the west of the meridian. And that was with Congressional oversight. Once passed and set on autopilot, this program will only get worse.

If your goal was to expand recreational opportunities to more Americans, then you have failed miserably if you vote for this bill.

But that is not the only problem with this legislation. I proposed a bipartisan amendment that would require the construction done under this act to adhere to Buy American provisions.

It was endorsed by the United Steelworkers, the AFL-CIO, American Iron and Steel Institute, and a broad coalition of trade associations and unions. The underlying bill includes billions in new spending on infrastructure. Those billions could be spent on products manufactured by American workers.

Can Congress consider this today? No.

Why? Because the Speaker rejected the amendment, rejected American workers, and rejected American manufacturing. At a time when America needs jobs, a failure to include Buy American provisions in this bill is a shame on this House.

I had amendments dealing with the infrastructure challenges facing our Native American reservations, including funding for Indian education and Indian health. In areas where COVID-19 was destructive, they need funds desperately to get back into the 21st century from their current dilapidated state.

Will Congress consider these amendments? No, because the special interests behind this legislation don’t want us to consider those needs on the floor of the House.

Considering this legislation sets the Federal Government on a massive land buying spree like never seen before, I prepared an amendment to protect our counties by ensuring full payment in the Payments in Lieu of Taxes program.

Do you remember that contract? Can we honor it? That won’t even be considered, as well as anything else.

This legislation isn’t a victory for America; it is a loss. Good process builds good policy builds good politics. It is a shame that we didn’t go there. I ask everybody to vote against this legislation.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BARRAGÁN) and thank her for her work on environmental justice legislation.

Ms. BARRAGÁN. Mr. Speaker, green spaces should be a right for everyone, regardless of where they live or the color of their skin.

Unfortunately, for too many Black, Brown, and Native American communities, parks are considered a privilege. Today, we can change this injustice.

The Great American Outdoors Act will create more local parks in low-income and urban neighborhoods. Minority communities across the country lack access to green spaces.

In my district, in Compton, we only have about half an acre of parkland for every thousand residents, well below the averages in the rest of Los Angeles County and the Nation.

Voting “yes” means more outdoor recreation opportunities, including sports fields and trails. Voting “yes” means all kids, no matter their ZIP Code, have the right to play on green grass and explore the natural world.

I am proud to vote “yes” to secure this right for our young people today and for future generations.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK), one of the ranking members on the committee, who has spent a lot of time on our committee and understands these issues.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I represent the Sierra Nevada of California. Yosemite Valley, Sequoia and Kings Canyon, and Lake Tahoe are all within my district.

The Yosemite Land Grant Act signed by President Lincoln in 1864 was the first time the Federal Government set aside land for “public use, resort, and recreation . . . for all time.”

Today, the Federal estate has grown to 640 million acres. That is 28 percent of the land area of our Nation. While the Federal Government owns just seven-tenths of 1 percent of New York State and 1.8 percent of Texas, it owns 46 percent of my home State of California and 93 percent of Alpine County in my district.

Now, we in the Sierra revere our public lands, and we are proud to share them with the world. But the Federal Government now holds far more land than it can take care of. The Federal lands now face a \$20 billion backlog of deferred maintenance, which makes tourism less desirable.

Now, this is all land that is off the local tax rolls, denying our local governments vital revenues. Federal restrictions on productive use of these lands has devastated local economies and, worst of all, the Federal Government has utterly neglected the management of our forests to the point that they have become morbidly overgrown and now present a constant threat of catastrophic fire.

Now, shouldn't we take care of the land we already hold before we acquire still more land? And when we have already taken two-thirds of Alaska and Utah and four-fifths of Nevada, shouldn't we pause and ask for some balance around the country?

Now, this measure does provide enough money over the next 5 years to address about half of our current de-

ferred maintenance needs, and that is very good. But then that funding disappears, and we are left with locked-in, billion-dollar-a-year mandatory spending in perpetuity for new land acquisitions placed outside of Congress' control, while removing the requirement that future acquisitions be focused where the Federal Government owns very little land.

It means that unelected bureaucrats will have a billion-dollar-a-year slush fund to take private property off the tax rolls with no accountability to our local communities, no provisions for long-term maintenance, and no reforms to protect our people from the scourge of wildfire produced by the continuing neglect of our Federal forests.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. PANETTA).

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Great American Outdoors Act.

In my district on the central coast of California, we protect, we promote, and we never put a price on our environment. Partly because it is what drives our local economy, but also we appreciate what it means for those after us.

By fully funding the Land and Water Conservation Fund, this bill ensures the type of necessary care needed for our National Parks, forests, and critical wildlife areas. This is needed today, because those treasures have been put under extreme pressure with this pandemic, but also previously with increased visitors and decreased budgets.

That is why this legislation is so important, as it will not only address needed infrastructure projects and deferred maintenance, but also because it will promote conservation, recreation, and access to the outdoors.

By passing this bipartisan bill that ensures investments in our parks and forests, we are ensuring that our natural treasures, our postcards to the future, actually get delivered to future generations.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. MCADAMS).

□ 1345

Mr. MCADAMS. Madam Speaker, Utah is blessed with many treasured national areas, from parks and trails to red rock canyons. Conserving these places is more important than ever, and today, we take landmark action by passing full funding for the Land and Water Conservation Fund. This successful conservation program has given us, at no cost to the taxpayer, decades of vital funding for national and State parks, wildlife refuges, and recreational areas.

State and local officials rely on the money to improve local parks and trails, which see increased demand along the rapidly growing Wasatch Front. Utah has five of the country's

most beloved national parks, including Zion National Park, which has quite literally been loved to death and has a \$67 million backlog in deferred maintenance. This bill provides some desperately needed funding to fill that backlog.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud today to be voting for this legislation and the promise it holds for our economy and an excellent quality of life in Utah for my children and for future generations.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I won't tell the gentleman from Utah that the Utah Association of Counties is opposed to this and all the trails that he is talking about come from the State's side of projects. That is beside the point.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA).

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member and colleague from Utah. I appreciate his service and his force with which he does things here.

Mr. Speaker, all right, where are we? Gigantic deficits, yet we want to add to the burden of that deficit with a forced \$900 million, nearly \$1 billion, every year in this bill for acquiring new Federal land.

Now, I come from the West, so we are already ravaged by wildfire, by unmanaged lands that are detrimental to the neighbors, to the private lands. I have three fires going on in my district right now. A lot of this emanates from unmanaged Forest Service lands. So, we want to add to their inability to manage even more lands in this legislation.

Now, the part of the bill that Mr. BISHOP had authored is a good part, taking care of the backlog that we have in our parks and our lands, if you would listen to him, \$20 billion worth of backlog that we haven't found a way to pay for yet. Yet, instead of finishing our dinner, we are already going for the dessert by buying more lands that we can't afford and we know we can't manage.

I will be thinking about this, and my constituents will, as more and more forest lands burn each year and threaten communities. These forests are gated off because they don't have time to do the maintenance and the work that needs to be done so the public can have access to these lands because of the \$20 billion backlog or the funding to take care of the juniper problem that we have in northeast California, the wild horse population that needs to be managed so they don't die out there of starvation during the draught, the sage grouse habitat so they don't become endangered, and our local counties, our rural counties, that are already struggling with the lack of PILT funds because they have to come back here and beg every year for the payment in lieu of taxes to get this place to keep its commitments on that and

to secure rural schools funds that our rural counties need.

Mr. Speaker, I say “no” on this bill and get back to managing what we should manage.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close when the gentleman from Utah is done with his speakers.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

We have talked about several of the problems with this particular bill. With this particular bill, we have talked about how the poor reckoning of its sources there do not say what is going to happen if this money does not develop. I think Mr. GRAVES would be good to talk about where this money is coming and how it is being used at the same time. And we don't necessarily know what will happen with the lowering of the royalties that we are experiencing this year from next year.

There is one other consideration I hope that people will understand, especially for all those who are speaking about it who come from the eastern coast. There was a conforming amendment put in the Senate in this particular bill, a conforming amendment. In the good old days, we used to call them earmarks, but it is a conforming amendment.

The original bill said that on Forest Service land that would be bought, 15 percent of that had to come from west of the 100th meridian and 85 percent had to come from east of the 100th meridian. That was taken out, quietly and surely taken out. The end result of that means that there is a siphoning of billions of dollars that should be and could be going to Eastern States.

I mention that because one of the Democrat speakers did speak about the need for urban recreation opportunities. That was what was supposed to happen, and with this conforming amendment, that is what is taken out of the bill.

In the 1960s, as this bill was being discussed, Orville Freeman was the Secretary of Agriculture for Kennedy. He said at that time that the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission pointed out that the greatest need for recreation opportunities lies in the areas adjacent to the metropolitan centers in the Eastern States.

It would be our purpose under this bill to expand about 84 percent of what would be available under it for acquisition in the eastern national forest acquired under the Weeks Act.

In fact, that commission went on to say that outdoor opportunities are most urgently needed near metropolitan areas. Much of the West and virtually all of Alaska are of little use to most Americans looking for a place in the Sun for their families on a weekend when the demand is overwhelming.

At regional and State levels, most of the land is where people are not. One-sixth is in the sparsely populated Alaska. Seventy-two percent of the remainder is in the West, where only 15 per-

cent of the people live. The Northeast, where one-quarter of the people live, only 4 percent of the acreage is there.

But that language was not put in there by happenstance. There was a reason for it. In one iteration of this particular act that we introduced a long time ago, there was the idea of putting a specific percentage that would go to urban recreation so there would be those urban recreation concepts, as was originally designed in the bill. That has been taken out.

What that will mean is that for you who live east of the 100th meridian, basically east of Denver, there will be \$1.19 billion less dedicated to you than there would have been if this amendment had not been put in there. That works out to an average of \$32 million per congressional district of those living east of Denver.

I am glad that all those who are for this, on whatever side, will have a good time to explain to their constituents why they are in favor of giving their area \$32 million less in recreation opportunity simply because you are going to confirm a conforming amendment that was slipped into the Senate version of this bill that really hurts this process and is not necessarily positive.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. KILMER).

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman and all who worked on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, as someone who grew up on the Olympic Peninsula, I learned how important protecting our parks and our public lands is to driving tourism and growing jobs and supporting rural economies.

This is a big day. Permanently funding the Land and Water Conservation Fund, providing dedicated funding to make much-needed repairs at Olympic National Park and throughout our park system, this is progress for ensuring that these natural assets can continue to provide amazing visitor experiences and serve as economic drivers for rural communities that need these jobs and need these opportunities for future generations.

This is a day to also celebrate the extraordinary coalition of environmental groups, outdoor economy groups, and local civic leaders that got involved to move this bill forward today.

I am grateful for all who worked on this. I am proud to be a supporter of this bill, and I am encouraging all of my colleagues to vote “yes” today.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES).

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I want to introduce another dose of reality, something you have not heard many folks talk about today.

Where is this money coming from? How are we paying for this initially—what is it?—\$1.9 or \$2.9 billion a year in mandatory spending?

This is coming from offshore energy revenues. That is where the majority of these moneys are coming from, from oil and gas production. I want to be clear: from oil and gas production.

Now, the majority at the same time and in the same breath is taking step after step to decimate or eliminate the domestic energy industry, therefore not making us get oil and gas from the United States but getting it from places like Russia, as we have seen over and over again when these drastic policies have been put forth.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the other thing is, any time you have energy revenues like this produced on Federal land under the Mineral Leasing Act, 50 percent of the money goes to those States that host that production, and they can use it for whatever they want. They can use it for whatever they want to use it for.

In this case, the Gulf States, Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, Texas, we get about 4 percent right now.

So, Mr. Speaker, I have a question. I have a question for my friends on the majority. Can they tell me what they are going to say to the residents of Texas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, and Florida next time we have a huge hurricane come through because you have refused, under the bipartisan amendment that the Congressional Black Caucus and others advocated, you have refused to allow for a larger percentage of money to be invested back in the resilience of this ecosystem, the resilience of these communities?

Tell me what you are going to say to them whenever we have another Hurricane Katrina, Rita, Gustav, Ike, Harvey, Irma, Maria, Michael, Florence. Tell me what you are going to say to them because you are taking their money, and you are spending it in other places, and you are saying this is for the environment, these environmental groups out there advocating for this, when it is a greater environmental investment to make it in the Gulf.

Mr. Speaker, I urge opposition to the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD statements from the U.S. Farm Bureau Association and the Cattlemen's Association in opposition to this, from the American Energy Alliance in opposition to this, as well as the CRS report that analyzes from whence this money comes, whence it is going, and how much we probably won't have in the future.

JUNE 5, 2020.

Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

Hon. CHUCK SCHUMER,
Minority Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATORS: We the undersigned western state Farm Bureau organizations write to express our concerns and areas of opposition to the S. 3422, the Great American Outdoors Act (GAOA). While we recognize the significant benefits that the GAOA would

provide in addressing the extensive maintenance backlog for federally-managed lands, we also write to express our collective concerns with funding further expansion of federal land ownership in the west.

Farm Bureau members are significantly and directly impacted by federal land ownership, land-use policies and decisions. Throughout the West, our members hold public lands grazing permits, own property adjacent to federal lands and engage in public and private land forestry. For many ranchers, access to public lands grazing is economically and ecologically essential to their operation and provides access to land that may not otherwise be available to new or beginning farmers and ranchers.

Legislation or regulation that could be used to curtail viable multiple use access to these public resources is a threat to America's farming and ranching families. Historical experience illustrates, in many cases, that expansion of public land ownership over time leads to new policies that further limit multiple uses of land such as livestock grazing or create additional restrictions on access and rangeland improvements. Further, additional federal land acquisition does not adequately consider the reduction in economic activity and the loss of jobs in resource-dependent communities. For these reasons, Farm Bureau believes that it is essential for agricultural stakeholders to be represented on any sort of planning and/or advisory committees formed for federal land expansion especially in those areas where private or state land is proposed for purchase or exchange.

American farmers and ranchers have always demonstrated their fortitude and resilience in adapting to the ever-changing landscape—both political and ecological. While the resources made available through federally managed lands provide opportunities for ranchers to add value to their businesses, availability of private land is essential for successful business and commerce. The federal government already owns over 640 million acres, which is approximately 28% of the 2.27 billion acres of land in the U.S.

Since enactment of the LWCF in 1965, Congress has appropriated \$18.9 billion (not adjusted for inflation), of which \$11.4 billion was for federal land acquisition. Over 5 million acres of private land has been purchased by USDA and DOI agencies.

The Federal government already owns more land than it can effectively maintain and manage. In the west, the federal government owns roughly every other acre of land and many counties have more than 75% of their land in federal ownership. Further federal and ownership erodes the available tax-base and limits the ability of local governments to effectively provide critical government services.

The second title of the GAOA establishes the Land and Water Conservation Fund as a trust fund with permanent authorization and without annual appropriations oversight. The Congressional Budget Office (CBO) estimates the price tag for the first year of this legislation could be upwards of \$20 billion. In this midst of the current pandemic and related economic crisis, we are concerned with the additional financial burden this legislation would create.

We believe, at this time, that funds allocated by the Land and Water Conservation Act (LWCA) would be better utilized to manage existing federal lands and request Congress amend the GAOA to allow for LWCA funds to instead be allocated to individual state foresters for their use in fire suppression, fire management and conservation efforts instead of utilizing funds to acquire additional private property. We request that you consider the following amendment requests:

1. Sunset in five years. This would allow the Congress to evaluate the program and decide whether to reauthorize, modify, or eliminate it. A five-year sunset would conform the LWCF title of the bill with the \$49.5 billion maintenance title.

2. Limit land acquisition to states with less than the collective average of those western states with federal owned/administered lands.

3. Require that all federal and acquisitions be subject to approval of the relevant state legislature, Governor, and county commissions.

4. Require notice of any potential land acquisition be given at least 90 days before title can be transferred to the state legislature, Governor, and county commissioners. Notice should include the annual loss of property tax revenues that will result; or if the land is already held by a tax-exempt owner, such as a land trust, the notice should include the tax revenues lost if the property were subject to property taxes.

5. Require that priority be given to the maintenance backlog, forgoing any acquisition requests in those instances when revenues are limited.

Additionally, our organizations would welcome the opportunity for inclusion of additional maintenance and enhancement projects that would benefit critical natural resources to the West. We ask that you consider including the provisions of S. 2044, the Water Supply Infrastructure Rehabilitation and Utilization Act. This amendment would create an aging infrastructure account within the Bureau of Reclamation (BOR) to provide loans to local water managers to perform extraordinary maintenance on the federal BOR infrastructure they manage. Initially, \$40 million per year over five years (\$2 billion total) would be provided to this account from the Reclamation Fund. No taxpayer funds would be used to fund the account and water users would be required to repay the loans received to repair and replace water facilities with interest. The repaid funds would be available to BOR to fund additional extraordinary maintenance projects, essentially creating a revolving fund.

The GAOA provides deferred maintenance for every federal asset agency within the Department of Interior except BOR. Yet, BOR is facing significant issues with deferred and maintenance needs at federal water supply facilities. 80% of BOR's facilities are more than 50 years old and are in need of major upgrades or replacement costs beyond regular maintenance. Since water managers do not own the infrastructure, they are unable to bond against it and therefore have limited access to other sources of capital for major repair projects. Creating this account within BOR would allow water managers to perform repairs, repay cost over time and ultimately ensure that our aging federal water infrastructure remains viable to serve the billions of dollars of agricultural and other economic activity that depends on it.

Our organizations are happy to further discuss the GAOA, our recommendations and the opportunity for inclusion of additional maintenance projects. We thank you in advance for your consideration and look forward to continuing this important conversation.

Sincerely,

American Farm Bureau Federation, Alaska Farm Bureau Federation, Arizona Farm Bureau Federation, California Farm Bureau Federation, Colorado Farm Bureau Federation, Idaho Farm Bureau Federation, Montana Farm Bureau Federation, Nevada Farm Bureau Federation, New Mexico Farm and Livestock Bureau, Oregon Farm Bureau Federation, Washington Farm Bureau Federation, Wyoming Farm Bureau Federation.

[From the American Energy Alliance, July 22, 2020]

KEY VOTE NO ON H.R. 1957

The American Energy Alliance urges all members to vote NO on H.R. 1957 as amended by the Senate with the text of the Great American Outdoors Act. The federal government already owns far more land than it can adequately manage, which is part of the reason for the large maintenance backlog this bill tries to address. However, the Land and Water Conservation Fund is simply a vehicle for buying up even more land for the federal government to mismanage.

By buying up land, the federal government hems in and impoverishes local rural communities by removing taxable land and limiting space for economic activity. Land procured through the LWCF that is later placed off limits to development further harms the local communities as well as harming the larger economy. While the LWCF itself is questionable policy, at least the current structure of the fund allows for congressional input into the land acquisition process through appropriations. Making LWCF funding permanent removes this last Congressional check on federal land acquisition. Permanent funding of the LWCF should be opposed.

The AEA urges all members to support free markets and affordable energy by voting NO on H.R. 1957 as amended with the Great American Outdoors Act. AEA will include this vote in its American Energy Scorecard.—Thomas Pyle, President, American Energy Alliance.

[From CRS Reports & Analysis]

EFFECT OF COVID-19 ON FEDERAL LAND REVENUES, JULY 13, 2020 (R46448)

EFFECT OF COVID-19 ON ENERGY AND MINERAL OPERATIONS AND RECEIPTS

The COVID-19 pandemic and accompanying recession have significantly affected energy and mineral prices, production, and consumption. Many observers expect energy consumption will remain below 2019 levels through at least 2021 . . . These expectations stem from reported and ongoing reduced demand for liquid fuels for the transportation sector and reduced demand for coal and natural gas associated with the reduced demand for electricity and industrial activity.

Royalties are the largest contributor to federal energy and mineral revenues. Royalty rates are set by statute, regulation, or for specific leases, but the rates are rarely altered once a lease has been issued. The revenues from royalties reflect the product of the royalty rate and the market value of the commodity produced. The pandemic and accompanying recession have resulted in reduced demand for oil, gas, and coal, which has resulted in lower prices and lower production for these commodities in recent months, relative to 2019.

For May 2020, ONRR reported onshore oil and gas royalty collections of \$170 million, a decline of 53% from May 2019. ONRR reported offshore oil and gas royalty collections of \$100 million, a decline of 84% from royalty collections for the same month in 2019. The royalty collections for May reflect production and sales in April. ONRR reports new monthly data on an ongoing basis.

To the extent that royalties and other revenues are reduced due to impacts from the COVID-19 pandemic and recession, disbursements to states and some federal programs would decline accordingly. The severity of these impacts on program funding and state budgets depends on the portion of total revenue coming from energy and mineral disbursements and on other factors. Some programs (e.g., the LWCF) receive disbursements up to a specified limit; in such cases,

royalties could fall but remain sufficient to fund such programs. Reductions in energy and mineral revenues also could affect the funds remaining in the U.S. Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time I actually have left here.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Utah has 3½ minutes remaining.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

We have heard all sorts of platitudes about this bill today. Whether it passes or not is actually irrelevant. It is not bipartisan, and it has all sorts of flaws. There are questions about the future source of funding.

We have heard speaker after speaker come up and say: We are not talking about taxpayers' money. This is only royalties that are off there.

One of the problems we have to face is that all the royalties that come from offshore development and onshore development from energy and gas, those royalties are placed in the general fund. In fact, the second largest source of funds that go into the general fund is from these royalties, second only to the IRS taxes that go in there. If these revenues weren't deposited in LWCF, they would be deposited in the general fund of the U.S. Treasury. If that is not taxpayer money, I don't know what is.

We have talked about the need for, actually, urban recreation areas. We would like to do it, but unfortunately, this bill diminishes that opportunity and puts it in limbo, which is not good.

I have heard speaker after speaker come up here with pretty pictures about our national parks, reservation lands, BLM land, resource lands, all these things that need to be helped. A lot of them talked about all the wonderful programs that are on State lands, that are parks, roads, picnic areas, and all those things which we are already doing.

When we permanently reauthorized the LWCF last Congress, that is when we put more money into those types of things everyone says is wonderful.

□ 1400

What we didn't put more money into is buying Federal land, buying more land to put into the Federal estate. As everyone talks about how important it is actually to now start putting money into park maintenance, into maintenance of the backlog, what this bill does is put that at the very lowest rung on priorities of where this royalty money is spent.

You will spend it first on GOMESA. You will send it to the States. It will go to historic preservation. You will spend it on buying up more land before you ever come to anything that helps the parks and helps the public lands. That is because we have disproportionately done this.

This bill is not about funding our public lands. This bill is about circumventing the limitations that we put in in the last Congress on buying more

land. The only thing this bill is about is how we can find another way to buy more property.

We can't even afford the property we already have. There is a \$20 billion maintenance backlog. But what this is attempting to do is find a way to put more money into buying more land so we can exacerbate that problem.

Now, you can say all you want to about how wonderful it is, how good it is, and, I am sorry, most of those platitudes were misstated. They were talking about things that either already exist or are actually being de-emphasized by this particular bill.

What this bill is about is: Are you going to put more money into buying more land before you put more money into actually maintaining the land we already have? That is really the only issue of this bill, and that is why we are fighting this strongly about it.

Last year, when we did the Dingell Act, that was bipartisan. We had worked together to come up with a lot of bipartisan stuff. This was not a bipartisan bill. Mr. KILMER, I appreciated his work with me on the parks. That was bipartisan. This is not bipartisan. It is still about how do we buy more land. That is the goal of this piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, how much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Arizona has 7¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, the process of this legislation reaching this point on the floor to be voted upon has, to those of us involved, been difficult. It has been frustrating. Yet, the possibility of it being done was always there, and that was the goal. I think the overwhelming support in the Senate for a clean bill to come to the House was bipartisan.

I think today would have been—I didn't feel it was necessary to engage in the same arguments that we have been engaging about with the Land and Water Conservation Fund in particular and the backlog. This legislation is not about robbing Peter to pay Paul. It is not about taking money from the East to give to the West. It is not about denying coastal States their share.

If we do transition, as we transition, which we need to urgently, to clean energy in the future, future Congresses, I think, will have the foresight to look at this legislation and deal with how we move forward with it and continue to fund it.

When I went to visit Land and Water Conservation Fund sites, I went to a park in south Phoenix, the only green space and recreation area for close to 8,000 families who live in that general area, Land and Water Conservation Fund; and when I went to other locations in urban areas across this country, Land and Water Conservation Fund.

That continues to be a priority for reasons of public health, equity, and access.

Mr. Speaker, in a strange procedural trick of the House, we have spent this afternoon debating the Great American Outdoors Act, but the bill we refer to as H.R. 1957 began as something else.

H.R. 1957 was originally a bill to protect taxpayers by ensuring fair treatment under the law. It was introduced back in March 2019 by our late friend and colleague, Representative John Lewis.

Now, I can't personally speak to Representative Lewis' thoughts on conservation spending. But I do believe our late friend would be happy with the work that we have done here today and the vote that we are about to take.

Representative Lewis truly believed in a government by and for the people, all the people. He challenged us to leave petty partisanship at the door and to consider the essential pursuit of justice and equity that we have long sought and failed to meet in this country.

I am proud to have called Representative Lewis my friend. I am proud that we can honor his legacy with the passage of this bill.

There is much work left to be done to ensure real equity and justice in the United States, and I look forward to working with all my colleagues across the aisle in continuing that work in the future.

But when we come together as we have today, as the people's representatives working toward the common goal of protecting future generations, then perhaps there is hope we might see Representative Lewis' vision realized.

I thank all of my colleagues who spoke on behalf of this legislation. I thank leadership for bringing it to the floor and all the members of the committee and Members not on the committee who worked very hard to bring this legislation forward. It is historic. It is important. It is necessary. And it is an essential step. I urge us to vote "yes" on H.R. 1957.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my support for the Senate amendment to H.R. 1957, the Great American Outdoors Act. This legislation will establish permanent funding for the Land and Water Conservation Fund and establish a National Parks and Public Land Legacy Restoration Fund supporting deferred maintenance projects on federal lands. The funding authorized by this legislation will assist many states, including my home state of Rhode Island, in improving state parks and beaches, and preserving open spaces and wildlife habitats. Additionally, funding for deferred maintenance projects within the National Park System will help ensure that resources remain available to Rhode Island in the future for required improvements and developments for sites like the Roger Williams National Memorial and the Blackstone Valley National Historic Park.

While I support this legislation, I am hopeful that the Natural Resources Committee, as well

as the House Appropriations Committee, will work to improve funding outcomes for coastal states under the Land and Water Conservation Fund. Per-capita, coastal states receive approximately forty cents on the dollar compared to funding received by inland states. Rhode Island's coastal economy generates more than \$2 billion annually, and supports more than 41,000 jobs, while New England as a whole supports nearly a quarter of a million jobs through its coastal economy. As a result of geography, coastal states face a number of challenges which many inland states do not face, including beach erosion, migrating fish stocks which impact commercial fisheries, and vulnerability to tropical storms and other weather-related disasters. All of these challenges are further exacerbated by the effects of climate change.

Congress needs to be able to support critical programs like the Land and Water Conservation Fund and also ensure that coastal communities are able to receive necessary funds to preserve their coastlines, protect wildlife, and support workers who rely on jobs supported by ocean economies. I look forward to working with Chairman GRIJALVA to discuss ways in which we may be able to achieve this going forward.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support the bipartisan Great American Outdoors Act, which, among other things, would address the National Park Service's (NPS) deferred maintenance backlog, a problem that disproportionately affects the National Capital Region and, especially, the District of Columbia. Twenty percent of the District consists of parkland, almost 90 percent of which is under the jurisdiction of NPS.

National parks are some of America's greatest treasures, yet NPS, the agency that maintains our federal parks, has a \$12 billion maintenance backlog. One-sixth of all projects in the backlog are in the National Capital Region, with \$1.3 billion in D.C. itself. The National Mall and Memorial Parks have the highest number of deferred maintenance projects in the nation, with more than \$840 million in needed repairs still outstanding, according to Pew Charitable Trusts. The most significant deferred maintenance projects involve refurbishing memorials and making necessary repairs for supporting infrastructure. Although these parks are located in D.C., they are of national significance. The National Mall and Memorial Parks accommodate more than 36 million visits each year and roughly 30,000 people use their 15 softball fields, eight volleyball courts, two rugby fields and the Washington Monument grounds for sporting events nearly year-round. This heavy use has caused a \$13 million repair backlog for the Mall grounds.

In addition to the National Mall and Memorial Parks, NPS owns most of D.C.'s neighborhood parks, including 156 small green spaces and many circles, squares and fountains throughout D.C. Also included in the backlog are historic sites such as Ford's Theatre, the FDR Memorial, East and West Potomac Parks, the Carter Barron Amphitheatre and the Belmont-Paul Women's Equality National Monument. I support passage of the Great American Outdoors Act so that NPS can properly maintain all of our incredible national parks.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support Senate Amendment to H.R. 1957. The Great

American Outdoors Act is landmark legislation that will clear the maintenance backlog at our National Parks, protect our country's ecosystems, and permanently fund the Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF). The permanent funding of the LWCF has been one of my longtime goals. When I was Chairman of the Natural Resources Committee, I introduced the Conservation and Reinvestment Act (CARA) with my dear friend, the late Chairman John Dingell by my side. Today marks the culmination of our work, and I am proud to have accomplished this with the help of John's wife, Congresswoman DEBBIE DINGELL. My enthusiasm for permanent LWCF funding is as strong now as it was then. In recognition of this day, Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the following op-ed that I authored in the Fairbanks Daily News-Miner on July 4, 2000 in support of CARA.

[From the Fairbanks (Alaska) Daily News-Miner, July 4, 2000]

LEGISLATION BESTOWS LASTING ALASKA RETURNS
(By Don Young)

There's been a lot of interesting speculation about my legislation called the Conservation and Reinvestment Act. Numerous stories and editorials have been written about what this landmark bill would do and why I led the effort to pass such a major conservation package.

Even News-Miner columnist Fred Pratt has devoted a significant amount of attention to CARA and my participation in this process. In his most recent column, he speculated that I wrote the bill to benefit Alaska Native corporations. This was a new and novel theory, but unfortunately, not accurate.

The truth is actually very simple—CARA is good for all Alaskans.

In Alaska and throughout the nation, CARA will increase funding for federal and state conservation and recreation programs, urban parks, historic preservation, and wildlife conservation. The bill also resolves a major inequity regarding the disposition of funds generated from Outer Continental Shelf activities.

Currently, states receive 50 percent of the revenues for onshore oil production but nothing from the federal waters six miles and beyond a state's coast. CARA corrects this problem by creating new programs that benefit coastal states with the OCS revenues, which have averaged between \$4 to \$5 billion annually. Under CARA, \$2.8 billion of this funding will go toward important recreation, wildlife and conservation programs each year.

In addition, CARA creates new private property protections which go beyond existing law.

Alaska will receive about \$2.5 billion during the 15-year period included in CARA for these programs. Each year, Alaska would receive: \$87 million for coastal conservation programs; \$38.5 million for state and federal land conservation under the Land and Water Conservation Fund; \$17.5 million for wildlife conservation; \$9.8 million in PILT payments; \$9 million for federal and Native land restoration; and about \$1.5 million for historic preservation and endangered species programs.

In previous years, the LWCF has helped fund several popular Alaska projects including Alaskaland in Fairbanks, the Coastal Trail in Anchorage and Eagle Crest in Juneau. The increased funding for the state programs under the LWCF will allow for local communities to determine how these funds are spent in their own communities based upon their local priorities, rather than federal dictates.

Despite inaccurate claims by fringe groups like the American Land Rights Association, CARA also includes new private property protections that go beyond existing law. No new federal land can be acquired under CARA without the specific approval of Congress. The federal government can only purchase land from willing sellers—condemnation is not allowed under CARA unless it is specifically approved by Congress. CARA also created new requirements to protect land owners who do not want to sell their land from new regulations.

Additionally, the administration must seek to use land exchanges and conservation easements as alternatives to acquisition. These new protections were included to enhance private property rights in all 50 states.

Despite the noisy opposition by some fringe groups, CARA is supported by thousands of organizations and officials throughout the nation. Last month, CARA was overwhelmingly approved by the U.S. House by a 315 to 102 vote with a majority of both Republicans and Democrats voting for passage of the bill. CARA is supported by all 50 governors, the U.S. Conference of Mayors and the National Association of Counties. CARA has also been endorsed by more than 4,500 organizations including numerous conservation, hunting, fishing, and recreation groups like the National Rifle Association, and other organizations like the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Realtors.

Alaskans know that over the past 27 years, I have lead the effort for the authorization of the trans-Alaska pipeline, oil development in Prudhoe Bay and the Coastal Plain, a strong mining industry, and numerous other economic programs in every region of the state.

During this same period, I have also authored numerous important conservation bills including the reauthorization of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation Act and a comprehensive improvement of America's national wildlife refuge system.

In addition, I have authored and supported dozens of bills to promote hunting, fishing and outdoor recreation in our state and the entire nation.

Fred Pratt is correct. CARA and its expanded conservation, wildlife and recreation programs is consistent with my 27-year congressional record of working for Alaskans.

Don Young has served as Alaska's sole representative in Congress since 1973.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 1053, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA).

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3 of House Resolution 965, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

PERMISSION TO EXTEND DEBATE
TIME ON H.R. 7573, REPLACING
BUST OF ROGER BROOKE TANEY
WITH BUST OF THURGOOD MARSHALL

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that debate

under clause 1(c) of rule XV on a motion to suspend the rules relating to H.R. 7573 be extended to 1 hour.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

REPLACING BUST OF ROGER BROOKE TANEY WITH BUST OF THURGOOD MARSHALL

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 7573) to direct the Architect of the Capitol to replace the bust of Roger Brooke Taney in the Old Supreme Court Chamber of the United States Capitol with a bust of Thurgood Marshall to be obtained by the Joint Committee on the Library and to remove certain statues from areas of the United States Capitol which are accessible to the public, to remove all statues of individuals who voluntarily served the Confederate States of America from display in the United States Capitol, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 7573

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. REPLACEMENT OF BUST OF ROGER BROOKE TANEY WITH BUST OF THURGOOD MARSHALL.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) While sitting in the United States Capitol, the Supreme Court issued the infamous *Dred Scott v. Sandford* decision on March 6, 1857. Written by Chief Justice Roger Brooke Taney, whose bust sits inside the entrance to the Old Supreme Court Chamber in the United States Capitol, this opinion declared that African Americans were not citizens of the United States and could not sue in Federal courts. This decision further declared that Congress did not have the authority to prohibit slavery in the territories.

(2) Chief Justice Roger Brooke Taney's authorship of *Dred Scott v. Sandford*, the effects of which would only be overturned years later by the ratification of the 13th, 14th, and 15th Amendments to the Constitution of the United States, renders a bust of his likeness unsuitable for the honor of display to the many visitors to the United States Capitol.

(3) As Frederick Douglass said of this decision in May 1857, "This infamous decision of the Slaveholding wing of the Supreme Court maintains that slaves are within the contemplation of the Constitution of the United States, property; that slaves are property in the same sense that horses, sheep, and swine are property; that the old doctrine that slavery is a creature of local law is false; that the right of the slaveholder to his slave does not depend upon the local law, but is secured wherever the Constitution of the United States extends; that Congress has no right to prohibit slavery anywhere; that slavery may go in safety anywhere under the star-spangled banner; that colored persons of African descent have no rights that white men are bound to respect; that colored men of African descent are not and cannot be citizens of the United States."

(4) While the removal of Chief Justice Roger Brooke Taney's bust from the United

States Capitol does not relieve the Congress of the historical wrongs it committed to protect the institution of slavery, it expresses Congress's recognition of one of the most notorious wrongs to have ever taken place in one of its rooms, that of Chief Justice Roger Brooke Taney's *Dred Scott v. Sandford* decision.

(b) REMOVAL OF BUST OF ROGER BROOKE TANEY.—Not later than 45 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Joint Committee on the Library shall remove the bust of Roger Brooke Taney in the Old Supreme Court Chamber of the United States Capitol.

(c) REPLACEMENT WITH BUST OF THURGOOD MARSHALL.—

(1) OBTAINING BUST.—Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Joint Committee on the Library shall enter into an agreement to obtain a bust of Thurgood Marshall, under such terms and conditions as the Joint Committee considers appropriate consistent with applicable law.

(2) PLACEMENT.—The Joint Committee on the Library shall place the bust obtained under paragraph (1) in the location in the Old Supreme Court Chamber of the United States Capitol where the bust of Roger Brooke Taney was located prior to removal by the Architect of the Capitol under subsection (b).

SEC. 2. REMOVAL OF CERTAIN STATUES AND BUST.

(a) REMOVAL.—Not later than 45 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Joint Committee on the Library shall remove the statue of Charles Brantley Aycock, the statue of John Caldwell Calhoun, the statue of James Paul Clarke, and the bust of John Cabell Breckinridge from any area of the United States Capitol which is accessible to the public.

(b) STORAGE OF STATUES.—The Architect of the Capitol shall keep any statue and bust removed under subsection (a) in storage until the Architect and the State which provided the statue or bust arrange for the return of the statue or bust to the State.

SEC. 3. REQUIREMENTS AND REMOVAL PROCEDURES FOR STATUES IN NATIONAL STATUARY HALL.

(a) REQUIREMENTS.—Section 1814 of the Revised Statutes (2 U.S.C. 2131) is amended by inserting "(other than persons who served as an officer or voluntarily with the Confederate States of America or of the military forces or government of a State while the State was in rebellion against the United States)" after "military services".

(b) STATUE REMOVAL PROCEDURES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—

(A) IDENTIFICATION BY ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL.—The Architect of the Capitol shall identify all statues on display in the United States Capitol that do not meet the requirements of section 1814 of the Revised Statutes (2 U.S.C. 2131), as amended by subsection (a); and

(B) REMOVAL BY JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE LIBRARY.—The Joint Committee on the Library shall arrange for the removal of each statue identified by the Architect of the Capitol under subparagraph (B) from the Capitol by not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) REMOVAL AND RETURN OF STATUES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (C), the Architect of the Capitol shall arrange to transfer and deliver any statue that is removed under this subsection to the Smithsonian Institution.

(B) STORAGE OR DISPLAY OF STATUES.—The Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution shall follow the policies and procedures of the Smithsonian Institution, as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act, regarding the storage and display of any statue transferred under subparagraph (A).

(C) STATE REQUESTS.—A statue provided for display by a State that is removed under this subsection shall be returned to the State, and the ownership of the statue transferred to the State, if the State so requests and agrees to pay any costs related to the transportation of the statue to the State.

(3) REPLACEMENT OF STATUES.—A State that has a statue removed under this subsection shall be able to replace such statue in accordance with the requirements and procedures of section 1814 of the Revised Statutes (2 U.S.C. 2131) and section 311 of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2001 (2 U.S.C. 2132).

(4) AUTHORIZATION AND APPROPRIATIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—There are appropriated for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2021, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, \$5,000,000 to carry out this section, including the costs related to the removal, transfer, security, storage, and display of the statues described in paragraph (1)(A), of which—

(i) \$2,000,000 shall be made available to the Architect of the Capitol; and

(ii) \$3,000,000 shall be made available to the Smithsonian Institution.

(B) AVAILABILITY.—Amounts appropriated under subparagraph (A) shall remain available until expended.

SEC. 4. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

In addition to the amounts appropriated under section 3(b)(4), there are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this Act, and any amounts so appropriated shall remain available until expended.

SEC. 5. DETERMINATION OF BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled "Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation" for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the House Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the measure under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I bring this legislation to the floor today on behalf of the Committee on House Administration. I thank our chair, Congresswoman ZOE LOFGREN, for her leadership. I thank Ranking Member RODNEY DAVIS for his friendship and leadership on our committee. I thank Mr. DAVIS, and as I said to him privately, I thank him for the spirit in which he has approached this important but delicate issue.

Recognizing the issue of removing Confederate statues from the Capitol has been simmering for years. Since I recognize that, I will now approach the issue today with the utmost respect for those who are opposed to the goal of the legislation. But I ask the dissenters to consider that America has been a divided nation since its founding, and it is past time for us to close this chapter of American history by removing statues that depict an era that caused enormous pain to African-American citizens.

Mr. Speaker, as you, I grew up in the rural, segregated South. Commonplace were Confederate flags and monuments on public property, honoring Confederate soldiers and the Confederacy. Many Southern jurisdictions are now voluntarily removing these statues.

President Abraham Lincoln won the 1860 general election by winning 18 of 29 States. The 11 States that Lincoln failed to carry were slaveholding States. These States were fearful that Lincoln would find a way to end slavery and deprive slave owners of their so-called property.

Eleven Southern States, after Lincoln was elected, immediately seceded from the Union, forming the Confederate States of America. The CSA elected its leadership. They printed a currency and stood up a military.

At Fort Sumter on April 12, 1861, the Confederate States of America took military action against the United States of America. For the following 4 years, more than 600,000 Americans lost their lives on the battlefield, including, I might say, African-American soldiers who fought for the Union.

This was not a war between the States; it was a war against the United States of America by 11 Southern States.

When the Union finally won the war, and both sides buried their dead, 4 million slaves were granted their freedom by the signing of the Emancipation Proclamation and passage of the 13th Amendment.

□ 1415

In 1864, each State was granted the privilege to donate two statues of deceased persons to be displayed in the Capitol that depict the history of their State. These statues are now known as the National Statuary Hall Collection. Approximately 10 of these statues depict men who volunteered to fight against the United States in the Civil War.

All of these statues were donated many decades after the Civil War. Like many other statues around the country honoring members of the CSA, and particularly those erected in the South, these 10 statues were not donated and installed in the Capitol until the 1900s, during the height of Jim Crow.

Many Americans see these statues and the timing of their placement as a means to intimidate African Americans and to perpetuate the notion of white supremacy. We must not con-

tinue to honor these combatants by allowing their images to be on display in the Capitol.

The bill before us today also identifies several other statues for removal or replacement that are not part of the National Statuary Hall Collection, including the bust of Chief Justice Roger B. Taney, who authored the 1857 Supreme Court decision of *Dred Scott v. Sandford*, which ruled that slaves could not be considered citizens and that Congress did not have the ability to ban slavery. This opinion, Mr. Speaker, is regarded as possibly the Supreme Court's worst decision of all time, and the 7-2 decision was a major factor contributing to the war.

Another bust not part of the collection is of Vice President John Breckinridge, 1857 to 1861. In 1860, Mr. Speaker, Breckinridge ran for President on the Southern Democratic ticket and he lost.

During the Civil War, Breckinridge served in the United States Senate from Kentucky but became a traitor and enlisted in the Confederate military, and he was assigned to the army of Mississippi stationed in Jackson, Mississippi, achieving the rank of major general. He was expelled from the Senate. Jefferson Davis then appointed him as Secretary of War. After the war, he fled the country for several years.

So I ask my colleagues, I ask America: Does this bust deserve to stand outside of the Senate Chamber? I would hope that your answer to that question will be no.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to answer the summons of our time by voting to remove all of these offensive statues from the Capitol of the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the Speaker of the House.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his leadership in bringing us together today, along with our distinguished leader, Mr. HOYER; our distinguished whip, Mr. JIM CLYBURN; Congressional Black Caucus Chair KAREN BASS; Chairman BENNIE THOMPSON; Congresswoman BARBARA LEE; and Mr. BUTTERFIELD. I thank Mr. BUTTERFIELD for leading this critical effort, so important.

Mr. Speaker, as our country knows, nearly 2 months after the murder of George Floyd, America remains gripped by anguish as racial injustice continues to kill hundreds of Black Americans and tear apart the soul of our country.

Last month, inspired by the activism of the American people and led by the Congressional Black Caucus, the House passed the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act to fundamentally transform the culture of policing, to address systemic racism, curb police brutality, deliver accountability, and save lives.

On Juneteenth, I had the privilege as Speaker of the House, by my authority

as Speaker of the House, to remove four paintings of Speakers of the House who were in the Speaker's lobby, to remove them because they were part of the Confederacy, three of them before they came to the Congress and one who came after his participation in the Confederacy.

It was long overdue. When we were checking out the statues, we found out about the paintings, and on Juneteenth we said good-bye to those four.

Now in Congress and in the country, we must maintain a drumbeat to ensure that this moment of anguish continues to be transformed into action. That is why, today, the House is proud to pass legislation to remove from the U.S. Capitol the 12 statues of Confederate officials and four other statues honoring persons who similarly exemplify bigotry and hate.

Mr. Speaker, again I thank Leader HOYER, Whip CLYBURN, CBC Chair KAREN BASS, Chairman BENNIE THOMPSON, Congresswoman BARBARA LEE, and Chairman G.K. BUTTERFIELD for leading this effort.

As I have said before, the Halls of Congress are the very heart of our democracy. The statues in the Capitol should embody our highest ideals as Americans, expressing who we are and what we aspire to as a nation. Monuments to men who advocated barbarism and racism are a grotesque affront to those ideals. Their statues pay homage to hate, not heritage.

Among the Confederate statues in the Capitol—can you believe this?—are Jefferson Davis and Alexander Stephens, president and vice president, respectively, of the Confederacy, both of whom were charged with treason against America. Both were charged with treason against America, and they have statues in the Capitol.

Now, think of this about Stephens—I hate to even use his words, but it may be important for people to know why the statues have to go in clearer terms. The infamous words of Stephens make as clear today as they did in 1861 the aims of the Confederacy.

In his so-called Cornerstone Speech, Stephens asserted that the “prevailing ideas” relied upon by the Framers included “the assumption of the equality of races. This was in error,” says Mr. Stephens.

Instead, he laid out in blunt and simple terms the awful truth of the Confederacy. He said: “Our new government is founded upon exactly the opposite idea.”

Imagine, exactly the opposite idea of equality of races.

“Its foundations are laid, its cornerstone rests, upon the great truth”—and these are his words; I hate to even use them, but we have to face this reality—“the Negro is not equal to the White man; that slavery, subordination to the superior race, is his natural and normal condition.”

He has got a statue in the Capitol of the United States.

How can we seek to end the scourge of racism in America when we allow

the worst perpetrators of that racism to be lauded in the Halls of Congress?

This bill also removes the statue of John Calhoun, the unapologetic leader of the Senate's pro-slavery faction, who, on the Senate floor, celebrated slavery as a "positive good."

Mr. Speaker, I know Mr. CLYBURN supports removing this South Carolinian.

On the floor, John C. Calhoun made this vile assertion that "in few countries is so much left to the share of the laborer, and so little exacted from him, or more kind attention paid to him in sickness or infirmities of age."

What could he have been talking about?

It removes from the old Supreme Court Chamber the bust of Justice Roger Taney. And this is because of the persistent leadership of Mr. HOYER, who has been on this case for a long time.

Justice Taney was the author of the Dred Scott ruling, which Mr. BUTTERFIELD very clearly laid out as probably one of the worst decisions of the Supreme Court ever, certainly a horrific stain on the history of our country, and certainly on the Court.

How fitting it is that the Taney bust will be replaced with a bust of U.S. Supreme Court Justice Thurgood Marshall, a towering champion of equality and justice in America.

Mr. CLYBURN, as well as Mr. HOYER, has been working on this. Mr. HOYER is a Marylander. I am a Baltimorean. As we all know, the airport in Baltimore is named for Thurgood Marshall. So as one who was born and raised there, I take pride in his leadership and service to the country.

Let us recall Justice Marshall's words spoken nearly 30 years ago but as true today. Justice Marshall said: "Democracy cannot flourish amid fear. Liberty cannot bloom amid hate. Justice cannot take root amid rage. America must get to work. In the chill climate in which we live, we must go against the prevailing wind. We must dissent from the indifference. We must dissent from the apathy. We must dissent from the fear, the hatred, and the mistrust. We must dissent, because America can do better, because America has no choice but to do better."

How much our great Elijah Cummings reflected the words of Thurgood Marshall, two Baltimoreans.

The Congress now has a sacred opportunity and obligation to do better, to make meaningful change to ensure that the halls of the U.S. Capitol reflect the highest ideals as Americans.

Mr. HOYER, as our distinguished floor leader, had this planned for awhile that everybody would work together and bring this composite bill to the floor at this time. Little did we know when those plans were being made that, at the same time, we would be mourning the loss of our darling John Lewis. It is a death in the family for us in the Congress. But he knew that this was in the works, and he is up there looking down

on us to make sure it happens in the most bipartisan way.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a strong bipartisan vote for this important step for justice, reconciliation, and progress in America.

As far as our John Lewis is concerned: Thank you. Thank you for bringing us to this place. May you rest in peace.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, at this time, it looks like I am going to be here on the floor with many of our colleagues who are going to offer remarks on this legislation, so I will give my opening remarks after I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, first and foremost, the Confederacy was a fundamental attack on our Constitution and the founding principles of our Nation, and it should never be romanticized or lauded.

I have got no problems with removing, lawfully, any monument that specifically honors this rebellion, but that is not what this bill does. Rather, it begins by removing the bust of Roger Taney from the Old Supreme Court Chamber.

Now, it is true he wrote the absolutely worst decision ever rendered by the Supreme Court, the Dred Scott decision, but let's not forget he also presided over and joined in one of its better decisions, the Amistad slave case.

If we remove memorials to every person in this building who ever made a bad decision—and his was the worst—well, this will be a very barren place, indeed. It is only by the bad things in our history that we can truly measure all of the good things in our history.

Now, this bill also removes the statues of Confederate sympathizers sent to the Capitol by the States. Well, that is not our decision. That is a decision that has always belonged to the individual States, and several of them are already making these decisions. We should let them.

The only other one is John C. Breckinridge of Kentucky, who is honored not for his service to the Confederacy but, rather, for his service as Vice President of the United States. And, granted, we have had some absolutely terrible Vice Presidents through our history, and I am sure we will in the future, but if we are going to start down that road, we are going to be swapping out statues like trading cards at the whim of the moment. Our Nation's history should be made of sterner stuff.

Perhaps we would all be better advised to practice a little temporal humility and heed the wisdom of Omar Khayyam: "The moving finger writes; and, having writ, moves on: nor all thy piety nor wit shall lure it back to cancel half a line, nor all thy tears wash out a word of it."

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN), the Democratic whip,

the gentleman representing the Sixth Congressional District of South Carolina, the State where the Civil War began, who is a national expert on American history, having been a former history teacher, as I recall.

□ 1430

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina for yielding me the time, and for his leadership and his management of this significant piece of legislation.

I want to thank Mr. DAVIS and the other Members on the other side for their tremendous cooperation in trying to help us move to a more perfect Union.

Mr. Speaker, 7 years ago, I stood on this floor and I referred to this Chamber, this great Hall, as America's classroom. And it is in that spirit that I think of this building as America's schoolhouse. And what is taught in this building, what is experienced by the people who visit this building ought to be about the uplifting of this great Nation.

What people see when they come here, who people see lauded, glorified, and honored when they visit this building ought to be people who are uplifting to history and the human spirit.

It is in that light that I recall the writings of one great writer who wrote that if we fail to learn the lessons of history—I think it was George Santiano—we are bound to repeat them.

There are a lot of lessons to be learned from history. I study it every day. Hardly a day goes by when I don't spend some time looking at some facet of American history.

We did not come to this floor with this legislation to get rid of that history. A lot of it we don't like; a lot of it we do like. And I think that what we need to do is discern between what should be honored and what should be relegated to the museums and to other places to commemorate that history. That is not eradicating history. That is putting history in its proper place.

And for those who did not do what I think they should have done, they have got a place in the history books, but it is not to be honored, and it is not to be glorified. It ought to be put in its proper perspective.

So I don't have a problem with the fact that one of the statues in here, John C. Calhoun—he was a historical figure. He died in 1850, if my memory serves, 10 years before the war broke out. So we aren't talking about John C. Calhoun as a Confederate. We are talking about John C. Calhoun as one of the Nation's biggest proponents of slavery and the relegation of human beings.

I want to thank my home State of South Carolina, because the people of Charleston, Mayor Tecklenburg and the city council in Charleston, decided several weeks ago, the John C. Calhoun statue should be taken down, and they did it.

Clemson University—Calhoun, one of the great founders of that university—is one of the original land grant schools. Clemson University decided that they would take John C. Calhoun's name off of their honors college.

So if the State of South Carolina, where he was from sees that, why is it that we are going to laud him in this building?

I am asking my colleagues to do for John C. Calhoun what his home State is doing for him, putting him in his proper place, not a place of honor. They didn't tear down his statue; they very meticulously took it down to retire to his proper place.

Mr. Speaker, you and I spoke last night about one other gentleman whose statue is in this building, Wade Hampton. Wade Hampton, he was not a Confederate, but he was a perseverer. There were three Wade Hamptons, senior, and the third.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from South Carolina an additional 1 minute.

Mr. CLYBURN. But Wade Hampton's history should not be glorified. I don't know what my State's going to do about him, but what I would like to see us do here is put him in his proper place.

So those two statues that are here representing the State of South Carolina need to be removed from their places of honor and, at some point, I would hope the State would bring them back home and put them in their proper place.

So, I would like to say here today that I am not for destroying any statue. I am not here for burning down any building. I am here to ask my colleagues to return these people very properly and lawfully to their proper place. Put them where they can be studied. Put them where people will know exactly who and what they were.

But do not honor them. Do not glorify them. Take them out of this great schoolhouse so that the people who visit here can be uplifted by what this country is all about.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to follow Whip CLYBURN and the historical context of being a history teacher, and also the historical context of serving this institution and what it means. So I thank Whip CLYBURN for his leadership.

I thank my good friend, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, for his leadership on this issue. We are going to work together today to make sure that we are sending a message to the American people that it is Republicans and Democrats standing together.

Now, I have a unique district in central Illinois. I am from the Land of Lincoln. As a matter of fact, Abe, himself, lived in my district. I represent Lincoln's Tomb, Lincoln's Home. The

old State Capitol where Abraham Lincoln delivered his "House Divided" speech in 1858 is in my Congressional District. It was there when Lincoln not only spoke out against slavery and, specifically, the Dred Scott decision, but stood unequivocally in support of a free country, famously saying: "A house divided against itself cannot stand. I believe this government cannot endure, permanently half slave and half free. I do not expect the Union to be dissolved—I do not expect the house to fall—but I do expect it will cease to be divided. It will become all one thing or all the other."

While Lincoln and many others who stood for freedom are represented throughout this Capitol, there are others that symbolize the opposite. While we cannot erase our past and should do everything we can—as Whip CLYBURN just stated—we should do everything we can to learn from it instead.

The statues in the U.S. Capitol represent to visitors throughout the world what we stand for as a Nation. I support this important discussion about which statues belong in the U.S. Capitol and, also, the goal of this legislation.

Before we began debating this piece of legislation, my friend, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, and I had a discussion, a discussion about the 13th Amendment. And I invite all Members of this institution to come to my district, to come to the Abraham Lincoln Presidential Museum and Library, where I can show you an original copy of the 13th Amendment; also, one of the first copies of the Emancipation Proclamation.

This institution is not just an extended classroom. Where Lincoln lived, where Lincoln is honored, the 13th District of Illinois, that I am truly blessed to represent, is also a living classroom of the good things in our Nation's history.

Now, we also have to remember that the National Statuary Hall Collection was created in 1864 to commemorate States and their contributions to this country. And many statues being discussed today were donated by States to the collection nearly 100 years ago. And as my colleagues earlier said, many States are already working to remove them.

While I support their removal, I believe the better route would have been to have some more hearings in the Committee on House Administration. But today, today, is not about politics. Today is about coming together as an institution. And today is a day that I can say I proudly am blessed to be a Member of Congress.

Our country, right now, is facing a very difficult time, and Abraham Lincoln's spirit of unity is desperately needed. "A house divided against itself cannot stand." As leaders, we need to come together to show there is much more that unites us Americans than divides us, and lead this country, together, Republicans and Democrats, through this difficult time.

I hope this legislation today, the bipartisanism that we will see, is a shining example to the rest of the country of what we can build together.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me thank the gentleman from Illinois. I am just delighted that he mentioned that his home State, the State of Illinois, was, in fact, the home of Abraham Lincoln.

I am a student of history and love to read that portion of our history, and I recall that many people believe that it was the Emancipation Proclamation on January 1 of 1863 that legally ended slavery in America. The Emancipation Proclamation, as great as it was, was an executive order.

It was the 13th Amendment, as the gentleman mentioned, that legally ended slavery in America; thereby freeing 4 million slaves, most of whom lived in the South.

Mr. Speaker, you should know, and to my friend from Illinois, that it was on January 31, 1865, a few days after Lincoln's re-election, that this body, this body, the House of Representatives, passed the 13th Amendment to the Constitution. It required the ratification of 27 States.

The gentleman from Illinois' home State was the first State, on February 1, 1865 to ratify the 13th Amendment. My State of North Carolina was the 26th State, and the State of Georgia was the final State to ratify the 13th Amendment on December 6, 1865.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the State which is the home of both Chief Justice Taney and the first African American Associate Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court, the Honorable Thurgood Marshall.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina, the former Justice of the North Carolina Supreme Court, for yielding.

I am glad that I was on the floor to hear the remarks of the ranking member, Mr. DAVIS. I am going to bring up a quote. I won't get it soon enough to read right now, but I will read it.

David Brooks wrote a column in the New York Times and he said we were facing five crises in America. One, of course, the pandemic.

He said the second crisis was the crisis of confronting racism and the history of racism and slavery and segregation in our country.

The observation he made was that Americans, post-George Floyd, have been riveted on the recognition of our past and the recognition of our present, and how we need to improve the treatment and the reality of equality in America.

□ 1445

I think Brooks' observation will be proved today on the floor, Mr. Speaker, as we come together not in partisan

disagreement but in unity of purpose, recognizing that our conscience and the conscience of America has also been pricked by the loss of John Lewis, who all his life fought for equality.

Mr. Speaker, the Capitol Building is a sacred space for our American democracy. It is where we write our laws, inaugurate our Presidents, and say a somber farewell to great Americans who earned our respect, like Dwight Eisenhower, other Presidents, and Rosa Parks.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot erase the difficult history and painful truth that this temple to liberty was built using the labor of enslaved people. But we can, Mr. Speaker, do everything in our power to ensure that how we use the Capitol today reflects our commitment to equality and justice for all.

For too long, we have greeted visitors from here and abroad with the statues of those who denigrated these values by championing secession, slavery, segregation, and inequality.

As a Marylander, I have always been uncomfortable that the Old Supreme Court Chamber prominently displays a bust of former Chief Justice Roger Brooke Taney, who was from my district, as a matter of fact, the county across the river from my house, Calvert County.

Taney, of course, was the son of slaveholders and the author of the 1857 Dred Scott ruling that upheld slavery and said that African Americans could not be citizens. This was a man, Mr. Speaker, who, in his zeal to protect the interests of slaveholders and uphold a system of white supremacy, wrote an opinion that twisted the very meaning of America's founding.

After quoting the Declaration of Independence, "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal," Taney wrote this: "The general words above quoted would seem to embrace the whole human family, and if they were used in a similar instrument at this day," meaning 1857, "would be so understood." He went on to say: "But it is too clear for dispute that the enslaved African race were not intended to be included and formed no part of the people who framed and adopted this declaration." Of course, neither did women.

In short, Mr. Speaker, Taney argued that, in his day, in 1857, people of African descent had come to be seen as human beings, but because our Founders in 1776 did not view them as such, Black people could never truly be citizens of the United States.

What he was saying, Mr. Speaker, was that Black lives did not matter. And so, Mr. Speaker, when we hear that phrase today, that Black lives matter, it is fundamental to what America is and has become.

Sadly, Roger Brooke Taney—respected in his time, the attorney general of my State, the Attorney General of the United States, the Acting Secretary of the Treasury—could not extricate himself from the false premises of the past.

Abraham Lincoln was, as Mr. DAVIS pointed out, outraged at the decision he wrote, arguably, as my friend the Justice said earlier today, the worst case in the history of the Supreme Court of the United States.

In short, Taney argued that people of African descent had come to be seen as human beings, but because our Founders did not view them as such, Black people could never truly be citizens of our country. Think of that, the blindness and schizophrenia of 1787 repeated 80 years later in 1857.

One of the great facets of America is that we can grow. We change, and we can accommodate to better knowledge, better insight, and better inclinations. The past, Taney argued, bound those in the present to follow the errors of their forebears in perpetuity. Let us reject that premise out of hand lest the more perfect Union will never be attainable.

What he could not or would not accept is that the passage of time allows us the space to grow as individuals, as States, and as a country so that we may see our faults and correct them, not repeat them.

In Maryland, we have grappled with that difficult history of our State with regard to slavery and the Civil War. While our State did not secede from the Union, many Marylanders sympathized with slavery in the South and fought for the Confederacy.

Mr. Speaker, I represent what was the largest slaveholding area of the State of Maryland. We grew tobacco and some cotton, but mainly tobacco. Early Maryland was built on the profits of slavery, and it sent individuals like Taney to serve in America's earliest institutions. Indeed, in his infamous decision, he drew on his home State's ban of interracial marriage as justification for his views.

One of the ironies, Mr. Speaker, is that I was elected to the Maryland State Senate in 1966, and one of my first votes in January 1967 as a Maryland State senator at the age of 27 was to vote to repeal the miscegenation statutes in my State. Of course, the Supreme Court had ruled on that before, but we still had not repealed it 110 years after Dred Scott.

Maryland today, like other States where slavery and segregation had a long history, is not the same place that it was when Taney wrote his opinion, nor are these States today the same places they were when many of the statues and busts of Confederates and segregationists were sent here to our Capitol during a period of intense and racially charged sectionalism.

In recent years, Maryland made the courageous and correct choice to remove a statue of Taney from the grounds of the statehouse in Annapolis. I strongly supported that decision, as did our Republican Governor, Mr. Hogan, and our Democratic legislature.

Removing a statue—as my dear friend of over one-half century, Mr. CLYBURN, observed on this floor—does not erase history. That act by itself

will not make right what was so terribly wrong in the past. But the statues we choose to set in places of honor are a reflection of the present, not the past. They show our fellow American and foreign visitors what our values are today.

Our decision to remove statues of secessionists, white supremacists, Confederates, and segregationists and replace them with defenders of justice and equality shows that, as a country, we are capable of critical introspection and growth.

That is our strength. That is the glory of America: working toward a more perfect Union.

That is why I introduced this bill along with Representative LEE, Whip CLYBURN, Chairwoman BASS, and Chairman THOMPSON, who sits in the chair today. That itself is a historic demonstration of the change that we have wrought. Not only could a Black man from Mississippi be a Member of the Congress, but he can preside over the Congress. He matters, and his life matters.

Taney was wrong because, in the 21st century, we must not be Roger Brooke Taney's America anymore, nor can we be Jim Crow's.

Our bill removes the bust of Chief Justice Taney from the Old Supreme Court Chamber and replaces it with a bust of Thurgood Marshall, a son of Baltimore. The irony is the Taney statue was on the east front of the Capitol, Mr. Speaker. If you turned around and went through the Capitol 5 years ago, 10 years ago, 15 years, if you went through about 500 feet and walked out on the west front, you walked into Thurgood Marshall Memorial, as you would today. He was our first African-American Justice.

How appropriate it is that we honor him in place of Roger Brooke Taney. Thurgood Marshall is the face of our Maryland in 2020, not Roger Taney.

Second, our bill no longer allows States to display statues in the Capitol of individuals who voluntarily served the Confederacy against our Union during the Civil War.

Let me just say as an aside that none of us are perfect. Our Founders weren't perfect, but what our Founders did was create a union. The statues we are removing tried to destroy a union.

Third, there are three specific statues in the collection of individuals who did not serve in the Confederacy but whose careers were built on the perpetuation of White supremacy and segregation. Our bill would require those statues to be removed and replaced as well, as my friend, JIM CLYBURN, said, not destroyed. We urge nobody to tear down statues—to remove them, yes; to destroy them, no.

They do not reflect the diversity and inclusivity of our Nation today, nor do they comport with our values as a nation that has reached a greater understanding of the principles enshrined in the Declaration of Independence, that all are created equal, and humankind,

Taney admitted in 1857, would have been the understanding of that phrase. There are still, sadly, a lot of people in our country in 2020 who do not understand that our diversity is our strength or recognize clearly that Black lives matter.

Taney forcefully argued they did not. He was willfully wrong. They do, and they must. I believe that most Americans are deeply distressed by racial injustice and want to see the progress of the civil rights movement continue. They want our Nation and our democracy to grow, mature, and become more perfect. Part of that process is making it clear through our symbols and public displays of honor what our country stands for and, as importantly, what it must never stand for again.

So, Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join us not as an expression of partisan opinion but an expression of America's values to our citizens and to the world that we do not glorify racism, bigotry, and exclusion in the temple to liberty and in the land of the free.

I hope our colleagues will join in making possible and making sure that all Americans, no matter their race, can come to this Capitol and know that they have an equal share in a government that is truly of the people, by the people, and for the people.

□ 1500

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from the State of Michigan (Mr. MITCHELL), my friend.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS) for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I wasn't planning on speaking on this. It is an honor to speak after Mr. HOYER.

I heard Mr. CLYBURN speak eloquently regarding the removal of statues, statues including that of former Chief Justice Taney, a statue honoring him for what we all agree was the most dreadful decision the Supreme Court has ever made in this country, not based upon the law but based upon his feelings that African Americans weren't people.

I am speaking today not so much that it convinces anybody in this Chamber, but I am speaking about history, and I am speaking about my children, my children and my grandchildren, that they need to remember the history of this Nation.

The history of this Nation is so fraught with racial division, with hatred, and the only way to overcome that is to recognize that, acknowledge it for what it is.

Mr. Speaker, I support this resolution, and I support what Mr. CLYBURN said: to remove statues such as that of Mr. Taney, to lawfully remove them—not tear them down, not destroy them—return them back to the States and places from which they came, and to study, to put them in the study of the history of this Nation, because it

should not be lost. Tearing it down does not do justice to the history of this Nation and what our young people must understand.

Mr. Speaker, what you have gone through in your life, Mr. Lewis did and others, we can't simply ignore it and say, because we tore down statues or we burn things, it is suddenly gone. No, we need to recognize those things as part of our history in order to move on beyond them. Because, as many have said, to not acknowledge, to recognize, to understand our history runs a very real risk of reliving it. And, my God, we can't continue to do that.

Mr. Speaker, I support the resolution and support the removal of statues.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), a passionate advocate for underserved communities.

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, let me first thank the gentleman for yielding and for his tremendous leadership and constantly reminding us of the accurate accounting of the United States' history.

Also, I thank our Speaker; our majority leader; our whip, Mr. CLYBURN; Chairwoman BASS; Chairwoman BENNIE THOMPSON; and, of course, Congressman BUTTERFIELD for moving this legislation forward with the urgency that it requires.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 7573, which would remove shameful reminders of slavery and segregation from the United States Capitol.

Now, in 2017, in the wake of the white nationalist rally in Charlottesville, I introduced the Confederate Monument Removal Act to remove all statues of people who voluntarily served the Confederacy from the Capitol building. So, thank you for including this in this current bill.

Venerating those who took up arms against the United States to preserve slavery is an affront to the human dignity of all Americans. These painful symbols of bigotry and racism have no place in public places—certainly should not be enshrined in the United States Capitol.

It is past time for Congress to stop glorifying the men who were traitors and committed treason against the United States in a concerted effort to keep African Americans in chains.

The movement to honor Confederate soldiers was a deliberate act to rewrite the very history of the United States and humanize acts designed to dehumanize African Americans. They are symbols of hatred and defiance of Federal authority and should not be held in a place of honor in the United States Capitol.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, I conclude by saying this: In this moment, the horrors of systemic racism

are front and center, and the manifestations are before the public each and every day. The removal of the Confederate statues from the United States Capitol is an important step in dismantling the systems that hold us back.

As a descendant of enslaved Americans from Galveston, Texas, and enslaved human beings, I thank you for this bill, and I ask for an "aye" vote.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time each side has remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from North Carolina has 13½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Illinois has 21 minutes remaining.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN), a member of the House Committee on Administration, a great constitutional scholar and friend.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. BUTTERFIELD for his really exemplary leadership here.

Mr. Speaker, it is a proud day for Maryland as we move to replace the bust of Roger Brooke Taney with the bust of Thurgood Marshall.

One Marylander wrote the infamous Dred Scott decision, hundreds of pages of argumentation about how the Constitution is and must forever be a White man's compact and that African Americans have no rights that White people have to respect.

The other, Thurgood Marshall, whose bust will replace that of Justice Taney, argued *Brown v. Board of Education*, argued *Shelley v. Kraemer*, argued *Smith v. Albright*, became the first African-American Associate Justice of the Supreme Court. He made equal protection come alive in our country. So it is a proud day for Maryland.

I was delighted to hear the gentleman from Illinois' remarks, but I was amazed to hear another colleague in the minority defending the bust of John C. Breckinridge on the grounds that we don't honor him for his service as secretary of war in the Confederacy but we, rather, honor him for what he did before that in his prior service as United States Senator and Vice President of the United States.

Well, that is just precious. Think about that for a second.

Breckinridge was serving as a U.S. Senator from Kentucky when he defected to the Confederacy, signed up to become their secretary of war, and betrayed the Union. And they still have his bust outside of the United States Senate saying "Vice President" on it, despite the fact that, on December 4, 1861, he was convicted of treason by the Senate and stripped of all of his titles—including Senator, President of the Senate, and Vice President.

So we may as well put up a statue of Benedict Arnold to honor him for his service to the Continental Army before

he defected over to the British side and led British groups against America.

So let's go all the way here. If there are statues of traitors and racist White supremacist supporters of the Confederacy up in the Capitol, then we need to get rid of them. This is our opportunity to remake the social contract as represented by the symbolism in this great House.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY).

Mr. Speaker, before he speaks, the history that I have read over the years suggests to me that, on January 31, 1865, when the 13th Amendment was passed by this body, this Chamber, Mr. KENNEDY, the gallery was full of White abolitionist women from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts who waved handkerchiefs and cheered for a prolonged period of time, cheering the 13th Amendment.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman.

Mr. Speaker, 155 years ago, Senators from my home State of Massachusetts, Charles Sumner and Henry Wilson, knew that a bust of Roger Taney deserved no home in our government's highest institutions. Yet here we are, in 2020, and the bust of a man who tried to codify and protect our original sin remains only a few hundred feet away.

Statues honoring traitors willing to destroy our Nation so that they could own Black men, women, and children litter our Capitol, and somehow we still need to have this debate.

Let me be clear: Dismantling the symbols that glorify White supremacy is a bare minimum, but dismantling those symbols is no substitute for dismantling the system that those men created.

This cannot be the end or the best of what we can offer the millions who took to our streets demanding justice. This cannot be the end of our work. This shouldn't even be considered the beginning of that work. It should have been done 150 years ago.

Mr. Speaker, the Senate needs to pass the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act. We need to dismantle and destroy White supremacy that exists everywhere, from our education system to our healthcare system, to our incarceration and juvenile justice systems and our financial institutions and our economy. That is where we need to be working, and that is what begins.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON), the chairman of the Committee on Homeland Security, a great warrior of many years, Mr. BENNIE THOMPSON.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr.

BUTTERFIELD) giving me an opportunity to speak.

Mr. Speaker, for those of us who are sons of the South, for those of us who have endured hardship, discrimination, and a lot of things that are very difficult to even talk about, for this moment in time where we are today, where we are going to start the process of healing and setting the record straight as it relates to the real history of this country, it is fitting and proper that those individuals who fought to keep many of our ancestors enslaved should not have to be recognized in a place where people who do good expect to be recognized.

This is not a way of erasing history. It is a way of correcting history so that those people who come and see it will see it in the manner for which it is presented. So, at the end of this debate, I hope we all will be on the same page.

This notion that in America it is not your color, it is not your race, it is not your sex, we have to stand for something; our values should mean something as Americans.

So this bill establishes what America stands for, and we should not recognize traitors in order just to say we are together. Traitors have a place, but not in a place of honor.

My State recognizes the president of the Confederacy. If he had won the war as president, none of us of color would be in this institution today. But thank God he lost and the South lost and we are better because of it. Mr. Speaker, for that, I ask support of this legislation.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), from the 18th District of Texas, a senior member of the Committee on the Judiciary, Committee on Homeland Security, and the author of H.R. 40, Ms. JACKSON LEE.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the manager of this legislation for his leadership.

Let me also acknowledge and thank Mr. HOYER for his, as well, and to Mr. CLYBURN, Ms. BASS, Mr. THOMPSON, and, as I indicated, Mr. BUTTERFIELD.

Mr. Speaker, let me start as I did just a few minutes ago, "In God we trust," and recognize that God has created, in many of our faiths, all of us equal as humans. We stand together dealing with the Confederacy that diminished and denied those descendants, those African slaves, their humanity. And yet, in a place of freedom, this place, we honor them.

Mr. Speaker, I welcome H.R. 7573 and am glad to be joining as a staunch supporter, for, if Justice Taney viewed me as inhuman, then that means that those today, those babies yet unborn from descendants of enslaved African Americans, would be inhuman. This is needed not because we don't put it in the historical context, but because we need to unify America.

Mr. Speaker, as we have lost a great warrior, John Lewis, and, as well, C. T. Vivian, I know they are looking down to say that we are not to honor those who voluntarily serve to deny us our humanity and to fight for the Confederacy and were treasonous.

□ 1515

Alexander Hamilton Stephens—it is interesting that he secured the name of Alexander Hamilton—has a statue in Statuary Hall. It says:

I am not fearful of anything on Earth, I am not fearful of anything above, except to do something wrong.

That is what Alexander Hamilton Stephens said.

Well, this is wrong. It was wrong to enslave so many human beings and for that slavery to last over 200 years.

I am delighted with the gentleman from Illinois for his congenial and historic moment today, and we do it in unity. I offer peace to this Nation and to this body that we remove these by bringing America together.

I know the family of George Floyd, who struck a chord in the hearts of all Americans and Black Lives Matter, would welcome this magnificent decision today. Let us do it together, under this flag. In God we trust.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes time to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. MFUME), my friend, who is not only the representative of a district in Maryland, but also the former national president of the NAACP.

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Speaker, 33 years ago, I stood near this spot and watched Thurgood Marshall come through these doors as a member of the Supreme Court at a State of the Union address. And as a Marylander and as a Baltimorean, I had a great sense of pride.

I got to know Mr. Marshall. All he ever said by his eloquence and his example was this is how we ought to be as Supreme Court justices.

I must tell you, I was dismayed, though, years earlier, to learn as a young student at Morgan State University the history of Roger B. Taney, who did just the opposite to my spirit and just the opposite, I think, to what we believe Supreme Court Justices should act like and how they conduct themselves.

A gentleman from the other side earlier said that Mr. Taney rendered the worst Supreme Court decision ever. And he is exactly right. That decision said that Black people had no rights for which the White man must respect, and therefore that the Negro might justly and lawfully be reduced to slavery for his own benefit. It also said that Black people born in America, like Dred Scott, were not citizens and it eviscerated the Missouri Compromise of 1820.

So replacing the statue of Taney with one instead of Thurgood Marshall

seems to me the way we ought to go as a Chamber. I hope in a bipartisan fashion, not only for ourselves, but to say to all the visitors that come through this building that we will continue to hold high real American heroes that sought to keep us together, and we will not honor those who sought to divide us.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time, and I will close.

Mr. Speaker, it is great to follow our new colleague, Mr. MFUME.

Because of COVID and the restrictions we have in getting together and getting to know each other like we did before this pandemic, I have not had a chance to meet you yet. Welcome to this institution. Thank you for your service here. Thank you for your service leading the NAACP.

I don't know if Mr. MFUME is aware, but many say that the birthplace of the NAACP is also in Springfield, Illinois, because of the 1908 race riots that took place in my district.

We are trying to honor those who suffered during that instance in our Nation's history, still centuries after we saw the scourge of slavery come to our shores.

We still have a lot of work to do. But I welcome Mr. MFUME. Come to my district and see the artifacts from those race riots that have been dug up and displayed for all to see, to be honored. That is what education and history is.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. MFUME).

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's kind and overly gracious remarks. I appreciate also his sense of history and for what I think today is being displayed as a bipartisan effort to draw attention to and to reconcile a very real problem.

So I will be more than happy to do that. And Lincoln was one of my heroes in many respects, not just because he signed, as Mr. BUTTERFIELD said, an executive order in 1863, but that he reminded us of what we were supposed to be as a Nation. Was he flawed? Yes. Are we flawed? Yes. Do we increase our ability to grow together? The absolute answer is yes. So I do appreciate the gentleman's comments, and I appreciate him yielding.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I will reclaim my time.

That is exactly why we still, as a Nation, have so much to learn about each other. We have so much to learn as to why we live, and we are blessed to live in what I consider the greatest country on God's green Earth.

The opportunity for every American to do what we do, to serve in this great institution, is something that should be cherished.

Those issues that seemingly divide us more in a Nation of prosperity, we need to educate the youth, we need to edu-

cate America, and how we can come together, not just correcting some of the awful, evil parts of our Nation's history, but let's continue to correct the division that exists today, not just on this floor, but in this country.

And if we can stand together in this instance, we can surely stand together and make this country, at a time and place of civil unrest, a better place for every single American in this country.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I thank again all of my colleagues. I respect their opinions, their ideas. But today is a day of history. Today is a day that we are going to band together in a bipartisan way.

And I commend my good friend and look forward to hosting him in Springfield, Illinois.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time. I thank all of the speakers for their eloquent words today.

Mr. DAVIS, we have talked a lot about President Abraham Lincoln. There is one thing I failed to mention, and the other speakers failed to mention as well. And that was, before the ratification of the 13th Amendment, Lincoln was actually assassinated on April 14, as I recall, of 1865, and did not live to see the full ratification of the 13th Amendment, which was the culmination of a lot of his work. So I just wanted to put that into the RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased with the tone of this debate. I don't even want to call it a debate. I would call it a discussion for the last few minutes. I feel the bipartisanship in the air, and I thank Mr. DAVIS so very much. It is appreciated.

History teaches us that there are times in our history where eras must be closed, and we must begin a new era in this great Nation.

We need to continue to strive for a more perfect union, and today is a good example of that.

I ask my colleagues to vote "yea" on this legislation. I ask for a unanimous vote. Hopefully, we can do this by voice vote. That is my prayer and that is my hope that we will show the world that we are united on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 7573, as amended.

H.R. 7573 directs the Joint Committee on the Library to remove the bust of Chief Justice Roger B. Taney, the author of the Dred Scott decision in the Old Supreme Court Chamber with a bust of Justice Thurgood Marshall, and requires the Joint Committee on the Library to remove statues of Charles B. Aycock, James P. Clarke, and John C. Calhoun, as well as a bust of John C. Breckinridge. H.R. 7573 would also amend section 1814 of the Revised Statutes (2 U.S.C. 2131) to change the criteria for those eligible for inclusion to prohibit those who "served as an officer or voluntarily with the Confederate States of America or of the military forces or government of a State while the State was in rebellion against the United

States." The Architect of the Capitol would be charged with identifying those statues which do not meet the revised criteria and the Joint Committee on the Library would remove the statues and turn them over to the Smithsonian Institution or their respective states, if desired.

As Chairperson of the House Fine Arts Board and the Vice Chairperson of the Joint Committee on the Library I am more than pleased to remove these symbols of cruelty and bigotry from the halls of the Capitol. This has been a long time coming, and it is long past time to act.

The United States Capitol is one of the most visible, and most visited, symbols of liberty, freedom and democracy in the entire world. Who we choose to honor in this space is uniquely indicative of our values and principles.

Contrary to those who argue in opposition to this long overdue action, this action does not seek to erase history nor ask that we forget that history. We must never forget the shameful scar of slavery, segregation and racism. Instead this is about who we honor. When we think about the holocaust the words "never forget" admonish us to always remember the millions murdered by the Nazis. But we do not accomplish that by erecting a statue of Adolf Hitler to put in a place of honor.

Those who violently rebelled against our government upon the belief, as Confederate Vice President Alexander Stephens infamously said, "that the negro is not equal to the white man; that slavery subordination to the superior race is his natural and normal condition," and those who enabled and protected the practice of holding human beings as property deserve no place of honor in the halls of our nation's Capitol. Slavery is the "original sin" of our country, and its disastrous effects are felt to this day.

It is long past time to remove these symbols of bigotry and cruelty from the halls of Congress, and it is long past time to repair the lasting damage their hatred and racism has visited on the fabric of this country. The removal of these symbols from the People's House is a necessary step in this long-overdue work, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 7573 and in working to right the wrongs of the past to better perfect the promises of our country.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 7573, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3 of House Resolution 965, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

FOSTERING UNDERGRADUATE TALENT BY UNLOCKING RE- SOURCES FOR EDUCATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on concurring in the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 2486) to reauthorize mandatory funding programs for historically Black colleges and universities and other minority-serving institutions, with the amendment specified in section 4(a) of House Resolution 891, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on concurring in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 233, nays 183, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 153]

YEAS—233

Adams	Finkenauer	Maloney, Sean
Aguilar	Fitzpatrick	Matsui
Allred	Fletcher	McAdams
Axne	Foster	McBath
Barragán	Frankel	McCollum
Bass	Fudge	McEachin
Beatty	Gabbard	McGovern
Bera	Gallego	McNerney
Beyer	Garamendi	Meeks
Bishop (GA)	Garcia (IL)	Meng
Blumenauer	Garcia (TX)	Mfume
Blunt Rochester	Golden	Moore
Bonamici	Gomez	Morelle
Boyle, Brendan F.	Gonzalez (TX)	Moulton
Brindisi	Gottheimer	Mucarsel-Powell
Brown (MD)	Green, Al (TX)	Murphy (FL)
Brownley (CA)	Grijalva	Nadler
Bustos	Haaland	Napolitano
Butterfield	Harder (CA)	Neal
Carbajal	Hastings	Neguse
Cárdenas	Hayes	Norcross
Carson (IN)	Heck	O'Halleran
Cartwright	Higgins (NY)	Ocasio-Cortez
Case	Himes	Omar
Casten (IL)	Horn, Kendra S.	Pallone
Castor (FL)	Horsford	Panetta
Castro (TX)	Houlahan	Pappas
Chu, Judy	Hoyer	Pascrell
Cicilline	Huffman	Payne
Cisneros	Hurd (TX)	Perlmutter
Clark (MA)	Jackson Lee	Peters
Clarke (NY)	Jayapal	Peterson
Clay	Jeffries	Phillips
Cleaver	Johnson (GA)	Pingree
Clyburn	Johnson (TX)	Pocan
Cohen	Kaptur	Porter
Connolly	Keating	Pressley
Cooper	Kelly (IL)	Price (NC)
Correa	Kennedy	Quigley
Costa	Khanna	Raskin
Courtney	Kildee	Rice (NY)
Cox (CA)	Kilmer	Richmond
Craig	Kim	Rose (NY)
Crist	Kind	Rouda
Crow	Kirkpatrick	Roybal-Allard
Cuellar	Krishnamoorthi	Ruiz
Cunningham	Kuster (NH)	Ruppersberger
Davids (KS)	Lamb	Rush
Davis (CA)	Langevin	Ryan
Davis, Danny K.	Larsen (WA)	Sánchez
Dean	Larson (CT)	Sarbanes
DeFazio	Lawrence	Scanlon
DeGette	Lawson (FL)	Schakowsky
DeLauro	Lee (CA)	Schiff
DelBene	Lee (NV)	Schneider
Delgado	Levin (CA)	Schrader
Demings	Levin (MI)	Schrier
DeSaulnier	Lieu, Ted	Scott (VA)
Deutch	Lipinski	Scott, David
Dingell	Loeb	Serrano
Doggett	Lofgren	Sewell (AL)
Doyle, Michael F.	Lowenthal	Shalala
Engel	Lowey	Sherman
Escobar	Luján	Sherrill
Eshoo	Luria	Sires
Españillat	Lynch	Slotkin
Evans	Malinowski	Smith (WA)
	Maloney,	Soto
	Carolyn B.	Spanberger

Speier
Stanton
Stevens
Suozzi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko

Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (NC)
Bishop (UT)
Bost
Brady
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Cline
Cloud
Cole
Collins (GA)
Comer
Conaway
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curtis
Davidson (OH)
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duncan
Dunn
Emmer
Estes
Ferguson
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxy (NC)
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garcia (CA)
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert

Gonzalez (OH)
Gooden
Gosar
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harris
Hartzer
Hern, Kevin
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill (AR)
Hollingsworth
Huizenga
Jacobs
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Katko
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
Lesko
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Marchant
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
Meuser
Miller
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Murphy (NC)
Newhouse
Norman
Nunes

Abraham
Byrne
Cook
Griffith
Holding

Torres (CA)
Torres Small
(NM)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky

NAYS—183

Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Pence
Perry
Posey
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (SC)
Rodgers (WA)
Roe, David P.
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose, John W.
Rouzer
Roy
Rutherford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Spano
Staubert
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiffany
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Van Drew
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Waltz
Watkins
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Wright
Yoho
Young
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—14

Hudson
King (IA)
Loudermilk
Mullin
Riggleman

□ 1610

Messrs. YOUNG, FULCHER, and PENCE changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. PETERSON changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the first portion of the divided question was adopted.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Speaker, I was unable to vote on July 22, 2020, due to delayed arrival to the floor. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows: “no” on rollcall No. 153.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE
RESOLUTION 965, 116TH CONGRESS

Cárdenas (Sánchez)	Kirkpatrick (Gallego)	Payne (Wasserman Schultz)
Clay (Grijalva)	Kuster (NH)	Pingree (Cicilline)
DeSaulnier (Matsui)	(Brownley (CA))	Porter (Wexton)
Deutch (Rice (NY))	Lawson (FL) (Evans)	Price (NC)
Frankel (Clark (MA))	Lieu, Ted (Beyer)	(Butterfield)
Garamendi (Boyle, Brendan F.)	Lipinski (Cooper)	Rush (Underwood)
Gomez (Gallego)	Lofgren (Boyle, Brendan F.)	Serrano (Jeffries)
Horsford (Kildee)	Lowenthal (Beyer)	Trone (Beyer)
Johnson (TX) (Jeffries)	Moore (Beyer)	Watson Coleman (Pallone)
Kaptur (Beatty)	Napolitano (Correa)	Welch (McGovern)
Khanna (Sherman)	Pascrell (Sires)	Wilson (FL) (Hayes)

FOSTERING UNDERGRADUATE TALENT BY UNLOCKING RE- SOURCES FOR EDUCATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. TLAIB). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on concurring in the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 2486) to reauthorize mandatory funding programs for historically Black colleges and universities and other minority-serving institutions, with the amendment specified in section 4(b) of House Resolution 891, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on concurring in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 231, nays 184, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 154]

YEAS—231

Adams	Clyburn	Foster
Aguilar	Cohen	Frankel
Allred	Connolly	Fudge
Amash	Cooper	Gallego
Axne	Correa	Garamendi
Barragán	Costa	García (IL)
Bass	Courtney	García (TX)
Beatty	Cox (CA)	Golden
Bera	Craig	Gomez
Beyer	Crist	Gonzalez (TX)
Bishop (GA)	Crow	Gottheimer
Blumenauer	Cuellar	Green, Al (TX)
Blunt Rochester	Cunningham	Grijalva
Bonamici	Davids (KS)	Haaland
Boyle, Brendan F.	Davis (CA)	Harder (CA)
Brindisi	Davis, Danny K.	Hastings
Brown (MD)	Dean	Hayes
Brownley (CA)	DeFazio	Heck
Bustos	DeGette	Higgins (NY)
Butterfield	DeLauro	Himes
Carbajal	DelBene	Horn, Kendra S.
Cárdenas	Delgado	Horsford
Carson (IN)	Demings	Houlahan
Cartwright	DeSaulnier	Hoyer
Case	Deutch	Huffman
Casten (IL)	Dingell	Jackson Lee
Castor (FL)	Doggett	Jayapal
Castro (TX)	Doyle, Michael F.	Jeffries
Chu, Judy	Engel	Johnson (GA)
Cicilline	Escobar	Johnson (TX)
Cisneros	Eshoo	Kaptur
Clark (MA)	Españillat	Keating
Clarke (NY)	Evans	Kelly (IL)
Clay	Finkenauer	Kennedy
Cleaver	Fletcher	Khanna
		Kildee

Kilmer
Kim
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Mfume
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell

Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Norcross
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rose (NY)
Rouda
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrier
Scott (VA)

Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shalala
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stanton
Stevens
Suozi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres Small
(NM)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NAYS—184

Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (NC)
Bishop (UT)
Bost
Brady
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Chabot
Cheney
Cline
Cloud
Cole
Collins (GA)
Comer
Conaway
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curtis
Davidson (OH)
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duncan
Dunn
Emmer
Estes
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxx (NC)
Fulcher

Gaetz
Gallagher
Garcia (CA)
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Gonzalez (OH)
Gooden
Gosar
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harris
Hartzler
Hern, Kevin
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill (AR)
Hollingsworth
Huizenga
Hurd (TX)
Jacobs
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Katko
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
Lesko
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Marchant
Marshall
Massie

Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
Meuser
Miller
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Murphy (NC)
Newhouse
Norman
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Pence
Perry
Posey
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (SC)
Rodgers (WA)
Roe, David P.
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose, John W.
Rouzer
Roy
Rutherford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Spano
Staubert
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiffany
Tipton
Turner

Upton
Van Drew
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Waltz

Watkins
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman

Womack
Woodall
Wright
Yoho
Young
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—15

Abraham
Byrne
Carter (TX)
Cook
Gabbard

Griffith
Holding
Hudson
Loudermilk
Mullin

Riggelman
Roby
Rooney (FL)
Sensenbrenner
Timmons

□ 1648

So the second portion of the divided question was adopted.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 965, 116TH CONGRESS

Cárdenas (Sanchez)
Clay (Grijalva)
DeSaulnier (Matsui)
Deutsch (Rice)
Frankel (Clark)
Garamendi (Boyle)
Brendan F.)
Gomez (Gallo)
Horsford (Kildee)
Johnson (TX)
Jeffries)
Kaptur (Beatty)
Khanna (Sherman)

Kirkpatrick (Gallo)
Kuster (NH)
Brownley (CA)
Lawson (FL)
Evans)
Lieu, Ted (Beyer)
Lipinski (Cooper)
Lofgren (Boyle)
Brendan F.)
Lowenthal (Beyer)
Moore (Beyer)
Napolitano (Correa)
Pascrell (Sires)

Payne (Wasserman)
Schultz)
Pingree (Cicilline)
Porter (Wexton)
Price (NC)
Butterfield)
Rush (Underwood)
Serrano (Jeffries)
Trone (Beyer)
Watson Coleman (Pallone)
Welch (McGovern)
Wilson (FL)
Hayes)

TAXPAYER FIRST ACT OF 2019

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the motion to concur in the Senate amendments to the bill (H.R. 1957) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modernize and improve the Internal Revenue Service, and for other purposes, offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA), on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the motion.

The Clerk redesignated the motion. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion to concur.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 310, nays 107, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 155]

YEAS—310

Adams
Agullar
Allred
Amodei
Axne
Bacon
Balderson
Barr
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Bergman
Beyer
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici

Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brindisi
Brooks (IN)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Carbajal
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Cartwright
Case

Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Comer
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney

Cox (CA)
Craig
Crenshaw
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Cunningham
Davids (KS)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny K.
Davis, Rodney
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael
F.
Duncan
Engel
Escobar
Eshoo
Españat
Evans
Finkenauer
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fletcher
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx (NC)
Frankel
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallagher
Gallo
Garamendi
Garcia (CA)
Garcia (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Gianforte
Gibbs
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez (OH)
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Granger
Green (TN)
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Guthrie
Haaland
Harder (CA)
Hastings
Hayes
Heck
Herrera Beutler
Higgins (NY)
Hill (AR)
Himes
Horn, Kendra S.
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Huizenga
Hurd (TX)
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Joyce (OH)
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)

Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Kustoff (TN)
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Marshall
Mast
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCarthy
McCaul
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McHenry
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Meuser
Mfume
Miller
Moolenaar
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (NC)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Norcross
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin

Reed
Rice (NY)
Rodgers (WA)
Roe, David P.
Rogers (KY)
Rose (NY)
Rose, John W.
Rouda
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Rutherford
Ryan
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schradler
Schrier
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shalala
Sherman
Sherrill
Simpson
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Smucker
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stanton
Staubert
Stefanik
Stevens
Stivers
Suozi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres Small
(NM)
Trahan
Trone
Turner
Underwood
Upton
Van Drew
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Wagner
Walden
Walorski
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watkins
Watson Coleman
Welch
Westerman
Wexton
Wild
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Yarmuth
Young
Zeldin

NAYS—107

Bost
Brady
Amash
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Baird
Banks
Biggs
Bishop (NC)
Bishop (UT)

Conaway
Crawford
Curtis
Davidson (OH)
Dunn
Emmer
Estes
Ferguson
Flores
Fulcher
Gaetz

Gohmert	LaMalfa	Roy
Gooden	Lamborn	Scalise
Gosar	Latta	Shimkus
Graves (GA)	Lesko	Smith (MO)
Graves (LA)	Lucas	Smith (NE)
Graves (MO)	Luetkemeyer	Spano
Grothman	Marchant	Steil
Guest	Massie	Steube
Hagedorn	McClintock	Stewart
Harris	McKinley	Thornberry
Hartzler	Mitchell	Tiffany
Hern, Kevin	Mooney (WV)	Tipton
Hice (GA)	Newhouse	Visclosky
Higgins (LA)	Norman	Walberg
Hollingsworth	Nunes	Walker
Jacobs	Olson	Waltz
Johnson (LA)	Palazzo	Weber (TX)
Johnson (OH)	Palmer	Webster (FL)
Johnson (SD)	Perry	Wenstrup
Jordan	Posey	Williams
Joyce (PA)	Reschenthaler	Womack
Keller	Rice (SC)	Woodall
Kelly (MS)	Richmond	Wright
King (IA)	Rogers (AL)	Yoho
LaHood	Rouzer	

NOT VOTING—13

Abraham	Hudson	Rooney (FL)
Byrne	Loudermilk	Sensenbrenner
Cook	Mullin	Timmons
Griffith	Riggleman	
Holding	Roby	

□ 1730

Mr. STEWART changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. WATKINS, GIBBS, FLEISCHMANN, GREEN of Tennessee, Mrs. RODGERS of Washington, Mr. LONG, Ms. FUDGE, and Messrs. ROGERS of Kentucky and STAUBER changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to concur was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 965, 116TH CONGRESS

Cárdenas (Sánchez)	Kirkpatrick (Gallego)	Payne (Wasserman)
Clay (Grijalva)	Kuster (NH)	Schultz
DeSaulnier (Matsui)	(Brownley)	Pingree (Cicilline)
Deutch (Rice)	Lawson (FL)	Porter (Wexton)
(NY)	(Evans)	Price (NC)
Frankel (Clark)	Lieu, Ted (Beyer)	(Butterfield)
(MA)	Lipinski (Cooper)	Rush
Garamendi (Boyle)	Lofgren (Boyle)	(Underwood)
Brendan F.)	Brendan F.)	Serrano
Gomez (Gallego)	Lowenthal	(Jeffries)
Horsford (Kildée)	(Beyer)	Trone (Beyer)
Johnson (TX)	Moore (Beyer)	Watson Coleman
(Jeffries)	Napolitano	(Pallone)
Kaptur (Beatty)	(Correa)	Welch
Khanna (Sherman)	Pascarell (Sires)	(McGovern)
		Wilson (FL)
		(Hayes)

REPLACING BUST OF ROGER BROOKE TANEY WITH BUST OF THURGOOD MARSHALL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 7573) to direct the Architect of the Capitol to replace the bust of Roger Brooke Taney in the Old Supreme Court Chamber of the United States Capitol with a bust of Thurgood Marshall to be obtained by the Joint Committee on the Library and to remove certain statues from areas of the United States Capitol which are accessible to the public, to remove all stat-

ues of individuals who voluntarily served the Confederate States of America from display in the United States Capitol, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 305, nays 113, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 156]

YEAS—305

Adams	Dingell	Kirkpatrick
Aguilar	Doggett	Krishnamoorthi
Allred	Doyle, Michael	Kuster (NH)
Amash	F.	Lamb
Amodei	Emmer	Langevin
Axne	Engel	Larsen (WA)
Bacon	Escobar	Larson (CT)
Balderson	Eshoo	Latta
Barragán	Españillat	Lawrence
Bass	Evans	Lawson (FL)
Beatty	Finkenauer	Lee (CA)
Bera	Fitzpatrick	Lee (NV)
Beyer	Fletcher	Levin (CA)
Bilirakis	Fortenberry	Levin (MI)
Bishop (GA)	Foster	Lieu, Ted
Blumenauer	Fox (NC)	Lipinski
Blunt Rochester	Frankel	Loebach
Bonamici	Fudge	Lofgren
Bost	Gabbard	Lowenthal
Boyle, Brendan	Gallagher	Lowey
F.	Gallego	Lucas
Brindisi	Garamendi	Lujan
Brooks (IN)	Garcia (CA)	Luria
Brown (MD)	Garcia (IL)	Lynch
Brownley (CA)	Garcia (TX)	Malinowski
Buchanan	Gianforte	Maloney,
Burgess	Gibbs	Carolyn B.
Bustos	Golden	Maloney, Sean
Butterfield	Gomez	Matsui
Calvert	Gonzalez (OH)	McAdams
Carbajal	Gonzalez (TX)	McBath
Cárdenas	Gottheimer	McCarthy
Carson (IN)	Green, Al (TX)	McCaul
Cartwright	Grijalva	McCollum
Case	Guthrie	McEachin
Casten (IL)	Haaland	McGovern
Castor (FL)	Harder (CA)	McNerney
Castro (TX)	Hastings	Meeks
Chabot	Hayes	Meng
Chu, Judy	Heck	Mfume
Cicilline	Herrera Beutler	Miller
Cisneros	Higgins (NY)	Mitchell
Clark (MA)	Hill (AR)	Mooleenaar
Clarke (NY)	Himes	Moore
Clay	Hollingsworth	Morelle
Cleaver	Horn, Kendra S.	Moulton
Clyburn	Horsford	Mucarsel-Powell
Cohen	Houlahan	Murphy (FL)
Connolly	Hoyer	Murphy (NC)
Cooper	Huffman	Nadler
Correa	Huizenga	Napolitano
Costa	Hurd (TX)	Neal
Courtney	Jackson Lee	Neguse
Cox (CA)	Jacobs	Newhouse
Craig	Jayapal	Norcross
Crenshaw	Jeffries	Nunes
Crist	Johnson (GA)	O'Halleran
Crow	Johnson (OH)	Ocasio-Cortez
Cuellar	Johnson (SD)	Olson
Cunningham	Johnson (TX)	Omar
Davids (KS)	Joyce (OH)	Pallone
Davidson (OH)	Joyce (PA)	Panetta
Davis (CA)	Kaptur	Pappas
Davis, Danny K.	Katko	Pascarell
Davis, Rodney	Keating	Payne
Dean	Kelly (IL)	Pelosi
DeFazio	Kelly (PA)	Perlmutter
DeGette	Kennedy	Peters
DeLauro	Khanna	Peterson
DeBene	Kildée	Phillips
Delgado	Kilmer	Pingree
Demings	Kim	Pocan
DeSaulnier	Kind	Porter
Deutch	King (NY)	Pressley
Diaz-Balart	Kinzing	Price (NC)

Quigley	Sherrill	Torres Small
Raskin	Shimkus	(NM)
Reed	Simpson	Trahan
Reschenthaler	Sires	Trone
Rice (NY)	Slotkin	Turner
Richmond	Smith (NJ)	Underwood
Rodgers (WA)	Smith (WA)	Upton
Rose (NY)	Smucker	Van Drew
Rouda	Soto	Vargas
Roybal-Allard	Spanberger	Veasey
Ruiz	Speier	Vela
Ruppersberger	Stanton	Velázquez
Rush	Staubert	Visclosky
Ryan	Stefanik	Wagner
Sánchez	Stell	Walden
Sarbanes	Stevens	Walker
Scalise	Stewart	Walorski
Scanlon	Stivers	Wasserman
Schakowsky	Suozzi	Schultz
Schiff	Swalwell (CA)	Takano
Schneider	Takano	Waters
Schrader	Taylor	Watson Coleman
Schrier	Thompson (CA)	Webster (FL)
Scott (VA)	Thompson (MS)	Welch
Scott, David	Tipton	Wexton
Serrano	Titus	Wild
Sewell (AL)	Tlaib	Wilson (FL)
Shalala	Tonko	Yarmuth
Sherman	Torres (CA)	

NAYS—113

Aderholt	Gohmert	Palazzo
Allen	Gooden	Palmer
Armstrong	Gosar	Pence
Arrington	Granger	Perry
Babin	Graves (GA)	Posey
Baird	Graves (LA)	Rice (SC)
Banks	Graves (MO)	Roe, David P.
Barr	Green (TN)	Rogers (AL)
Bergman	Grothman	Rogers (KY)
Biggs	Guest	Rose, John W.
Bishop (NC)	Hagedorn	Rouzer
Bishop (UT)	Harris	Roy
Brady	Hartzler	Rutherford
Brooks (AL)	Hern, Kevin	Schweikert
Buck	Hice (GA)	Scott, Austin
Bucshon	Higgins (LA)	Smith (MO)
Budd	Johnson (LA)	Smith (NE)
Burchett	Jordan	Spano
Carter (GA)	Keller	Steube
Carter (TX)	Kelly (MS)	Thompson (PA)
Cheney	King (IA)	Thornberry
Cline	Kustoff (TN)	Tiffany
Cloud	LaHood	Walberg
Collins (GA)	LaMalfa	Waltz
Comer	Lamborn	Watkins
Conaway	Lesko	Weber (TX)
Crawford	Long	Wenstrup
Curtis	Luetkemeyer	Westerman
DesJarlais	Marchant	Williams
Duncan	Marshall	Wilson (SC)
Dunn	Massie	Wittman
Estes	Mast	Womack
Ferguson	McClintock	Woodall
Fleischmann	McHenry	Wright
Flores	McKinley	Yoho
Fulcher	Meuser	Young
Gaetz	Mooney (WV)	Zeldin
	Norman	

NOT VOTING—13

Abraham	Hudson	Rooney (FL)
Byrne	Loudermilk	Sensenbrenner
Cook	Mullin	Timmons
Griffith	Riggleman	
Holding	Roby	

□ 1805

Messrs. WALKER, EMMER, and Mrs. RODGERS of Washington changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

Messrs. JOHNSON of Louisiana and GROTHMAN changed their vote from “present” to “nay.”

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: “A bill to direct the Joint Committee on the Library to replace the bust of Roger Brooke Taney in the Old Supreme Court Chamber of the United States Capitol with a bust of

Thurgood Marshall to be obtained by the Joint Committee on the Library and to remove certain statues from areas of the United States Capitol which are accessible to the public, to remove all statues of individuals who voluntarily served the Confederate States of America from display in the United States Capitol, and for other purposes.”

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE
RESOLUTION 965, 116TH CONGRESS

Cárdenas (Sánchez)	Kirkpatrick (Gallego)	Payne (Wasserman)
Clay (Grijalva)	Kuster (NH)	Schultz
DeSaulnier (Matsui)	(Brownley (CA))	Pingree (Cicilline)
Deutch (Rice (NY))	Lawson (FL) (Evans)	Porter (Wexton) Price (NC)
Frankel (Clark (MA))	Lieu, Ted (Beyer)	(Butterfield) Rush
Garamendi (Boyle, Brendan F.)	Lipinski (Cooper)	(Underwood) Serrano
Gomez (Gallego)	Lofgren (Boyle, Brendan F.)	(Jeffries) Trone (Beyer)
Horsford (Kildée)	Lowenthal (Beyer)	Watson Coleman (Pallone)
Johnson (TX) (Jeffries)	Moore (Beyer)	Welch
Kaptur (Beatty)	Napolitano (Correa)	(McGovern)
Khanna (Sherman)	Pascarell (Sires)	Wilson (FL) (Hayes)

GOD BLESSED AMERICA WITH
JOHN LEWIS

(Mr. SWALWELL of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, God blessed America and this Chamber when we were sent John Lewis. We will miss his character, his conviction, and his kindness; and this place feels a lot emptier without him.

There is so much that will be said about our colleague, but I will never forget, just right before us in this well, after the country had gone through mass shooting after mass shooting after mass shooting, and we were so troubled about what to do next, our colleague told us, if we were willing to cause a little bit of good, necessary trouble, we could make a difference.

We will miss John. He brought his experience from movements to a moment where his country needed him. His work continues and, because of that, the next generation will march on.

God bless our colleague.

RECOGNIZING CAPTAIN CANDICE
BOWEN

(Mr. CLINE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Captain Candice Bowen who, this week, became the first woman to lead a Virginia National Guard infantry company. On Saturday, she took command of the Woodstock-based Bravo Company, 3rd Battalion, 116th Infantry Regiment, 116th Infantry Brigade Combat Team.

After being deployed to Qatar in 2016, Captain Bowen then volunteered for an

assignment in Afghanistan, where she earned a Combat Action Badge. Her superiors say that she has “demonstrated the absolute ability to lead soldiers in close combat.”

Captain Bowen had already earned the distinction of becoming the Virginia National Guard’s first female infantry officer in 2019, and when she spoke after accepting her command, Bowen encouraged other women to follow in her footsteps and join an infantry unit. In short, she said to jump in there, do it aggressively, and give it everything you’ve got.

I wish Captain Bowen the best of luck in this new endeavor and know that those under her command in Bravo Company are in good hands.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY
OF JOHN LEWIS

(Mr. THOMPSON of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, great women and great men have served in Congress, walking these Halls and casting votes on this very floor. One of the greatest was our friend, John Lewis.

A civil rights icon, responsible at a young age for lasting progress and remarkable courage in the face of violence and injustice. He was the conscience of our Congress. The room quieted and people listened when he spoke. It was a true honor to serve with him in the House and, for me, on the Ways and Means Committee.

It was surreal to walk with him over the Pettus Bridge in Selma on the 50th anniversary of Bloody Sunday. And constituents thank me to this day for inviting him to my district.

Our great country is better because of John Lewis, and we should all work to be just a little more like John Lewis.

John, we miss you. Rest in peace, my friend.

REMEMBERING THE LIFE AND
LEGACY OF CHARLES EVERS

(Mr. GUEST asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GUEST. Mr. Speaker, this evening, I rise to honor the life of Charles Evers, who passed away earlier today.

Charles and his brother, Medgar, dedicated their time on this Earth to the advancement of civil rights for all Americans. Following the tragic murder of his brother, Charles assumed Medgar’s position as head of the NAACP in Mississippi, to continue his efforts to expand civil rights for African Americans in the Magnolia State.

In 1969, he became the first African American mayor elected in Mississippi since Reconstruction, making Mr. Evers a symbol of the civil rights that he and his brother fought to advance.

He served as an adviser and mentor to many public officials, from local governments, to the President of the United States.

Today, I join our Mississippi family in thankful prayer for his time on Earth, and that he returned to our Heavenly Father having accomplished his goal of creating a better nation for all people.

Please join me in a moment of silence as we remember his service to our State and our Nation.

□ 1815

MEMORIALIZING THE HONORABLE
JOHN LEWIS

(Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of our friend and colleague, John Lewis.

John will be remembered as one of the pioneers of the civil rights movement, and his example of courage will be talked about for generations to come.

John Lewis was loved on both sides of the aisle. Even when we disagreed, John never failed to be kind and professional.

John loved this country and never stopped his pursuit of a perfect union for all Americans. Even in the last few weeks of his battle with cancer, John was still partaking in nonviolent activism and advocating for equal justice.

When I was a freshman here in Congress, I was touring the Smithsonian with my sons and daughter. One of my sons asked who the bleeding man in the picture was. I told him it was a photo of John Lewis during the civil rights movement and that I now have the privilege of serving with him in Congress. I am lucky to have been able to call John Lewis a colleague and a friend.

His passing is a loss for American democracy and advocacy. My wife, Shannon, and I send our deepest condolences to John’s family, friends, and staff. He will truly be missed. The House will miss John Lewis greatly.

FUNDING NEVADA’S PRECIOUS
PUBLIC LANDS

(Mrs. LEE of Nevada asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. LEE of Nevada. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of Nevada’s Third District, I rise today in support of the Great American Outdoors Act. This bill, which I co-sponsored, will finally secure full, dedicated funding for the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

This fund helps to conserve some of southern Nevada’s most precious public lands, like Red Rock Canyon, Sloan Canyon, and Lake Mead.

Coming together on such a vital issue is a reminder that Congress has the

ability to rise above partisanship and find solutions that benefit us all. There is no issue more universal to all Americans and all people than protecting our planet. We can't keep kicking this can down the road. This is the time to fully fund the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

In closing, my time was short with Congressman John Lewis, but I will forever be impacted and am eternally grateful for his leadership.

OPENING OUR SCHOOLS

(Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, as August approaches, reopening schools is now at the forefront of the American agenda.

The American Academy of Pediatrics strongly advocates that we should start with a goal of having students back physically in the classroom. As an experienced physician of more than 30 years, I concur with the AAP, and I believe that the science and the data point toward reopening our schools in America.

This is why I introduced the Open Schools Responsibly Act yesterday, which provides liability protection to schools that adhere to CDC and State guidelines. As we want to open schools again, then educational administrators need to have the confidence that they will not face the brunt of frivolous lawsuits.

Obviously, schools that reopen without taking the proper precautions should be held accountable, and this legislation will still ensure that is the case. We want to protect everyone, from exceedingly low-risk students up to our higher-risk older teachers.

We simply cannot allow our children, especially our higher-at-risk children, to fall further behind in their education. So, it is Congress' duty to pass liability protection to let our kids get back to school and get back on track.

KEEPING KLAMATH RIVER RENEWABLE ENERGY

(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission for the decision the other day to not accept the proposal by an entity called the Klamath River Renewal Corporation, which seeks to remove four very important hydroelectric dams on the Klamath River in northern California and southern Oregon.

These dams produce enough renewable hydroelectric power to power 70,000 homes. The problem with renewing them, thinking it is going to help the fish population, is that it would unleash at least 20 million cubic yards of silt with who knows what all is in there—heavy metals, et cetera—that

will then be unleashed upon the rest of the river all the way out to the ocean.

It takes only 3 years to wipe out a salmon population, and it will take much longer for the silt to dissipate in the river.

So much more needs to be done to explore this situation. I advocate that we allow these dams to continue to operate and provide power to our grid that indeed is renewable and helps meet the renewable portfolio standard for California and not just tear them out at unknown costs exceeding \$450 million.

REMEMBERING THE LIFE OF CONGRESSMAN JOHN LEWIS

(Mr. NEWHOUSE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise with a heavy heart to honor the life of the distinguished Congressman from Georgia's Fifth District, John Lewis.

Few members of this body have had such a profound impact on the fabric of our Nation as John Lewis. He was a man of honor, a freedom fighter, and one of the truly great leaders of the civil rights movement.

From the Edmund Pettus Bridge in Selma, Alabama, where he marched with the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., to demand an end to segregation to the Halls of the Congress of the United States of America where he dutifully and faithfully served his constituents, Representative Lewis spent a lifetime showing Americans what it means to stand up for what is right, even at great personal cost.

He understood something that is all too often forgotten: that the work of creating a more perfect union and the pursuit of liberty and justice for all is never finished, but it is an ongoing and often frustrating process. Nevertheless, he demonstrated both to the Members of this body and to the American people the value of compassion, dedication, and civility.

The world is a better place because of John, and it was an honor to serve alongside him in Congress. May he rest in peace, and may we always honor his example.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO CONGRESSMAN JOHN LEWIS

(Mr. GUTHRIE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of our colleague, Congressman John Lewis.

Growing up and learning about Mr. Lewis' contributions to our country, I never thought I would one day have the honor of serving alongside him in Congress or the honor of calling him my friend.

I will always remember the time I think several of us had the opportunity to watch the movie "Selma" with him.

It was amazing to watch everything I had learned about in history class with someone who had experienced it. After the movie, as we were all kind of feeling empty in our stomachs and just the feeling from seeing the movie, I walked up to Mr. Lewis, and I asked him: What is it like to have your life portrayed upon the screen such as that?

If you remember, the actor resembled him when he was younger. Mr. Lewis looked at me and he said: All I was thinking is that I had a lot of hair back then.

That was Mr. Lewis for you, a giant in our history, but unfailingly humble and kind. I am grateful I had the opportunity to know him, and I will miss him dearly.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF CONGRESSMAN JOHN LEWIS

(Mr. KATKO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of Congressman John Lewis.

Our Nation mourns his loss. An icon of the civil rights movement, John Lewis dedicated his life to fighting for equality. He was an American hero who never wavered in his pursuit to make our country a more fair and just place.

During my first term in Congress, I met John Lewis when we sat near each other at the President's State of the Union Address my first time. We became friends after that and often spoke on the House floor and in his office. While we served on different sides of the aisle, he was always willing to hear and consider the perspectives of others.

It was an absolute honor to serve alongside him in Congress. John will forever be remembered for his strong leadership, his commitment to peaceful action, and the tremendous sacrifices he made to enact change.

I wish the family, loved ones, and all who knew and admired him peace during this difficult time.

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO TRANSNATIONAL CRIMINAL OR- GANIZATIONS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 116-137)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BUTTERFIELD) laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days before the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in

the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency with respect to transnational criminal organizations declared in Executive Order 13581 of July 24, 2011, is to continue in effect beyond July 24, 2020.

The activities of significant transnational criminal organizations have reached such scope and gravity that they threaten the stability of international political and economic systems.

Such organizations are becoming increasingly sophisticated and dangerous to the United States; they are increasingly entrenched in the operations of foreign governments and the international financial system, thereby weakening democratic institutions, degrading the rule of law, and undermining economic markets. These organizations facilitate and aggravate violent civil conflicts and increasingly facilitate the activities of other dangerous persons.

The activities of significant transnational criminal organizations continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States. For these reasons, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13581 with respect to transnational criminal organizations.

DONALD J. TRUMP.
THE WHITE HOUSE, July 22, 2020.

□ 1830

HONORING CONGRESSMAN JOHN LEWIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BASS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Ms. BASS. Mr. Speaker, it is with great honor that I rise today to co-anchor the Congressional Black Caucus Special Order hour. For the next 60 minutes, we have a chance to communicate to the American people our great love for an American hero, Representative John Lewis.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from the great State of California (Ms. PELOSI), my colleague and the honorable Speaker from the city of San Francisco.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding and appreciate her calling us together for this Special Order for a very special person.

This big picture of John Lewis was just put up here. "Rest in Power," it says. You can't see from the TV, but over here in the front row is a big bouquet of white flowers. It is in a place

where John usually sat in the front row of a section that many of the Members of the Congressional Black Caucus held fort, conspired sometimes, plotted, and made progress for the American people. It is appropriate that we have those flowers there where John sat for so many years.

Jon Meacham, who is writing a book on John Lewis, told us yesterday on a Caucus call that when John was born, he was born into a garden. He loved to be in the garden. He loved to be with the chicks, as we know, the little chickens, and he loved to see things grow. He loved to see things grow.

He lived his life in that way. He loved to see progress grow. He loved to see love and peace grow. He loved to see ideas grow, and he loved to see a more perfect Union grow.

Many of our colleagues will have many things to say this evening, and because it is a Special Order, I don't have my usual 1 minute, which is endless, so I will be briefer and save some remarks for another time. But here is what I will say.

John has always been about non-violence. That was his spirit in everything that he did. He was respectful of other views and respectful of other people. In the spirit of nonviolence, Reverend Lawson taught that to him, to Dr. King, and the rest, and much of it was in the spirit of Mahatma Gandhi and much of the nonviolence that he put forth.

In Sanskrit, Mahatma Gandhi's language, the word for nonviolence is "satyagraha." That word means two things: Nonviolence, and insistence on the truth.

And John Lewis, nonviolently, always insisted on the truth. Whether it was a lunch counter, the truth of equality, whether it was upholding the Constitution, the truth of our Founders, in everything that he did, it was about truth and peace and love.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD my statement, because, again, I am not used to not having endless time as the Speaker of the House, and I do know that our colleagues have a great deal to say.

I will say one more thing: At the end of his life, end of his time in Washington, D.C., right before he was preparing to go back to Atlanta, just a couple of weeks ago, in the middle of the night, he decided—early in the morning, 4 a.m.—that he was going to go, in the morning, to Black Lives Matter on the street.

So one of the last official or public photos that we have of John Lewis is with the Mayor of Washington, D.C., and then alone, standing on that beautiful tapestry, "Black Lives Matter," the connection from John, the boy from Troy, to Black Lives Matter, the future of a movement of which he was so much a part.

May he rest in power. May he rest in peace.

Ms. BASS. Mr. Speaker, the Nation lost an icon; the House lost its most re-

spected Member; and the Congressional Black Caucus lost the most senior member of our family.

The Congressional Black Caucus is known as the conscience of the Congress, but John Lewis was known as the conscience of our Congress. One of the greatest honors of serving in Congress was that I had the possibility of serving with him.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from the State of South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN), the majority whip.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I cringe often when I hear people talk about the 1960s as the civil rights movement. I always put an "S" on that.

The Stono Rebellion was in 1739. It was a civil rights movement.

Denmark Vesey's insurrection was in 1822. It was a civil rights movement.

The Niagara Movement that led to the creation of the NAACP more than 100 years ago was a civil rights movement.

John Lewis and I met in October 1960 at a civil rights movement. For as long as there are people held in suppression, there will always be a movement for civil rights. However, in any movement there will be a few—sometimes only one—that rise head and shoulders above all others, and so it was with my good friend, John Robert Lewis.

When we met the weekend of October 13, 14, 15, 1960, on the campus of Morehouse College, there was a little bit of an insurrection taking place. We, who were college students, felt that we knew how best to do things. We were not listening to Martin Luther King, Jr., and a few others, and so we asked King to meet with us. And he did.

We went into the meeting around 10 o'clock in the evening. We did not walk out of that room until 4 o'clock the next morning. I came out of that room having had a Saul-to-Paul transformation. I have never been the same since.

But listening to King's plea for non-violence, I decided, along with most others, to accept nonviolence as a tactic. But not John Lewis. He internalized. It became his way of life.

After going through a few issues of the 1960s, John got elected president of SNCC in 1963 and was summarily dethroned in 1966. But John then joined the effort, the Voter Education Project, where he directed. That was sponsored by the Southern Regional Council. And as he served as the director of the Voter Education Project in Atlanta, I became the chair of the Voter Education Project in Charleston, South Carolina, and we continued that relationship.

He got married to a librarian, I got married to a librarian—though I did so before he did—and they became fast friends. Lillian and Emily became fast friends.

I will never, ever get John Robert Lewis out of my system, because he

succeeded where I failed. It was a tactic for me. It was a way of life for John Lewis.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. BASS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of this Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Ms. BASS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON), the state of the District of Columbia.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from California, KAREN BASS, for leading this Special Order to our good colleague and friend, John Lewis.

John and I were elected to the House of Representatives about the same time. Actually, he was elected a couple years before I was. But we were colleagues before either of us could have hoped to become Members of Congress. We were kids together in the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, the youth arm of the Southern Civil Rights Movement.

The difference between John and me is I was in law school so I went in the summer, and John was a full-time member, who left school in order to join SNCC. SNCC came out of lunch counter sit-ins. Ella Baker called us all together because it was clear that the Civil Rights Movement was developing a youth arm. And Ella Baker, the great elder of the Civil Rights Movement, decided all of us really should become an organization.

John was not the first head of SNCC. Marion Barry was, because he was a lot more political than John, and he is remembered more today for his politics than for his civil rights acumen. When John was elected chair of SNCC, there was nothing political about it. His qualification was not that he was the strongest. His qualification was that he was the bravest.

It is almost impossible to describe the risks John took in the more than 40 times he was arrested, because today, we are so used to civil disobedience. People right now are lying down on Pennsylvania Avenue after the George Floyd killing. I really want to call to your attention what it meant when John led young people to be arrested.

Everybody has seen the film of his being knocked down as he marched in the front of the line; he had a concussion as a result of that. He never knew, as he led these marches, whether he would come out alive.

Let me tell you about these marches when SNCC would kneel down and assume other nonviolent postures. On the other side, were not counter-demonstrators. On the other side were not other people who were confronting us nonviolently. On the other side were the police leading white mobs. They

were befuddled by the tactics of SNCC and the Civil Rights Movement. Because when you kneel down and are nonviolent, they didn't quite know what to do with you or about you.

John, of course, will always be remembered as a Member of the House of Representatives, but as I close, I must say, it will be difficult, even for John to have done more in the House than he did in the Civil Rights Movement, to do more in Congress than he did for his country.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Ms. BASS. Mr. Speaker, his legacy to our country is that he devoted his life to fighting for justice and being a moral compass to our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from the great State of Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today for a solemn occasion. Tonight we honor our friend, brother, colleague, the conscience of the Congress, a true American icon: Congressman John Lewis.

Words cannot convey the loss to this body as well as to the Nation, but very few can claim to have altered the course of American history the way that John did. He was a guiding light to all of us and was a leader trying to make America a more perfect Union. His steadfast moral leadership will be deeply missed, particularly at this complex time in our history.

Those of us here today are standing on his shoulders. His historic life and legacy will undoubtedly live on, but we must be sure to continue his life's work, particularly when it comes to voting rights and restoring the Voting Rights Act. We must make some "good trouble" to honor his enormous legacy.

Ms. BASS. Mr. Speaker, Congressman John Lewis spent his life fighting racism and injustice wherever he confronted it, from Boy Scout sit-ins and other protests in the streets to championing bold, progressive policies in Congress, including the Voting Rights Act.

□ 1845

Ms. BASS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS).

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker,

To every man there is a way, a ways, and a way,

And the high souls take the high way,
And the low souls take the low.

While all the rest on the misty flats drift to
and fro.

But to every man there is a way, a ways, and
a way,

And each man decideth which way his soul
shall go.

John Lewis always took the high road, always giving of himself in such a way that you knew that he was gracious and kind.

John had faith.

Like John, I grew up in rural America, went to a one-room school, never

had a new schoolbook. But John had the faith of a mustard seed and said: If you want to move a mountain, just say to the mountain be moved. And if it wouldn't, then you get you some dynamite, nitroglycerin, TNT, and blow that sucker down.

That was John Lewis. May he rest in peace.

Ms. BASS. Now that he is no longer with us, we have to live up to his legacy and protect the right to vote for all Americans. As we continue to face challenges due to the coronavirus and issues of systemic racism, we must protect our democracy and elections, even in the midst of adversity.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, we are all heartbroken. We all are speechless. We all are committed to John Robert Lewis' beloved community.

Each of us have been touched without ceasing for the spirit he led us in acknowledging, even in anger, that there was the beloved community.

He loved his wife and his family and his extended brothers and sisters, all the way from Alabama to Georgia. I am reminded of his ability to love Dr. Martin Luther King. It is a testament of a man that is able to extend love and not to show envy but to learn and to seek knowledge. John did that, which allowed him to carry that all the way to the fights of today.

Dr. King said: "John Robert Lewis, are you the boy from Troy?" He loved to tell that story. He loved to tell that he preached to the chickens, but his voices were heard by kings and queens.

John Robert Lewis, a saint walking on Earth.

I am reminded of our days in front of the South African Embassy, arrested, against genocide, or fighting against the children in cages. John never stopped his fight.

And so I come today to honor him in this brief moment that we have, to be able to say, Isn't it good that a saintly man walked on this Earth and reminded us of the beloved community?

I am very glad to say that I knew, and the world knows John Robert Lewis, "the boy from Troy."

Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of this body and the Committee on the Judiciary, as a colleague of a great and beloved man, and as a member of a generation that directly benefited from and was inspired by his work in the Civil Rights Movement, I am proud but heartbroken to participate in this tribute to an American original, our friend and colleague, the late John Robert Lewis who died last Friday, July 17, 2020, in Atlanta, Georgia at the age of 80 years old.

But what amazing things my friend John bore witness to in those eight decades.

John Robert Lewis was a lifelong warrior for a more just, equitable, fairer, and better America, one of the Original Big Six, and a giant of the Civil Rights Movement.

John Lewis was one of the original Freedom Riders who challenged segregated interstate travel in the South in 1961.

He was a founder and early leader of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, which coordinated lunch-counter sit-ins.

He helped organize and was the last surviving person who addressed the multitude at the March on Washington, where Dr. King delivered his immortal "I Have A Dream" speech on the steps of the Lincoln Memorial.

John Robert Lewis was born on February 21, 1940, the third of 10 children, to Eddie and Willie Mae (Carter) Lewis near the town of Troy on a sharecropping farm owned by a white man.

After his parents bought their own farm—110 acres for \$300—John shared in the farm work, leaving school at harvest time to pick cotton, peanuts and corn.

Their house had no plumbing or electricity. In the outhouse, they used the pages of an old Sears catalog as toilet paper, that seems too much to bear but John was empowered by his history.

His family called him "Preacher," and becoming one seemed to be his destiny.

John often said he drew inspiration by listening to a young minister named Martin Luther King on the radio and reading about the 1955 through 56 Montgomery bus boycott.

John Lewis met Dr. King in Montgomery, Alabama in 1958, who was touched by a letter John had written him and sent him a round-trip bus ticket to visit.

When John arrived at the Dexter Avenue Baptist Church for his appointment, Dr. King greeted him thusly: "Are you the boy from Troy? Are you John Lewis?"

John said, "I am John Robert Lewis, giving his whole name."

But Dr. King henceforth would affectionately call our beloved John, "the boy from Troy".

But in 2011, at a White House ceremony, President Barack Obama awarded John Lewis the Presidential Medal of Freedom, the nation's highest civilian honor, and said this about the boy from Troy: "Generations from now, when parents teach their children what is meant by courage, the story of John Lewis will come to mind; an American who knew that change could not wait for some other person or some other time; whose life is a lesson in the fierce urgency of now."

The first time John Lewis was arrested was in February 1960, when he and other students demanded service at whites-only lunch counters in Nashville, the first prolonged battle of the movement that evolved into the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee.

John's advocacy was fierce and joyful, as embodied in his common refrain to involve oneself in the actions and passions of one's time "to get in the way, make necessary trouble."

Less than two years after that August 1963 day, in the shadow of the Lincoln Memorial, in March 1965, John led over 600 foot soldiers across the Edmund Pettus Bridge, in Selma, Alabama, in a march demanding the right to vote. John's protest against injustice was met with violence by Alabama State Troopers.

He was beaten and his skull left bloodied, the horror left bare for a nation to see on television.

That incident, immediately known and forever remembered as Bloody Sunday, led to the passage and enactment of the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

It was my personal honor to accompany John on countless pilgrimages to the Edmund Pettus Bridge to remember and acknowledge those common persons with common dreams and uncommon courage and love for the promise of the country.

In 1986, John Lewis was elected to the United States House of Representatives from Georgia's 5th District and served in that role until earlier the evening when the sun set on his heroic and extraordinary life.

John was the conscience of the Congress, widely beloved and revered on both sides of the aisle and the Capitol.

His moral authority was colossal because he had seen the worst of us but he always appealed to the best of us and never ceased to inspire us to strive to create the beloved community.

It is no exaggeration to say he was a man, the likes of which we shall not see again.

As news of John's passing reverberates across the United States and around the world, John would want us to reflect not on his death, but his life and the unfinished necessary work ahead of us.

John never took his eyes off the prize and to his last days, continued to march and stand in solidarity with those protesting injustice and inequality.

I remember getting arrested with John, Congressman MCGOVERN, former colleagues Jim Moran of Virginia and John Olver of Massachusetts, and our late colleague Tom Lantos, for protesting the genocide in Darfur at the Embassy of Sudan on April 28, 2006.

John Lewis led us in the sit-down demonstration on the House floor to protest the Republican Congress' refusal to take up gun violence prevention legislation in the face of the tragic mass shootings that plague our country.

And in his final act of civic engagement and civil disobedience, John Lewis stood in the middle of Black Lives Matter Plaza showing solidarity and the continuity with the now global movement fighting galvanized by the horrific murder of George Floyd to peacefully protest for justice and equal treatment in the criminal justice system.

Mr. Speaker, John Lewis was among the finest Americans this country ever produced.

He lived a consequential life and his legacy is all around us, in the realization of talent and opportunity of millions of persons who walked through the doors of progress that John Lewis helped open.

I hope it is comfort to John's family and loved ones, that people the world over are mourning his death but celebrating his life.

A fitting and proper means of paying tribute to John Lewis's extraordinary life is for the Senate to immediately take up and pass the John Lewis Voting Rights Advancement Act, landmark legislation to protect the precious right to vote for all persons and to ensure that our democracy has the tools needed to remain strong.

I ask the House to observe a moment of silence in memory and thanks of John Robert Lewis, the boy from Troy, who became a leader who helped change the world.

Ms. BASS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS).

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, John Robert Lewis was short in height, yet he was a giant. John Robert Lewis was a humble man but fierce for justice.

John Robert Lewis talked softly, but roared like a lion when it was time to fight for freedom, justice, and equality for all humankind. He said there was one race—the human race.

He is an individual that compelled a Nation to change, to make it better. His voice will echo in this Chamber forever.

It was my honor and pleasure for 22 years to serve with the Honorable John Robert Lewis.

May he rest in peace and rise in power.

Ms. BASS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. David Scott).

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, John Lewis' mother and his grandmother named him John after John the Apostle, the disciple, the Scripture says, whom Jesus loved, John the Beloved.

And John Lewis dedicated his life to building the beloved community.

And one more thing. John Lewis, being named after John, Jesus' Apostle, it must be noted that the Apostle John was the youngest of the disciples. John Lewis was the youngest of our civil rights leaders who spoke at the momentous March on Washington.

God bless John Lewis, and we thank God for sending him our way.

Ms. BASS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN).

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to say thank you to a friend and a great warrior.

I thank you, dear brother, for being the sermon you preached. You walked your talk. It is said that a great person will always rise to the occasion, but it is also said that the greater person makes the occasion.

He was an occasion-maker, and he rose to the occasion on the Edmond Pettus Bridge. And for this, many of us who are here tonight are here because he marched into brutality.

So tonight, I thank you, dear brother, for being able to withstand what many of us could not and would not. I rise to just say thank you and to let you know that we will never forget you, and we will always make it perspicuously clear that we are here because you were there.

Ms. BASS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. CLARKE).

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor a great man, Representative John Lewis.

This past Friday, July 17, our country lost one of its greatest heroes, a true patriot, who literally put his life on the line in the pursuit of justice and fairness in our society.

The Honorable John Lewis was a penultimate hero who embodied the struggle for human rights and dignity. He was a fierce civil rights warrior, who refused to abide by the Jim Crow laws of the South. He embodied what it means to be a public servant, putting his life on the line and the people above his own self-interests.

I am so honored and privileged to have served with John Robert Lewis—John Robert Lewis, who was a dancer, a man who loved to have fun but was convicted for the right to vote, convicted as an activist for civil rights and civil liberties.

And I will forever hold dear the moment that we landed in Ghana together, invited by the President of Ghana for the Year of Return, and to see the wonderment in his eyes of visiting a space where it all began for all of us 401 years ago.

May he rest in peace and rise in power. The Honorable John Lewis will never be forgotten. We all hold onto his legacy.

Ms. BASS. To honor Mr. Lewis, the first thing we need to do is to pass legislation restoring the Voting Rights Act and get it signed. We know the credibility of our elections has already shown early signs of concern during several State primaries and voter suppression cases, coupled with the fact that people are going to have to vote in dangerous conditions, cannot be ignored. I know that if Mr. Lewis was still with us, he would be leading that fight.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, much has been said about my friend, teacher, and mentor, John Lewis.

He was a family man, married to Lillian for 44 years, and to that union bore a son, John-Miles, who is with us today.

Along with John Lewis' brothers and sisters, he was number three of ten. He has a large extended family. And that family entrusted John to the world. And for 33 years, he was our colleague. For 14 years, he was mine.

I just want to say to the family that we here in Congress feel your pain. We appreciate your sacrifice in allowing John to do what he did for the world and for Congress. I want you to know that we stand with you, we feel your pain, and we will never forget your dear brother, uncle, cousin, whoever he was to you. We will never forget him. We know that he loved you.

He would depart this place to go to the family reunion during the summer down in Alabama where the family still owned hundreds of acres of land that they farmed even when his two sharecropping parents gave birth to John. And so he was a family man. Thank you, family, for entrusting him to us.

Ms. BASS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, there are no words to describe the pain that many Americans are feeling right now as we grapple with the loss of our conscience, our friend, our inspirational leader, John Lewis.

I am heartbroken. I am honored and humbled to have served alongside him, to have had him take my children, as he has done for so many Americans in the Faith and Politics movement through a historic march in Selma, across the Edmund Pettus Bridge.

During one of those trips I was lucky enough to have my daughter Laura and son Ray join me. Because of school obligations, they had to leave early and were going to miss the march across the Edmund Pettus Bridge. John wasn't about to let that happen.

He took the three of us in his car with him and we drove through Selma, as he told them what it was like and what he went through. They were both entranced by him and the story he was telling that was filled with graphic violence of what they endured as they fought for equal rights.

At the end of it, my daughter Laura, who was about 14 years old at the time, struck by what he had just told her, rather innocently asked him, "Mr. Lewis, did you ever have fun?"

There was a pregnant pause and then John got the biggest smile on his face. He told us that yes, they did. "And in fact, at night, we'd pitch our tents and sit around campfires and we'd sing and dance," he said. His smile then got broader as he remembered. "I can still see Andy Young doing the jitterbug in his coveralls. And he could dance . . . he could dance."

Despite everything John endured, they were still young and full of life.

One of the most inspiring memories I have of John Lewis is from 2009, when we were fighting to pass the Affordable Care Act. The day before we passed the bill, hateful protestors spewed racial slurs and spit on John Lewis, ANDRÉ CARSON, and EMMANUEL CLEAVER. Tensions were high after that. The next day at Caucus, I asked John to speak. He brought the Caucus to its feet, evoking the Civil Rights movement.

He said: "Pay no attention to what went on yesterday. We have to learn, as we did in the Civil Rights Movement, to look past this and keep our eyes on the prize. So, I ask you to stay calm and stay together." As he was walking away from the mic, he paused, and then he stepped back up and said, "Forty-five years ago, I walked across the Edmund Pettus bridge arm in arm with fellow citizens who believed strongly in Civil Rights. We faced far more difficult crowds than we are facing out here today. Let's lock arms and go across the street and pass this bill." And we did. We marched across the street, through the protesters and passed the bill.

In 2016, I worked with John to take another stand. This time, we were calling for a vote on the House floor on a bill to address the epidemic of gun violence in America. After the 2012 shooting at Sandy Hook Elementary, the House didn't take a single vote to address gun violence, until Democrats took the majority in 2019. In 2016, after the shooting at Pulse Nightclub in Orlando, John and the rest of the Democratic Caucus had had enough. He called on the Caucus to join him in causing some 'good trouble'. With that, we held a sit-in on the House floor demanding justice.

Most recently, we worked together to strengthen Social Security. Social Security is our nation's number one anti-poverty program and is a lifeline for millions. It needs to be strengthened so it's there for future generations too. Last summer we stood together outside the Capitol highlighting how important these benefits are for seniors, especially for Black seniors. He said:

"I grew up in rural Alabama, 50 miles from Montgomery, outside a little town called Troy, and I remember how seniors lived before they had Social Security. Most of the seniors in my district in Georgia depend on Social Security for the majority of their income. Without it almost half of Black and Latino seniors in this country would be living in poverty. That's not

right, that's not fair, and it's not just. Social Security is more than a right, it is a promise. A promise people paid into to secure their future. We can do better, we can do much better."

This year, even when battling cancer, he continued this fight.

I've been proud to call John Lewis a friend over my time in Congress. In 2016, I was honored to work with the Bipartisan Policy Center and Representative TOM COLE to establish the Congressional Patriot Award. John Lewis and Sam Johnson, who passed away earlier this year, were the first recipients. They were both authentic heroes. One held in captivity by the VietCong and tortured and nearly beaten to death; the other held captive by the Alabama Police, clubbed and beaten. They both had a genuine focus on doing for others, not themselves. They were humble, gracious, and kind, yet warriors for their cause.

John Lewis has forever changed our country. His legacy will live on in the policies and lives he changed. We must continue to follow his lead and cause good trouble.

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the heroic life of Congressman John Robert Lewis and his historic contribution to the nation we know and love today.

In September 1957, the Little Rock Nine walked into history as they walked up the front steps of Central High School. It was a pivotal moment in history.

John said this moment inspired him in his own leadership as an active member of the Civil Rights Movement.

I had the pleasure of calling John a friend, as did many of my colleagues, and will cherish the time we had together in the people's House.

John joining me as legislative cosponsors to expand the Little Rock Central High National Park boundary is a highlight of my congressional service.

John will truly be missed, but long remembered. As the USNS *John Lewis* sets sail as a new class of naval vessel, we are reminded to carry on his legacy of dignified leadership. I join all Americans in honoring the remarkable life of John Lewis. Martha and I offer prayers for his family and for all those he inspired and who thus grieve over his loss.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, our country lost Congressman John Lewis, an inspiring individual who stirred so much important change.

I would like to extend my deepest sympathies to Congressman John Lewis' family, friends, and staff. Congressman Lewis will always be an icon of courage to promote equality and freedom. I will always cherish his thoughtful and cheerful encouragement during our time serving in Congress together.

Congressman Lewis was especially appreciated by his neighbors—the people of South Carolina.

We will always remember Congressman Lewis for his many significant accomplishments. And although he is no longer with us, his legacy will always live on. My prayers are with the Lewis family during this incredibly painful time.

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in the passing of Congressman John Lewis, I have lost a dear friend, Georgia has lost a true leader, and our nation has lost a civil rights icon.

John Lewis and I first met upon my arrival to Congress nearly three decades ago. Yet, by

the time of that meeting, he had already made a profound impact on my life. It was because of his early work on the advancement of the Civil and Voting Rights Acts that I can stand here and address you today.

His grasp of the nuances and complexities of public policy, paired with his genuine personality, made him a dynamic presence in this Chamber. When he spoke, everyone—regardless of party or politics—listened. When he sang—like he did when we were jailed together following a nonviolent protest at the Embassy of Sudan—peace ensued. His stories captivated, his advice educated, his sermons inspired, and his speeches motivated. He brought the same passion he had as an activist to the halls of Congress, where he spent his career representing Georgia's 5th district.

It is impossible to properly eulogize John Lewis with only words—for he was a man of action. We would therefore all do well to reaffirm our commitment to the preservation of equality and justice in his honor, which is necessary now more than ever before.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to offer my condolences to John Lewis's family and to thank the Congressman for a life full of "good trouble."

Miss GONZALEZ-COLON of Puerto Rico. Mr. Speaker, for so many of us, serving in the U.S. Congress is the achievement of a lifetime. But by the time John Lewis arrived to this chamber, he had already built a historic legacy, as one of the Greats of the Civil Rights Movement. A man of inspiration and hope, committed to the struggles of freedom and justice, John had to put himself on the line and defend social justice throughout his whole lifetime.

America has lost one of its great leaders. John never relented in fighting for what he felt was right, yet he always sought the good in others. Having suffered bigotry and violence, he would not let himself be dragged down by hate.

It is a privilege to me, to have been able to know and serve in Congress with such a champion of equality and civil rights. Humble as the truly great are humble, serene and kind, but John was strong in his convictions. In his office he displayed mementos of our nation's crude history of segregation and the events of the struggle that he still remembered as if it were yesterday. I was privileged to have conversations with him asking about his experiences, in which he gladly spent much longer time than the usual congressional meeting. In his gaze as he spoke you could see an inner peace that filled the room and seemed magical.

John Lewis always supported the right of Puerto Ricans to choose their own future and achieve full equality as American citizens, and I was able to count on him as cosponsor of the Puerto Rico Statehood Admission Act (H.R. 4901). He also joined in our effort to recognize the valor and sacrifice in battle of the Puerto Rican soldiers of the 65th Infantry Regiment as cosponsor of the measure to establish the 13th of April as National Borinqueneers Day.

In the same spirit of justice and equality, he asked me to be the Republican co-lead for the Every Child Deserves a Family Act (H.R. 3114), a piece of legislation that seeks to end discrimination in adoption and foster care agencies across the nation, forbidding discrimination against children, youths, families

and individuals on the basis of religion, sex (including sexual orientation and gender identity) and marital status in the management and delivery of child welfare services. I did not hesitate to say yes. Discrimination is discrimination whether you are talking political or social issues.

Representative Lewis' gallant defense of equality and justice extended to the struggle for the rights of the LGBTQ community. I was proud to join him in the Equality Act, which would extend by law the protection against discrimination under the 1964 Civil Rights Act to LGBTQ individuals. The march towards true justice on which John Lewis spent his life goes on: it is up to us to continue it. There will be other bridges to cross, and his courage should inspire us to cross them, but always with love and care for all people.

May John's loved ones be comforted by the knowledge that his memory will continue to inspire many generations who are learning from his words, about inclusion and about fighting hatred with love. I Thank John (he never wanted me to call him Congressman or Mr. Lewis).

HONORING CONGRESSMAN JOHN LEWIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BISHOP) is recognized for the remainder of the hour as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, we are here to honor Congressman John Robert Lewis, our hero, our colleague, our brother, our friend.

Having known John for 52 years, I can tell you honestly that even in his humanity, he lived his life in the image of Jesus.

John was a voice of the voiceless—African Americans, for women, for LGBTQ people, for the least and the left out, for anyone mistreated by society.

His unwavering sense of right and wrong was a North Star for this Nation, which is why we called him the conscience of the Congress.

People as good as John don't come our way very often. Despite all of the accolades and recognition he received, John remained humble, unfailingly kind, and always fueled the capacity of people to be better, despite their past transgressions.

Where would America be today if it were not for John Lewis? Without his activism, without his courage, without his perseverance for voting rights, I doubt if I would be here today.

Thank you, John, for your lifetime of advocacy, for sacrifice of friendship and counsel.

And thank you, God, for the life of John Robert Lewis.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. CARSON).

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, John Lewis was certainly a leader amongst men. He was a mentor. He was a friend. And my heart goes out to his family. Our hearts go out to his family.

I can remember, Mr. Speaker, during the healthcare vote, I was coming out

of Cannon and I ran into John, and he asked: "How many votes do we have left, or how much time do we have left?" I said: "I think we will make it."

We crossed the street, along with his chief, Michael, and there were thousands of people yelling: "Kill the bill. Kill the bill. Kill the bill." And that wasn't it. They were yelling expletives, racial expletives, at the three of us.

And John looked at me and said: "Brother Andre, this reminds me of a darker time, brother."

John became a mentor. We would call him up, and he would speak to the Muslim community. We would call him up, and he would speak to the folks in Indiana who were there when it was announced that Dr. King had passed, because he was in Indianapolis at the time.

□ 1900

He was a true servant, Mr. Speaker. Jesus was mentioned. John was like Jesus. I am reminded of a Scripture when Jesus was having a conversation with his disciples about this notion of leadership, and Jesus looked at his disciples and said: He who wishes to be chief among you shall first be your servant.

John was a servant. He wasn't the kind of leader who looked at the protesters today and said: Oh, what you are going through is nothing compared to what we went through.

He stood in solidarity with those young folks and embraced those young folks like a real leader. John is an example to all of us, what true public servants should be.

We love you, John. God bless.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, we make our living by what we get. We make a life by what we give. John Lewis certainly made a life.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Alabama (Ms. SEWELL).

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and outstanding legacy of our colleague, friend, mentor, and my hero, Congressman John Robert Lewis.

Growing up as a little girl in Selma, Alabama, John's incredible legacy was a hero's tale as familiar to me as any Bible story or family lore.

As a little girl singing in the choir, the children's choir at Brown Chapel AME Church, my home church, it was the church where John and so many wonderful foot soldiers would come time and time again to honor the legacy of the Bloody Sunday march.

But to know John was to know a man without ego, who, despite his many well-deserved accolades and successes, loved every person he met. He looked them in the eye. Can't you hear him? "My brother, my sister," he would say.

John loved this country more than any person who I have met, and it was his deep-seated patriotism that will live on.

His legacy, indeed, was the Voting Rights Act. And, we, in this body, can do something about that. Yes, we can

name things for John, but the biggest thing that we can do is rename H.R. 4. We should call it the John Robert Lewis Voting Rights Act of 2020 and fully restore the Voting Rights Act of 1965. That is the legacy of John Lewis.

He gave us the road map. Can't you hear him? Never give up, never give in. Keep your eyes on the prize. Keep the faith.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. George Washington Carver once said: How far you go in life depends on your being tender with the young, compassionate with the aged, sympathetic with the striving, and tolerant of the weak and strong, because someday in your life you will have been all of these. That was our friend, John Lewis.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. BEATTY).

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, America has lost a national treasure, one of the world's greatest fighters and defenders of freedom and justice. Congressman LEWIS' words and work and legacy will live forever.

I am so fortunate to have traveled to Africa with him and to have marched in my hometown with him. You see, Mr. Speaker, when Mr. LEWIS spoke, you heard the voice of history, a voice that helped stir the conscience of America at a time of ugliness and struggle, but also at a time and in an era of hope and accomplishment.

My colleagues, there is no greater time for us to stand up against injustices that we are facing, no greater time for us to fight for justice and fairness at the ballot box. So, my colleagues, let us make some noise. Let us get in trouble, good trouble.

God bless you. Rest in peace. Rest in power, my friend. Good trouble.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. KELLY).

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I want to share my letter to Congressman John Robert Lewis.

Dear John, I hope you knew how incredibly honored I was to call you colleague and to serve with you. It was such a great privilege to watch you in action and listen to your stories.

When we planned the sit-in, being a part of the Fab 5 made me so proud. It took a while to get the bill out of the House, but we finally did it. I promise you, when I encounter a situation that is just not right, I will stand up, speak out, and get in the way.

I plan to carry a piece of you with me forever. I know I will be a better person for it. I hope you, C.T. Vivian, Martin, Rosa, Edgar, Robert Kennedy, and others are having a fabulous reunion.

Rest in power, my friend, until we meet again.

Love, Robin.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, how much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia has 22 minutes remaining.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. LAWRENCE).

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, just this year, I remember John urging

Americans to "get in good trouble, necessary trouble, and help redeem the soul of America," as we combat some of the most hateful messages and priorities driven by this current administration.

Today, I stand here and, John, I promise that I will continue to carry out your legacy, to get into good trouble and to ensure that the fight for equality and justice lives on, and to challenge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to do the same and pass the Voting Rights Act.

John, rest in peace. Rest in power. You have been a good and faithful servant.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. EVANS).

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor a truly great American and a real-life hero.

I was fortunate enough to have him as a colleague for 4 years. Congressman John Lewis has been an inspiration to me at a very young age.

I remember the first time I saw him was on the evening news. He was walking across the Pettus Bridge. I felt very strongly about him and what he was doing. I was 10 years old, and I found him to be inspiring. He was purposeful. He was driven to make a difference. He was driven to make some good trouble.

Now, we must carry on with the work of civil rights and equal opportunity.

Rest in power, Congressman LEWIS.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. DEMINGS).

Mrs. DEMINGS. Mr. Speaker, on June 12, 2016, a lone gunman walked into the Pulse nightclub in Orlando, Florida, and opened fire with a semi-automatic rifle. That night, the shooter killed 49 people and injured 53 others. At the time, it was the largest mass shooting in American history.

The Pulse nightclub is in my district, but I was not in Congress at the time. When I saw the Members of Congress taking to the floor and holding a sit-in, I was not surprised that the person leading the way was Representative John Lewis. To him, the victims were a part of the big family John Lewis often spoke about.

Thank you, John, for never discriminating. Thank you, John, for never leaving people behind.

Galatians 5 defines the fruit of the spirit as love, peace, long-suffering, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, gentleness, and self-control. John Lewis was all of that to the House, to the Nation, and to the world, and I am grateful for his friendship and his counsel and grateful for a life well-lived.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Georgia (Mrs. MCBATH).

Mrs. MCBATH. Mr. Speaker, tonight, we stand in this great Chamber and mourn our friend, a civil rights icon and the conscience of Congress.

John Lewis towered over his era, and his loss is deeply felt across this coun-

try and across the globe. From marching for freedom in Montgomery to being beaten and bloodied on a bridge in Selma, John's life showed us all the fundamental need for good, necessary trouble.

As John would often say:

We have a moral obligation, a mission, and a mandate to do what we can to make our country and our world a better place and to help usher in a loving community where no one is left out or left behind.

His words and his life ring through eternity.

We will honor John's legacy with an unshakeable determination to fight for what is right and what is just. He served the Nation in love. Rest in peace, my friend. We love you. I love you.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, may I request the amount of time remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlemen from Georgia has 15 minutes remaining.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. MFUME).

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Speaker, as we have been hearing and continue to hear, the passing of John Lewis represents a loss for America of one of our greatest heroes and, for many of us, a dear and old friend.

John and I were sworn in together in this Chamber 33 years ago as classmates in the 100th Congress. There were only four African Americans elected to Congress that year, he, myself, Floyd Flake of New York, and Mike Espy of Mississippi. We huddled with John here on the floor, and he made all of us hug each other. He said: We got here in different ways, but we are one band of brothers now.

The passion and the equality that he carried with him throughout his life, as we know, never waned. His untiring quest for justice never faltered. With a big heart for compassion, John, like his mentor, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., was unawed by opinion, unseduced by flattery, and undismayed by disaster.

Borned in an area of Jim Crow and vile and vicious segregation, he defied the limitedness of others' expectations.

John knew that politics changed people, so he set out early to change politics.

□ 1915

Everything about him pointed to the fact that he was emblematic of that great band of freedom fighters who realized that freedom wasn't free.

In this era where everyone seems to be searching for the next big thing or the next great thing, isn't it odd, Mr. Speaker, that the greatness of John Lewis was with us all along? We needed only to look as far as the latest movement for social change to find it.

We are sad today, but heaven is rejoicing, and John has claimed his final reward.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it has been said that service is the rent

we pay for the space we occupy on this Earth. John Lewis paid his rent, and he paid it well.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HURD).

Mr. HURD of Texas. A Freedom Rider unshaken by threats and violence, a leader in the struggle for voting rights who kept fighting even after a broken skull, a courageous American undeterred by more than 40 arrests after standing up for what is right, John Lewis spent his life fighting injustice and racism.

If it weren't for the bravery of John and men and women like him, many of us wouldn't be in this Chamber today. And as a Black man, I am not sure I would have had the same rights as my fellow countrymen.

John shaped this country in immeasurable ways. He never sat by when he saw injustice. He never stopped fighting.

At a time when America is so divided, we should look at John's courage for inspiration; we should look at John's bravery for imitation; and we should look at John's words and follow them.

I lost a mentor. John's family lost a father, son, brother, and husband. Our country lost an American hero.

Rest in peace, my brother.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

What a void we feel tonight. I rise to honor the life and legacy of a great warrior for peace and justice, a kind and gentle human being, the conscience of the Congress, Congressman John Lewis.

As a giant of, as our whip indicated, a civil rights movement, John's leadership and his courage continued as an extraordinary congressional leader. Every year, I joined John on his annual pilgrimage to Selma, Montgomery, and Birmingham, Alabama. I brought young people from the Martin Luther King Jr. Freedom Center in my district and my grandchildren each year to learn about and give thanks to the foot soldiers of the civil rights movement.

John always took time to meet with these young people. Even this year, with his failing health, he pulled them aside. He met with them. He always wanted to, and he did, inspire them to take that baton and to run the next lap of the race for justice and equality. And, yes, like with so many, he blessed my community by coming to my district to continue these efforts with my young people.

Last year, Speaker PELOSI and Chairwoman BASS led a delegation to Ghana, West Africa, to observe the 400th anniversary of the first enslaved Africans brought to America. John said that Ghana was one of the most moving trips of his life. He said: "To see and behold the inhumanity during another period of our history, it tells each and every one of us to never let this evil happen again."

Now, John was welcomed in Ghana as royalty, which he was. He was honored as a son of Africa who had come home.

John and I would compare notes on tough votes, such as on matters of war and peace and defense spending. I will miss his wise counsel and admonition—and, really, admonition—to do the right thing as he told all of us to keep our eyes on the prize.

Now, Members know how we get agitated when our colleagues poach our staff members. Well, John poached a brilliant and wonderful young woman from my office Jamila Thompson. When he told me about it, believe it or not, for the first time, I was thrilled that one of my staff members had been poached by John Lewis. What an honor.

John's presence in the people's House will be deeply missed, but one of the greatest tributes to Congressman John Lewis would be to restore the Voting Rights Act.

I would not be standing here as the 100th Black Member of Congress had it not been for the Honorable John Robert Lewis.

My deepest condolences and love and gratitude to John's family, Michael Collins, Jamila Thompson, his entire phenomenal staff, and his constituents, and to all those whose lives he touched. Let us continue to build the beloved community that he so eloquently spoke of.

In closing, I am reminded of a Scripture, 2 Timothy 4:7: I have fought the good fight, I have finished the race, I have kept the faith.

As John Lewis' soul returns to his Creator, may he rest in peace, may he rest in power.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, as we come to the close of this first hour of tribute to our friend and our colleague and our hero, John Robert Lewis, I leave you with the words of Douglas Malloch, who wrote:

The tree that never had to fight
For Sun and sky and air and light,
But stood out in the open plain
And always got its share of rain,
Never became a forest king
But lived and died a scrubby thing.
The man who never had to toil
To gain and farm his patch of soil,
Who never had to win his share
Of Sun and sky and light and air,
Never became a manly man
But lived and died as he began.
Good timber does not grow in ease;
The stronger wind, the stronger trees;
The further sky, the greater length;
The more the storm, the more the strength.
By Sun and cold, by rain and snow,
In trees and men, good timbers grow.
Where thickest lies the forest growth,
We find the patriarchs of both.
And they hold counsel with the stars
Whose broken branches show the scars
Of many winds and much of strife,
This is the common law of life.

John Robert Lewis was indeed good timber. God bless his soul. May he rest in peace and in power.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF CONGRESSMAN JOHN LEWIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Ms. CHENEY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor this evening to manage the time that we have on the Republican side to celebrate and remember the life of our tremendous colleague, Mr. John Lewis.

Mr. Speaker, I was very moved, having the opportunity to watch my colleagues on the other side of the aisle discuss and describe the impact that Congressman Lewis had on their lives, on all of our lives, and on this Chamber. I am struck by the fact that as we gather tonight in this Chamber, we rise not as representatives of two different political parties, but we rise as elected representatives of this great Nation, a Nation that is mourning the loss of a great American, and as honored colleagues of a man, John Lewis, who dedicated his life to service and to the fight for justice and freedom.

John Lewis taught us: "Nothing can stop the power of a committed and determined people to make a difference in our society. Why? Because human beings are the most dynamic link to the divine on this planet."

John Lewis understood that one man or woman can make a difference—indeed, that it is only the determined and principled action of committed men and women that brings change.

He knew the blessings of this Nation, and he knew what it took to secure those blessings for all Americans. He knew that the fight was unfinished.

Mr. Speaker, the day that I was sworn into this body for the first time, I was standing just outside these doors in the Speaker's lobby. I had just arrived with my dad, who joined me on the floor that day. By chance, as we were coming in, we met John Lewis standing in the lobby. The three of us had the chance before the ceremony to spend some time together.

The two of them didn't agree on much, but they did agree on certain critical things. They agreed on the exceptional nature of this country, on the magnificence of this, the people's House, and on the incalculable blessings of freedom.

I am blessed by the memory of that day, and I am blessed that at that moment when I was about to be sworn into this House, I was able to spend time with those two men.

Writing of his experiences fighting for civil rights, John Lewis said this: "Freedom is not a state; it is an act. It is not some enchanted garden perched high on a distant plateau where we can finally sit down and rest. Freedom is the continuous action we all must take, and each generation must do its

part to create an even more fair, more just society."

Great men and women like John Lewis in every generation have known this, that we all have an obligation to defend our freedom, to fight for it, to do our part to be worthy of the sacrifices of those who have gone before.

One of the greatest gifts we can give to young people today is to teach them that lesson, to teach them our history, to convey to them the duty, the obligation, and the incredible blessing of being an American and of working to make sure that we pass this Nation to our children and our grandchildren more perfect than it is today.

Our colleague, Congressman John Lewis, dedicated his life to that ideal. His memory will be a blessing and an example to us all, our colleagues, his colleagues, here in the House, to his family, to his constituents, and to his fellow Americans.

God bless John Lewis, and God bless the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

MEMORIALIZING THE HONORABLE JOHN LEWIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WALKER) is recognized for the remainder of the hour as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to participate in this Special Order, and I will look forward to hearing from our speakers in honoring the great John Lewis.

Over this past weekend, America lost not only a civil rights icon but also a loving father, a loving husband, a caring friend to this entire House body, Congressman John Lewis.

Mr. Lewis' courage and strength in the face of oppression are unmatched. His contributions to America's soul are paramount to the progress that we have made in our histories.

His experience on Bloody Sunday left him battered, covered in blood, and on the side of the road in Selma, Alabama, yet he carried on with his unifying message for America.

Many years ago, John Lewis crossed the monumental Edmund Pettus Bridge, fighting for freedom and a path toward achieving what our Founding Fathers had pledged but fell short to uphold.

I was extremely honored to have the opportunity 54 years later to walk across this very bridge in Selma, and we all honored the brave steps he led, rallying an entire Nation. The fact that I was asked to give the closing remarks at Dexter Avenue King Memorial Baptist Church in Montgomery is something, frankly, I will always treasure.

John Lewis' protest inspired our Nation to not only do better but to reflect on all of our actions. Through his grace and humility, he made monumental

progress. He liked to refer to these acts as "good trouble."

While we don't share many of the same political opinions, there was never a doubt in my mind that Congressman John Lewis lived his entire life fighting for our country and the American people.

He gave us all hope, hope that we could get over this partisan divide, hope that we could get over the divisions of the past to paint a brighter future.

May we never lose that spirit and forever honor his legacy by never letting the forces of division, hatred, and evil tear down those bridges that so many of us have sacrificed to build.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE), the minority whip.

□ 1930

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend and colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WALKER), for yielding.

I join with my colleagues, both Republican and Democrat, who mourn the loss of John Lewis.

We have so many honors to be able to serve in a job like this where we get to represent the people of this Nation, especially here in the people's House where we truly do bring all of the different elements of what makes America great into one body with people who represent every different type of background and every different kind of community, the kinds of people we get to serve with.

There are giants among the people we have the honor of serving with. John Lewis was at the top of that list, and you knew it when you served with him.

I remember telling colleagues years ago that, while we have our differences, it is really important to go get to know especially some of the legends, the giants we serve with in this body.

I remember talking about two Members in particular: it was John Lewis and Sam Johnson, one Democrat, one Republican, two people who were just giants. Unfortunately, we have now lost both of them in the last year.

Our institution is better because John Lewis was a part of this great body, but it is what John fought for his whole life.

I know my colleague from North Carolina as well as my colleagues in the Congressional Black Caucus talked about, earlier, his mantra of "good trouble." What John experienced in his life, there are so many people who have freedoms today they would never have if John hadn't gone through that.

I had an honor, like so many of my colleagues, to go with John, he invited Members from both parties to go to Selma to be a part of reliving that history, which was a dark side of our history, Bloody Sunday, but one that John used as a teachable moment to bring people from all parts of this country to walk across that Edmund

Pettus Bridge. I got to walk arm in arm with John. It was one of the great honors I have had as a Member of Congress to be able to do that.

The whole time we were walking with him—this could be a moment that John wanted to just leave in his past because he was so brutally beaten, but he wanted to share the experiences. And as we were walking, we would round the corner, and he would point to different buildings. And he said: That is where we gathered. That is where some of the people who were trying to stop us would be.

He helped organize the Student Non-violent Coordinating Committee, SNCC. He started at a young age in the civil rights movement, at a time when it was not only difficult, but it was possibly life-threatening. And for many, they did lose their life in that battle.

And John lost blood. He shed blood for the cause. But he never took it as a moment to get down. He never took it as a moment to be bitter.

He wanted to continue fighting to make America a more perfect Union, and he did. And that is what we will remember about John. We will remember his warm-hearted spirit.

John was one of those very few people in a body like this where, when he stood at the podium to speak, no matter what side you were on on that issue, you stopped, you sat down, and you listened, because you knew you were listening to somebody who was larger than life.

John is in a better place right now, but America is a better place because John was here.

God bless John Lewis and his family.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI).

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in honor of a beloved colleague and wonderful friend, John Lewis.

I first met John when my husband, Bob Matsui, was a Member of Congress. Bob loved John. He loved him for his humanity, his conviction, and the fact that he was a total human being.

I had heard so much about John because he was a historic figure, but I saw another side of him, too, when Bob brought him to Sacramento. He met many people. And I remember his walking across a university campus with the president of the university when he ran across, Bob and he and John, a bunch of chickens that the students were advocating to keep on campus. The president was saying: No. We have got to get the chickens out.

The president said: Excuse me, Mr. Lewis, but we are going to get rid of those chickens.

And John said: No way are you going to get rid of those chickens. I learned to preach by preaching to chickens.

That is the part of John that I really loved, too, that humorous part, the part you can laugh with.

But this gentle giant lived also every single day to overcome injustice, eradicate racism, and give hope to all who

walked beside him. He is a total person.

At this moment in our history when speaking truth to power is so vital, it is more important than ever to follow John's words, to "stand up, speak out, and keep your eyes on the prize."

John taught us all that America is greater than the sum of its parts. When you weave a rich, colorful tapestry, the weaving itself makes it strong. His impact will be forever felt in our Nation's conscience, and we are all better for it.

At this difficult time, my prayers are with the Lewis family and all his friends. He will be sorely missed.

I love you, John.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. FERGUSON), our deputy whip. It only makes sense to go first to John Lewis' colleagues in the delegation from Georgia.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WALKER) for allowing me to do this.

I rise tonight to honor the life and legacy of John Lewis.

John dedicated his life to equality and justice, and the Nation we are so blessed to live in is better because of his work and his sacrifice.

John was driven by his deep faith, his servant heart, and his love of his fellow human being. While John was always right to fight for legal changes to make America better, he ultimately knew that how you treated your fellow human being was a matter of the heart.

John led by example. He led by showing love and grace to all people. He showed love and grace even to those people who disagreed with him or showed him contempt.

John was always willing to offer forgiveness to those who had done him wrong, knowing that forgiveness was fundamental to building a relationship built on trust and love.

Two of my most vivid memories and treasured experiences here in my time in Congress involved John.

One was a dinner at his house. He invited the Georgia delegation over, and he retold the story of his life and experiences in the civil rights movement. What a cherished memory and experience.

The second was the night that we honored another Georgia giant here, former House Member and former U.S. Senator JOHNNY ISAKSON. I remember the night that JOHNNY ISAKSON and John Lewis met in the center and embraced in true love, friendship, and respect. It was truly an amazing moment.

John was an amazing man, and I believe that the only thing John Lewis ever hated was hate itself.

Rest in peace, our dear friend.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY).

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the memory of Congressman John Lewis, an American hero, a dear friend.

He taught us what patriotism is, that to love our country is to acknowledge and work to repair its imperfections.

Congressman Lewis endured angry mobs, death threats, and so much violence with endurance, persistence, and even warmth and optimism. Surely we can honor his remarkable life by coming together to reauthorize the Voting Rights Act, to ensure our laws reflect that Black lives matter.

Advocating for the Nation's marginalized throughout his life, acting as the conscience of Congress during his 34 years of service, he inspired generations of Americans to get in "good trouble."

I remember sitting on the floor with John. Rather than sitting in the chair, we were proving our point and all sitting on the floor.

He has taught us so much with his sweet, sweet manner, but the strength of his conviction.

We must honor Congressman Lewis' legacy by striving to achieve the equitable and just society for all that he fought so hard to attain. In the words of John himself, "If not us, then who? If not now, then when?"

Dear, sweet, kind John, we will miss you. We love you. May you rest in peace.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT).

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WALKER) for yielding to me to speak about my friend and colleague, Congressman John Lewis, a man that I loved.

I will miss dearly him saying, "I love you too, brother."

There is no telling how many times John Lewis told the people of this House, "I love you too, brother." He looked at everybody, no matter who you were, as a brother.

I selfishly thought about how much I was going to miss him and seeing him and Michael Collins on a Delta ready to fly up here. I always got a kick out of the fact that people from my district would sit down next to me and say: Did you see John Lewis on the plane? And, by the way, what do you do?

That was just the way people loved John Lewis.

There is not a person walking in this country today who didn't benefit from John Lewis and what he did for mankind, and I would venture to say that the majority of the people in the world benefited from his love and what he did.

I thought about a few passages. We have talked about him preaching to the chickens, and maybe we are the chickens he was preaching to his whole life.

I remembered the Beatitudes:

Blessed are the peacemakers, for they should be called the children of God.

If there was ever a peacemaker that I met, it was John Lewis.

Following from there:

Blessed are they which are persecuted for righteousness' sake, for theirs is the kingdom of Heaven.

A little further into the book of Matthew:

Let your light shine before men that they may see your good works and glorify your Father, which is in Heaven.

There is no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that John Lewis was a special man. He was a special man of God. And while his bones may rest, his legacy will live on forever in this body.

I, for one, look very forward to the day that a statue of John Lewis rests in the Halls of this Congress representing not only the great State of Georgia and the people of the State of Georgia, but all of the men and women of the United States.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative SCOTT for his comments tonight.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS).

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, with John Robert Lewis' passing, we lose and deeply mourn a great friend and mentor, and the world loses the most respected "good trouble" maker of our time.

John's standing will only grow as his legacy endures.

Mr. Speaker, every year since I have been in Congress, I asked John to speak to entering high school seniors from San Diego who visited our Capitol as part of an in-depth civics and leadership program; and for 20 years, with each new group of 45 very diverse students, he gave his time, his energy, and his wisdom, graciously answering their many spirited questions. They, too, will never forget him and how he changed them. Here is just a brief example:

Alejandra Cordova, from 2001, said Mr. Lewis taught her "not to be afraid to rock the boat every once in a while."

David Hickman, from 2015, said he "truly showed us what it meant to be a change-maker, to live through our actions and speak up against injustice."

He taught our children well.

John, you taught and changed me and everyone you touched. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Michael Collins and all of John's staff, who had the hardest task of all to say to visitors captured by John's words: "I am sorry, but the Congressman must depart now."

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. HICE), a fellow pastor.

Mr. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WALKER), my good friend, for yielding to me.

There is no question that all of us who have served with John Lewis mourn the passing of this towering figure who devoted his life to fighting for freedom and equality.

□ 1945

An interesting perspective of his life, as a son of Alabama sharecroppers, John Lewis demonstrated that, in America, a single individual, even one

coming from the most humble of backgrounds, can have an enormous impact in this country.

We all know that he rose to be a powerful leader in the civil rights movement; worked very closely with Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., and so many other great heroes who sacrificed their lives to ensure that Americans of all races live in liberty in this country. But he did so peacefully.

He once wrote this, and this has a great, powerful meaning. He said: "Release the need to hate, to harbor division, and the enticement of revenge. Release all bitterness. Hold only love, only peace in your heart, knowing that the battle of good to overcome evil is already won."

John Lewis knew that it was necessary to fight the sins of this country; but he understood also to fight those in a nonviolent way.

I just have the deepest respect for John Lewis, and I am honored to have considered him a dear friend.

I just want to thank all my colleagues this evening for joining in this time to honor such a great man and an icon, obviously, particularly in the civil rights movement.

My wife, Dee Dee, and I continue to pray for the Lewis family. Again, I thank all my colleagues for joining tonight.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE).

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from North Carolina for allowing me several minutes to pay my respects to a great man.

And it is not remiss that I see the Speaker pro tempore; it is very appropriate that you are in the seat tonight, sir.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor John Lewis. He was an American icon, civil rights legend, and dear friend and an inspiration to millions. Yet, these words truly fail to describe the difference he made in our country.

He always spoke of "getting into good trouble," and I know that has been echoed here on numerous occasions, but it sums up what Mr. Lewis was all about.

His efforts led to the Civil Rights Act. His efforts led to the Voting Rights Act. And his efforts led to the Congressional Black Caucus, and even the election of President Barack Obama.

But his loss is more than his legacy. For me, once again, I have lost one of my fathers on the floor of Congress. He was a role model for what makes a great Congressman, and I constantly watched as he moved about his business: Like the way he always fought for the right thing; the way he could convey such power and strength through such a gentle demeanor.

But when he had passion, and was committed, there is no one else on this floor you would rather have with you going into that fight.

And the way he stood up to abuse to make this country a better place. One of my greatest honors was to be a part of the sit-in he led on the House floor to fight for gun control legislation after the terrible, dreadful Florida issue. We got into some good trouble that day.

He inspired us then, and his words and deeds will inspire new generations; whether they are civil rights pioneers, elected officials, or any American with a dream or cause.

God bless you, Mr. Lewis. Your life made our country and our world a better place.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, may I get a time remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 32 minutes remaining.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ALLEN. I thank the gentleman from North Carolina for this privilege.

Mr. Speaker, many Americans learned about the civil rights movement in the news or read about it in history books. John Lewis lived it.

One of my greatest memories here was to have dinner with Congressman LEWIS at his home, where he shared with the entire Georgia delegation his experience in leading the civil rights movement.

He shared with me that Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. prayed with them on those buses before the demonstrations and urged everyone to remain at peace to ensure lasting change.

I know we can all learn from the example Congressman Lewis set as a civil rights icon. We must meet injustice with humility and perseverance to do what is right.

Pride and fear are the opposite of humility. John Lewis and all those in this movement demonstrated perfect love while being persecuted. Perfect love casts out all fear and only comes from God and obedience to His word and was perfectly demonstrated at the cross of Jesus Christ.

My wife, Robin, and I pray that his family finds peace during this difficult time. And this is a lesson for this body as we honor those like John Lewis, who have come before us and fought for an America that is stronger and is unified, by putting aside our differences to serve the American people in perfect love.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN), with his own amazing civil rights history.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the time.

I say to the gentleman from North Carolina that I remember that the last time I saw John Lewis was March 5, his birthday; and the gentleman offered the prayer. That meant a lot to me, and it showed me the respect that you had for him and that he had for you. It was a beautiful moment.

There was not a more perfect person that has probably served in the Con-

gress and, certainly that I have known in my life, than John R. Lewis. He had every quality that you would desire in a human being and couldn't even imagine a person to have them altogether.

He was a hero of the civil rights movement and cared greatly about the injustices that he had seen as an African American, and that is what launched him on his civil rights struggles. But once he got moving, it was people of different issues of discrimination that he championed; whether it was gay and lesbian; whether it was Native Americans; whether it was women, or just simple people being victims of gun violence, John Lewis took up the cause and he stood up for everybody.

He did not know color. He did not know gender. He did not know any differences in people. He loved all people.

It was such an honor to serve with him.

Early in my career, the American Bar Association presented the Day Award to John Lewis, Richard Lugar and myself. The award was nothing compared to the fact that I was with John Lewis that day. It made me feel much greater than I ever could become.

I had the great honor to travel with him to South Africa for the 50th anniversary of Robert F. Kennedy's Ripple of Hope speech in Cape Town. I saw and I sat across from him and Bishop Desmond Tutu, and I knew I was seeing two angels together, two special souls united.

Mr. Lewis loved two people in life that were his heroes; one was Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., and the other was Robert Kennedy. The purpose of that speech on that trip was to honor Robert Kennedy and the 50th anniversary of that speech.

In that speech, Robert Kennedy said: "It is from numberless diverse acts of courage and belief that human history is shaped. Each time a man stands up for an ideal, or acts to improve the lot of others, or strikes out against injustice, he sends forth a tiny ripple of hope, and crossing each other from a million different centers of energy and daring those ripples build a current which can sweep down the mightiest walls of oppression and resistance."

Robert Kennedy might as well have been speaking about John Lewis that day in 1964, because that is what John Lewis did; and he was more than a ripple of hope, he was a tsunami of hope. He was in every good cause there was, and he sacrificed himself physically in South Carolina, in Alabama, in Mississippi, for civil rights. And he sacrificed himself even when he was a Member of Congress for different causes, getting arrested.

And when he was on death's doorstep, he got himself to Washington, D.C., to appear at Black Lives Matter Plaza and give hope and encouragement and support to the young people that were striving for the causes that he had strived for his whole life.

I value every single moment I spent with Congressman Lewis. It was an honor to know him. I miss him.

And just the other day, I looked up at the scoreboard, and when I didn't know quite how to vote on some issues, I would look to John Lewis and see how he voted. And he wasn't there.

He was my hero.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER), another one of Mr. Lewis' colleagues.

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, in our lives there are people and places we remember. I will always remember John Lewis.

There are some people that you feel especially honored to have met. You feel like you are one of the lucky ones who had the opportunity to hear their stories, to learn their convictions, and to feel their triumphs. I believe just about anyone who had the opportunity to meet John Lewis would agree that he is one of those people.

He was born the son of sharecroppers. He grew up on his family farm, and he attended segregated public schools in Alabama. He told the story often, and I remember him telling us this story, about how he used to preach to the chickens.

He went on from that humble beginning to be called one of the most courageous persons the civil rights movement ever produced, a title he rightfully deserved.

John Lewis dedicated his entire life to securing equality and justice for all people, while remaining a devoted advocate for nonviolence. It must have been an incredible blessing for him to see how his fight changed our Nation and the entire world with his own eyes.

For me, it was a blessing to know him. His office was over in the Cannon Building for many years, and my office was in the Cannon Building. And oftentimes, as we were walking over here, I would get to walk with him. I hung on every moment, on every word, just to have the opportunity to spend time with someone like John Lewis. I will always be grateful for those walks.

Many of my colleagues in the Georgia Delegation have mentioned the time that he invited us to dinner at his home here in Washington. What great stories he told that night; truly, one of the greatest experiences I have had while I have been up here in Washington, D.C.

John Lewis was a giant among men. He will be deeply missed, but his legacy will live on forever.

□ 2000

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN).

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, sharing a jail cell with John Lewis was one of the greatest privileges of my life.

When we were arrested for protesting the genocide in Darfur a few years back, we were put into a police van,

booked, and fingerprinted. John had been arrested over 40 times for peaceful protests by that point, so let's just say he had some advice.

John made trouble like this because he knew that words aren't enough and that real change requires action. He called it the struggle of a lifetime, but it was never his struggle alone. He challenged all of us to fight injustice and oppression and to stand up for civil rights and for human rights.

Mr. Speaker, John was a great man. He was an American hero who called our country to a higher standard. But perhaps more importantly, he was a very good man. He treated every single person he met, no matter who they were, with dignity and respect. When he saw wrong in this world, he did his best to make it right.

Lisa, Patrick, Molly, and I miss you already, John. We love you, and we will never stop making good trouble in your name.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TURNER).

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, John Lewis has a true legacy of leadership in this House, and he changed the world that we live in.

When Congressman Lewis would take the podium, everyone in this House would fall silent and listen to him. I doubt in his long career in this House that the Speaker ever had to hammer the House into order to listen to John Lewis speak.

A man who fought for the Voting Rights Act, John Lewis' legacy demands that Congress act. I call on Congress to pass and send to the President's desk for signature the bipartisan H.R. 1799 renewing the Voting Rights Act.

Congressman Lewis was a giant in history, but he was a humble man in this House. He treated every Member the same and with dignity. He will be missed.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. CÁRDENAS).

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this hour to honor one of the most beautiful human beings that ever walked this Earth. Many of us believe in God, and many of us try to be the best that we can be, but few of us are capable and able to live a life of true love and of tremendous dignity and respect for every single person who comes our way.

I wish I could learn how to turn my cheek the way John Lewis proved he could and did.

I mourn his passing, but I celebrate the honor of knowing that he lived and also knowing that I could go to him on the floor of this House or in the hallways of Congress and speak with him, learn from him, and then say "I love you, brother," and then to have him tell me—and I selfishly relished the opportunity to hear him say it—"I love you too, brother," as I gave him a hug and he hugged me back.

I am unfortunate that I grew up in a very strict household where my mother

and father only said "I love you" to the big boys and girls and adults very few times. Once we got off their knee, it just didn't happen very often. But John Lewis reminded me how much I missed that, and in a selfish way, that is one of the reasons why I always rushed to him and asked him, by saying "I love you," to know that he would say "I love you" and with all his heart mean it.

I am going to miss him. Some of my family members were fortunate to meet him and to know him, and I feel blessed to know that he was my friend as well.

May he rest in peace.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind if we can keep the remarks about 1 minute, we will get as many as we can in tonight.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mrs. BROOKS).

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor and remember my friend, the civil rights pioneer, Congressman John Lewis, a true gentle giant among us.

He walked the talk, and we watched him walk the talk in these Halls of Congress for many years, from his years as a student at Fisk University to his last days as one of the most influential Members of Congress.

He didn't let bad actors and people who were trying to do him harm or even cancer slow him down from his fight for equality until the very end.

He led many Members of Congress on that march in Selma, a civil rights pilgrimage that my husband and I were honored to join him on a couple of years ago when we went to Memphis, Montgomery, Birmingham, and Selma. He walked the talk and walked with us and shared with us the memories of that painful journey for him and all of those students and all the people that he led across that bridge. He took our hands, and we all walked together.

He then later that year came to Indianapolis, where he was the keynote speaker because our community celebrated the Kennedy King Memorial Initiative becoming a national historic site. Indianapolis was the site where Senator Robert Kennedy informed our city that Dr. Martin Luther King had been killed on that night 50 years ago.

It was in Indianapolis, in 1968, that John Lewis learned from Robert Kennedy about Dr. King's death. Dr. King was his friend, his mentor, and his hero. He had not been to this park in Indianapolis for 50 years, yet he came there as the keynote speaker. He brought together our community—Democrats, Republicans, Hispanics, African Americans, and White. Everyone stood together to hear his words, to honor him, and to pay tribute to his legacy, to the legacy of Dr. King, and to the legacy of Senator Robert Kennedy.

John was our friend. He walked the talk. He is walking in Heaven now. He is showing us all how to walk the talk, and now it is up to us to not let him down.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. STEVENS).

Ms. STEVENS. Madam Speaker, Congressman John Lewis was the embodiment of human prosperity as measured by love. Not only was he the richest man I have ever known, but he was absolutely the most generous. John Lewis gave out love and, boy, did love come back. He was always showering people in love.

When I saw him in Kentucky long before I knew I would ever join this Chamber at the encouragement of a friend from Georgia, he was talking about Comic-Con and that his new book with pictures, "March," had just come out.

We have so much work to do. John Lewis, we will heed your words. We will not despair. We will look up. We will keep moving and marching forward. We will pass that Voting Rights Act. And we will remain dedicated to your pursuits.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. Craig).

Ms. CRAIG. Mr. Speaker, last week, our country lost a fearless fighter and hero for civil rights, and we in this Chamber lost a colleague and a friend.

Representative John R. Lewis' sense of fairness and of right and wrong was always ahead of his time. That sense of fairness extended to all civil rights issues.

His willingness to support opening up the 1964 Civil Rights Act to add protections for the LGBTQ community was critical and personally incredibly meaningful to me. My colleague and I, over my term in Congress, found that we had something very important in common. We both were adoptive parents.

His bill, the Every Child Deserves a Family Act, is another example of his commitment to fairness, eliminating discrimination against the LGBT community in foster care and adoption.

He took time to listen to my story of my fight to keep my son, Josh, in a years-long court battle. He understood that all that should matter is that children have safe, loving homes. He understood that right is always right.

My heart tonight is with his family, and my commitment is to continue his work to restore and protect the Voting Rights Act, to address systemic racism, and to do what is kind, good, and just.

Rest in power, Mr. Lewis. We promise to work today, next week, next month, and next year, just as you did for our lifetimes.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to introduce the majority leader. As he is coming, I want to express to him my thanks for allowing me to have the honor to pray for Representative John Lewis at his birthday party this past March. It is a privilege and a memory that I will cherish.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

Some in my generation remember the song "Abraham, Martin and John." Then, of course, there was Bobby. All four were taken from us far too early in their lives.

God blessed each of us, this institution, and this country by giving to John Lewis health for eight decades. He used that health and strength, mind and body, to serve his God, his faith, his country, and his people.

I can say that John Lewis was my friend, but then again, we could all say that John Lewis was our friend and be right in that claim because John Lewis was a person who loved his fellow human beings.

So many of you have heard me refer to John Lewis as the most Christlike person I have ever met. He was human, and he represented the best of humanity and all the positive attributes that humanity can summon. That is why you hear from both sides of the aisle, from all ideologies, from people of different colors, different races, different genders, different nationalities, and perhaps even different languages—certainly, different languages—for he was not just an American—though proud he was of that appellation—he was a citizen of humanity.

JIM CLYBURN said a little earlier today that we hear about Gandhi, and we talk about Christian values, but no one we know has lived and breathed who was those attributes, not that he believed in them or talked about them, but he embodied the best attributes that are in us all.

We have a short time because time is limited, and so many want to speak because they were touched by John Lewis, because they were inspired by John Lewis, and because they were motivated and uplifted by John Lewis.

Mr. Speaker, how lucky we are to be able to say that John Lewis was our friend. I knew John Lewis. John Lewis made a personal difference in my life and the lives of millions of other people who may not even know the name of John Lewis.

□ 2015

Mr. Speaker, if I had another hour or another day or another week, I would not run out of good things to say about John Lewis. But his life and his contributions need no elevation from me or any others, for his life is a book of goodness, of courage, of commitment, of vision, and of great accomplishment.

We sing the song "God Bless America," and God blessed America and the world with John Robert Lewis.

Thank you, Lord.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, may we make a commitment to make sure this next generation does know the name "John Lewis."

Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from North Carolina has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CASTEN).

Mr. CASTEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, John Lewis was a legend. He was also just a man. I knew the legend, but I was only just getting to know the man. And I guess I just hope we remember both, because somehow the legend feels unattainable.

On our best days, none of us are half the man that John Lewis was every day. And the real inspiration, I think, is the man, because it was that proof of his life that showed us our potential: if only we can summon his decency and his courage and his conviction.

The legend was the guy whom I could never muster the courage to call anything but Mr. Lewis. And the man was the guy who always said, "Just call me John."

The legend was the orator at this podium, or that one, or the one down there. And the man was the guy who would sit there and pull me aside and say, "How are you doing?"

But somehow, the legend and the man are one in the same, because it was a man who stood on that bridge, and it was a man who made all that "good trouble," and it was a man who showed us that the amount of love we can spread into this world isn't constrained by our mortality, but by our ambition.

Thank you, Mr. Lewis. And while I never quite mustered up the courage to say this while you were alive, thank you, John.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas (Mrs. FLETCHER).

Mrs. FLETCHER. Mr. Speaker, John Robert Lewis was one of the most courageous and committed citizens that our country has ever known. With unparalleled courage, with deep faith, and with profound hope, he personified a belief in this country and a belief in his fellow citizens all the days of his life.

Through his life, he gave all of us a gift: a chance to see the world as it should be and a way to make it so.

At this pivotal time in our country's history, his faith in America and in Americans must guide us now. We have the opportunity and the responsibility as Members of Congress and as citizens to honor him by believing, as he did, in an America as good as its promise and by working to make it so.

We have many miles to go to build the beloved community, but he showed us the way. How lucky we are, and how we miss him so.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, as we conclude this Special Order, I am most reminded by my colleagues this evening of the immense impact of a life that was John Lewis.

In our current House, who can we think of that has more of an impact in the civil rights movement than John Lewis?

His legacy is not simply of humility and kindness in the pursuit of equality, but one in which we should all aspire

to replicate. We have talked many times tonight of his nonviolent approach, but do not hesitate for one second to think that John Lewis was not a strong man, a strong man with a lion's heart.

America is the greatest country in the world, but let's be transparent. It took us a few years to really act out that all men were created equal. John Lewis dedicated his life to making sure this country lived up to the ideals of our Founding Fathers in making this Nation a better place for everyone.

John was a man of faith. He grew up as a young preacher and later became an ordained Baptist minister, and I can relate to that. It was under this background that he began this fight for equality. Had the church joined him, I am convinced there would be less division today.

As a member of the Freedom Riders, John and his fellow Riders were subjected to mob beatings and arrested for his efforts. Despite this opposition, he remained steadfast in his conviction and continued onward with his courageous message as he pressured our Federal Government to do the right thing.

Mr. Speaker, 25 years ago, John Lewis ascended to a seat in the U.S. Congress and continued to make "good trouble," as he would deem it. During this distinguished time as a Member of the United States House of Representatives, John left no stone unturned in his fight for the American people.

As you can see this evening, Congress has felt this impact resoundingly. It has been made clear: John Lewis' kindness and humility in the many faces of oppression and adversity have lifted up Congress and America for decades. To say he will be sorely missed is a vast understatement.

Let us continue to tell the story of John Lewis for generations to come. Remember his guidance, and let his presence live on in our hearts. In other words, let's keep on a walkin' and keep on a talkin'.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

HONORING CONGRESSMAN JOHN LEWIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES) for 30 minutes.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the topic of tonight's Special Order hour.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as we honor the life and legacy of the Honorable John Robert Lewis. I am thankful for my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, Republican Con-

ference Chair LIZ CHENEY and Republican Conference Vice Chair MARK WALKER, for their dual participation here on the House floor today, which is a recognition that, yes, John Lewis was a Democratic hero; he was a progressive hero; he was a civil rights hero; but above all else, John Robert Lewis was an American hero.

So we are here today on the House floor, not as Democrats or Republicans, not as progressives or conservatives, not as the left or the right, but as Americans because of what John Lewis meant to all of us: to our communities, to the country, to the Constitution, to the principle of liberty and justice for all, equal protection under the law, to the principle of the righteous cause of nonviolence as a pathway to the beloved community, as he would share with all of us.

John Robert Lewis was the connective tissue between the civil rights movement and the Black Lives Matter movement.

John Robert Lewis was the connective tissue between the dream of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., and the Presidency of Barack Obama.

And John Robert Lewis was the connective tissue between the tragedy on the Edmund Pettus Bridge and the tragedy that occurred in Minneapolis, Minnesota.

John Robert Lewis' life journey is the American journey, and he has guided the way as we have traveled and marched toward a more perfect Union; and through the sheer will of his morality, he has helped to bend the arc toward justice.

And so we are all thankful for his life and his legacy, honored by the privilege to have been able to call him "colleague."

We learned from John Lewis how to be a good American, a good patriot, a good neighbor, a good leader, a good human, a good activist, and how to get into "good trouble." And so we are thankful for this opportunity just to humbly communicate what John Lewis meant to all of us.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from the great State of Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ).

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, few of us will ever leave the mark on history and every human we encounter the way our dear friend Congressman John Lewis did. His profound generosity and goodness was so beautifully balanced by his courageous, unyielding demands for justice.

I saw it as we sat-in on this House floor demanding gun safety reforms after the Pulse nightclub shooting.

I saw it as young and old met him, sensed his moral bearing, and he patiently made each one the world's most important person in that moment.

We saw it plain as day as he bravely crossed the Edmund Pettus Bridge to confront America's racist sins, know-

ing that batons and beatings blocked the pathway to justice.

I saw it when he traveled to my district, and the outpouring of joy and reverence overflowed for this truly good man.

And I saw it when he took the time, 5 seconds of his time, in that room off the House floor, when he recorded a campaign video to help my then high school-age daughter win her student government campaign, which she did. That is a memory that she will treasure—and does treasure—throughout her life.

His lifetime of "good trouble" is a model for us all, especially now as we must carry on his work of racial justice. The more perfect Union John Lewis lived in and risked his life for is what our Founders expressed but did not necessarily exemplify and one that future leaders must aspire to. His courage and generosity are strengths we must all draw upon now.

Rest in power, my friend.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO), the distinguished chair of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. TAKANO. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise today with a heavy heart to honor the passion of a dear friend, a colleague, a personal hero of mine, Congressman John Lewis.

Mr. Lewis often spoke of building a beloved community, one that required us to get into "good trouble" to achieve. His vision for America and her world was one of justice, equality, and compassion for one another.

During dark times, his strength and his optimism lit the way to a path forward that brought us closer to justice.

During doubtful times, his words and his wisdom inspired confidence that progress was still in reach.

And during this difficult time for our country, as we mourn his death, may the life and the legacy he left behind inspire us to keep building that beloved community.

John Lewis, you taught me that optimism is a moral duty, and now that you are gone, sir, I will no longer have you around to remind me to keep the faith. I will have to do that all by myself.

□ 2030

Mr. JEFFRIES. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BUSTOS).

Mrs. BUSTOS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to mourn and also to celebrate a historic life, a man I was honored to know, privileged to serve with, and to call my friend.

Congressman John Lewis has been called home to God. I met Mr. Lewis right after I was elected to Congress, but over the years, I had the pleasure of getting to know him, a civil rights icon, a true American hero.

Too rarely are the most powerful also the most humble, the most caring, and the most kind. But Mr. Lewis had that

rare combination and more. He was the best among us.

In one moment, he would fearlessly stand in harm's way to stand up for what is right, and in the next, he wouldn't hesitate to take a minute to share his insights, his lessons, his personal stories with those lucky enough to cross his path or to walk into his office.

In 2015, so many of our colleagues and I joined him for the 50th anniversary walk across the Edmond Pettus Bridge in Selma, Alabama, to honor the moment that young John Lewis forever changed our Nation.

As we all gathered to follow in his historic footsteps, the magic and the power of John Lewis' action on that fateful day in 1965 could be felt by all of us. Our country is better, our Congress is better, and I am better for having known him.

I will miss you, Mr. Lewis, but I will forever celebrate and honor the impact you made on our Nation and on me.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. REED).

Mr. REED. Madam Speaker, I rise today to join with my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to express my condolences and express the spirit that John Lewis represented to all of us.

John Lewis was a humble man. I knew John serving on the Ways and Means Committee with him.

I traveled with my colleague, Mrs. BUSTOS, from Illinois down to Selma, Alabama, on that 50th anniversary day. And I will tell you, one of the moments that inspired me the most in my tenure here in Congress was not just that day, when we walked across the Edmund Pettus Bridge arm in arm in celebration of his victory over hatred, but it was the following day, when we sat at the doors of the Montgomery, Alabama, State Capitol, and I saw the daughter of Governor Wallace express to John an apology for the sins of yesterday. And John, in typical John Lewis fashion, stood up and embraced her when she said: "I'm sorry."

John Lewis epitomizes the best of the human race. John Lewis was an inspiration to all of us.

My predecessor, my mentor, Amo Houghton, who served in my seat for 18 years, expressed to me early on in my tenure: "Get to know John Lewis. Get to know and listen to his story." And I will tell you, that is some of the best advice I received from his friend, Amo Houghton.

And so I come here tonight to express my grief, but most importantly, my hope that the spirit of John Lewis does not die with us tonight. The spirit of John Lewis, who is now resting with the glory of God, will shine down upon us and improve this institution, improve each of our souls, and inspire us, the way that he did, as that proud, quiet, humble giant of a human being that inspired me and will continue to inspire me to search for our better angels each and every day.

So to my colleagues on the other side, I join you in your grief, but we are united in our love for the great John Lewis.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RUPPERSBERGER).

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Madam Speaker, I rise to recognize the life and legacy of Congressman John Lewis.

I first met John at a church event in Maryland 20 years ago in Anne Arundel County when I was a candidate running for Congress. And John was there to support me but also there to speak to a junior day event.

At that time, I first saw John speak and talk about his relationship with Dr. Martin Luther King. He recounted many brutal beatings and arrests that he endured during the height of the civil rights movement. From that point on, I considered John a mentor.

I am fortunate to have served with many inspiring people, but John stands out as one of the finest leaders I have ever known.

John encouraged us to get into good trouble, to make a difference. Though not typically my style, I was proud to participate in a sit-in on the House floor, led by John, to protest gun violence in 2016. He told me that by sitting down, we were standing up for thousands of Americans who have lost their lives in mass shootings after mass shootings. And so I sat.

The best way to honor John's life and legacy is by continuing the fight against gun violence, against police brutality, against veteran disenfranchisement, against systemic racism.

We will carry the torch for you, John.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. WILD).

Ms. WILD. Madam Speaker, shortly after I came to Congress, I learned through the grapevine that a couple of my staff members wanted nothing more than to meet the great John Lewis in person.

So with some trepidation, and very cognizant of the demands on his time, I approached him as a freshman Member on the House floor to inquire whether I could make an appointment with his staff. And in his usual warm and gregarious manner, Mr. Lewis said: "Of course. Of course."

A few weeks later, I took these staffers on a mystery field trip to the Cannon House Office Building. And the look on their faces when they realized we were about to enter John Lewis' office was priceless.

I figured it would be a quick handshake and a photo op, and then we would be on our way back to our office. But no. Mr. Lewis greeted my 6-foot-4-inch legislative counsel Zach and my speechwriter Yann with: "Hello, young brothers" and took them into his office where he proceeded to give them a narrated history of the civil rights movement with the aid of large photographs that were stacked all over his office.

Zach and Yann and Sara, another member of my team, asked many questions, and he answered them all. We took the obligatory photos for which I am thankful, because now they have the treasure of those memories forever.

A full hour-and-a-half elapsed, and our meeting with him ended only because my team needed to get back to work, so we had to break away. I am convinced he would have gladly spent the rest of the afternoon speaking with them. That is just one example of the generosity of spirit of the great John Lewis.

Rest in peace, Mr. Lewis. I hope you are starting a whole lot of good trouble wherever you are. It is the greatest honor of my life to have served with you.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Madam Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. AXNE). The gentleman from New York has 14 minutes remaining.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

Mr. CICILLINE. Madam Speaker, John Robert Lewis, an American hero, a civil rights icon, a movement leader, a peacemaker, a teacher, a drum major for justice, a mentor, a colleague, and a friend.

I want to begin by thanking John's family for sharing him with us and with our country.

As I listened to my colleagues tonight speak about John, I realize that he made each one of us feel like a very special person to him. I also realize that words can't really capture John Lewis and what he meant to us, to our country, and to the world.

I had the privilege, like so many of my colleagues, of walking across the Edmund Pettus Bridge with John and listening to him speak about his work in the civil rights movement; to be part of an effort to organize a sit-in here on the House floor to demand action on gun violence; to work with John when we played a really critical role in our right for passage of the Equality Act and made the case that LGBTQ Americans were entitled to full equality in this country; on his visit to Newport News, Rhode Island; or traveling to South Africa to celebrate Robert Kennedy's "Ripple of Hope" speech.

John Lewis made America more just, he made us all more human, because he deeply believed in justice and equality. They weren't just things that he believed in; it is who he was.

And most importantly, he reminded us always to be optimistic, because he believed in the fundamental decency of every human being. And even in the darkest moments, he would encourage us: "Keep the faith, brother. Keep fighting."

And it is that belief in the fundamental goodness of everyone, that optimism, that John left with us.

And so, John, knowing you, serving with you, has been the greatest honor

of my life. I thank you for all that you have done for me and for our country, and we promise you that we will keep the faith and keep up the fight.

Rest in peace, my friend.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT).

Mr. CHABOT. Madam Speaker, the word "hero" is used a little too often these days. But make no mistake, John Lewis personified the word. He was, without question, a true American hero.

The fearlessness he demonstrated throughout the civil rights movement, but especially on the Edmund Pettus Bridge in Selma on March 7, 1965, demonstrated to people across the globe how to stand up for equality, justice, and basic civil and human rights in the face of overwhelming odds. Quite simply, his heroic actions transformed our Nation and our world.

Early on in my time in Congress, I had the pleasure of meeting Congressman Lewis for the first time. When he found out I was from Cincinnati, he immediately asked me a question that I would hear from him many times in the coming years, how was his friend and fellow civil rights leader, Reverend Fred Shuttlesworth, doing.

The two men had worked together throughout the 1960s, along with Dr. Martin Luther King, organizing marches, sit-ins, and freedom rides. Like John Lewis, Reverend Shuttlesworth remained committed to civil rights throughout his life and worked diligently to improve conditions in Cincinnati.

Not surprisingly, when I would see Reverend Shuttlesworth back home, he would ask how John Lewis was doing up here. As a result, I was kind of a messenger between these two-larger-than-life civil rights icons, and they will always be inextricably linked in my memory.

Madam Speaker, the world needs more heroes like John Lewis and the Reverend Fred Shuttlesworth. Now, more than ever, their dedication to overcoming inequality and changing hearts and minds through nonviolent protests points the way forward as we continue to strive to come together and achieve a more perfect Union.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Virginia (Ms. SPANBERGER).

Ms. SPANBERGER. Madam Speaker, I rise tonight to remember Congressman John Lewis.

And for me, the best way to honor the memory of this beautiful man, this kind soul, our colleague, our friend, and for so many of us, our teacher, is to share his best lessons.

And in his 2017 book, Congressman John Robert Lewis said the following: "Freedom is not a state; it is an act.

"It is not some enchanted garden perched high on a distant plateau where we can finally sit down and rest.

"Freedom is a continuous action we must all take, and each generation

must do its part to create an even more fair, more just society."

These are words to drive our work and our lives. And he spoke them to the world.

But to us, on June 4, on a call with so many of our colleagues, he told us: "Be brave. Don't get weary. Let's continue to work."

And I wrote those words down, because like everything John Lewis said, they struck me as powerful and important and worth remembering. And in his memory and in his honor, we should all do just that, continue to work.

□ 2045

Mr. JEFFRIES. Madam Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL).

Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL. Madam Speaker, it is difficult to express the immense loss and pain that not just myself but that this body feels at the passing of our good friend, John Lewis.

It has been one of my greatest honors and privileges to be able to serve alongside him in my short time here in this body and to get to know him. He brought to us courage. He inspired love and gave us optimism in some of the most difficult times.

He worked with joy in his heart, with courage and faith, and without fear. He was a fighter against injustice to anyone. I remember him saying that he was inspired to see the young men and women of all backgrounds, creeds, and religious backgrounds rise up in non-violent protest, demanding justice. I wonder if he knows that he started that back in 1965 in Selma, Alabama.

My kids, Jude and Siena, every time they came to Washington, they always sought out John Lewis because they looked up to him, just like all of us did.

It is silly that I am crying, Madam Speaker. I just met him a year ago. I think it is because, during some of the most difficult moments in our country, we can't afford to lose someone like him.

But I am so inspired today to hear my colleagues stand together in unity, and I know, and I am filled with optimism, that we will be able to exemplify his work, continue his work, and carry his dream of a better America forward.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. KILMER).

Mr. KILMER. Madam Speaker, when you meet your hero and they turn out even more amazing than you expected, it is really cool. That was my experience getting to work with John Lewis. In fact, sometimes when he spoke in Caucus, I would find myself texting a colleague, saying: You work with John Lewis.

The last time many of us heard his voice was early this summer on a Caucus conference call. He spoke up and said that he was sad because he was reminded that we weren't as far on the path to justice as any of us want our country to be. But then he said he was

hopeful because people, and particularly young people, were speaking up, standing up, and working for change.

In 2019, I brought one young person, my daughter, Sophie, to Selma, Alabama. We crossed Edmund Pettus Bridge with him. We listened to his stories. He was so kind to her and so patient with her questions. At the end of the trip, Sophie approached him at the airport, and she thanked him.

She said: I have one more question.

He said: Go ahead.

And she said: Were you ever scared?

And he said to her: You know, I was scared. But I knew I was doing the right thing, and I knew there were others who were depending on me standing up for them, too.

He stood up for so many for so long. One of the honors of my life was to get to serve with this extraordinary man, even watching him preside over the House as we passed a new Voting Rights Act.

His legacy of peace and love, of fighting for justice, fighting for voting rights, and of causing good trouble will live on.

Rest in peace and rest in power, Mr. Lewis.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN).

Mr. LANGEVIN. Madam Speaker, from the moment I arrived in Congress, the aura of John Lewis loomed large. He will rightfully be remembered as a giant of the civil rights movement and the conscience of the Congress.

To me, though, he will always be remembered as a man who I felt privileged and honored and humbled to call colleague and friend. He will always be remembered as the kind, humble, approachable gentleman from Georgia, a tireless fighter who rallied our Caucus at pivotal moments to make positive change, to stand for what is right, to give a voice to the powerless, to protect the rights of the disenfranchised. Of course, he was well-known for making noise and getting into good trouble, necessary trouble.

It was one of the great privileges of my life to join John Lewis in making some good and necessary trouble when he organized a peaceful sit-in on the House floor to demand action on gun violence.

John Lewis made a difference in the lives of millions, and his presence was always felt in Congress, but his absence will be felt even more.

Rest in peace, my friend.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Madam Speaker, how much time do we have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Madam Speaker, let me simply close this portion of our special hour in honor of our friend, our colleague, our mentor, our hero, the legendary John Lewis, by simply recounting his words: Never give up. Never give in. Keep the faith. Keep your eyes on the prize. And make some good trouble.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO CONGRESSMAN JOHN LEWIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL) for 30 minutes.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I very much appreciate the time tonight to honor one of Georgia's favorite sons.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, one of the greatest honors of my life has been to serve alongside John Lewis in this House of Representatives. John was my friend, and I know that thousands of people say the same thing, and guess what? They are all right.

John was my leader. I sat down in the well of this House with him in the morning, and we didn't get up again until the next morning because we were fighting, with him in the lead, to end gun violence. I got arrested with John Lewis, he probably for the 60-something time and me for the first, because we were fighting for immigration reform.

My husband and I had the honor of walking behind John to cross the Edmund Pettus Bridge three different times at a place where the State troopers in Alabama nearly took his life.

Over the years in our Democratic Caucus meetings, there was a tone that would get gloomy sometimes, and those were John Lewis moments. John would stand up and, in no uncertain terms, he would remind us of our mission. What people really wanted to hear from us, he told us, was hope, and no one could deliver hope like John Lewis.

I give you his words, words we needed to hear: Do not get lost in despair. Be hopeful. Be optimistic. Our struggle is not a struggle of a day, of a week, of a month, or of a year. It is the struggle of a lifetime.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHNEIDER).

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Madam Speaker, I count among my life's greatest blessings the distinction of being able to call John Lewis my colleague and my friend.

Martin Luther King said the moral arc of the universe bends toward justice. John Robert Lewis spent his entire life working to accelerate and complete that bend fully committed to justice, to nonviolence and, in his own words, to good trouble.

John Lewis' incredible capacity for love, his steadfast belief in nonviolence, and his limitless humility inspired all of us, Democrat and Republican, to be better. His singular character established him as the conscience of the Congress.

I have too many personal stories to share in a short 1-minute speech,

enough stories, in fact, to more than fill the entire hour. I will hold each of these treasured memories in my heart for the rest of my life.

I join with my colleagues to honor his legacy and together hope we will continue his work bending that arc toward justice.

Rest in peace, John, knowing your memory will be a blessing to your Nation and to all whose lives you touched.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY), the former chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, the committee on which John Lewis did so much of his important work for the great State of Georgia.

Mr. BRADY. Madam Speaker, John Lewis was many things. He was a father. He was a Congressman. As you know, he was a civil rights pioneer who marched with Martin Luther King, Jr. He was a husband. He was a son of the South, one who walked in the wind to bring equality to America and is now walking in the heavens with his Creator. He was a colleague.

John was all these extraordinary things, and he was also my friend. We are a better Nation and a better people because of him. This institution, of all of our country, will miss him dearly.

I always struggle to explain back home just what an extraordinary person he was. To know John was a blessing. To get to work with him on so many important issues on the Ways and Means Committee, including the first reform to the IRS in over two decades, making important improvements to Medicare for our seniors and those who need our help the most, that was an honor of a lifetime.

I served with him on the Ways and Means Committee for many years. He was a warm, needed, inspirational presence in that storied committee room. When I look down the dais, I will be sad to miss my friend. But I will always be proud to have had the privilege of working with such a remarkable spirit.

Each day he walked in these halls, we all witnessed firsthand his remarkable integrity, his intelligence toward the complex policy issues we debate, and his willingness to work across the aisle if it means Americans will have greater dignity, opportunity, and equal rights.

God loved this remarkable servant, and I know John is walking hand-in-hand with God and his beloved Lillian today.

I miss you, John. Cathy and I will continue to pray for you and all those who call you family. May you rest in peace and rise in glory. God bless you.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Madam Speaker, I rise today in honor of our friend and colleague, Congressman John Lewis.

With every march, every sit-in, every time we reject unjust rules and institutions designed to oppress any group, we honor the legacy of John Robert Lewis.

A record number of Americans have stood up, spoken up, and laced up their marching shoes in recent weeks. Millions of them are too young to know about the man in whose footsteps they are following as they make what he so rightly called good trouble.

□ 2100

May we all model his grace, courage, kindness, and commitment to nonviolence as a way of life and continue the good trouble he started even when—especially when—it is unpopular.

I feel so much gratitude to have learned from this giant of history, this singular American genius, and to have served, however briefly, alongside him. His loss is devastating. His memory everlasting.

Rest in power, my beloved brother.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, at this time, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COOPER).

Mr. COOPER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

No one loved Nashville, Tennessee, more than our friend and colleague John Robert Lewis.

As a young man, he arrived in Nashville on a bus with a ticket purchased by the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Dr. King wanted young John to attend American Baptist College.

For anyone wondering how to honor John Lewis and his legacy, think of his alma mater, American Baptist, and remember also the historically Black college and university that he later attended, Fisk University. If you want more John Lewises in the world, think of his beloved training grounds, American Baptist and Fisk.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI).

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise today with a heavy heart to honor the life of Representative John Lewis, whose passing is a tremendous loss for Congress and for the entire country.

I will always remember walking across the Edmund Pettus Bridge with him on the 50th anniversary of Bloody Sunday. I took my son with me on that trip, and when John passed last weekend, my son said this: "He is the most memorable person I have ever met. I will never forget what it feels like to be in the same room as him."

We will never forget what it felt like to serve in the same Chamber as him.

And as the Nation reckons with centuries of systemic racism, we owe a great debt to John Lewis and the "good trouble" he made in the civil rights movement, past and present. If we only had half his courage.

We as a Congress and we as a country would be better if we all exemplify his kindness, his passion, and his stoic ability to remain calm in any kind of storm. I can hear his voice urging us: Never give up, never give in, and always keep the faith.

Rest in peace, rest in power, John Lewis.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BARRAGÁN).

Ms. BARRAGÁN. Madam Speaker, like so many here tonight, I was inspired by John Lewis and his lifelong fight for our country to live up to its ideals to be more tolerant, more just, and more equal.

He was fearless. He sacrificed his body, bloodied by billy clubs and beatings from police, in hopes that future generations of people of color would not have to.

He was my hero. I called him "Mr. Lewis" when I first arrived to Congress, and I will never forget, he would say, "Call me John." He was so humble and supportive.

Hearing John Lewis tell firsthand stories of the fight for civil rights was a privilege. Walking the Edmund Pettus Bridge with him was something I will never forget.

We will honor his life by continuing to, and as he said, cause "good trouble, necessary trouble, and help redeem the soul of America."

As he wrote: "Freedom is the continuous action we all must take, and each generation must do its part to create an even more fair, more just society."

We will try.

Thank you, John.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Washington State (Mr. HECK).

Mr. HECK. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Early in my service, I got out of the car in the parking garage to walk into Cannon, and Mr. Lewis walked up behind me. I turned and he said: "Good morning, my brother." I opened the door to try to point for him to enter first, and he said: "You first, my brother."

I often heard him refer to my colleagues as "my brother" or "my sister," and for a while I actually was fooled into thinking that was because he hadn't yet learned our names. But that wasn't it. He knew. It was more a sign of respect and affection and mutuality.

No one has ever walked in this Chamber on this floor, before, now, or in the future, who will ever command the love and reverence of him, because he was a great man.

Godspeed to you in your journey, John Robert Lewis, my brother.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Oklahoma (Ms. KENDRA S. HORN).

Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

It is my honor to rise today to recognize, honor, and celebrate the life, legacy, and impact of Congressman John Lewis.

Of those who have left their mark on history, the unique and indelible imprint of John Lewis stands in a category all its own. His strength, cour-

age, commitment, compassion, kindness, and fierce determination to challenge injustice made the world a better place for all of us and truly bent the arc of history ever closer to justice.

John showed us that being bold and standing up for those whose voices aren't heard are inextricably linked with the need for compassion and hope.

Though I don't think any of us were ready to let him go—I know I certainly wasn't—I simply cannot imagine the world had he not been in it. And it is one of the greatest honors of my life to be able to have served with him and to call him a colleague and to join him on the civil rights pilgrimage last year, as I know many voices have said before.

And it was on this journey that I had the opportunity to share with him a blessing that had been bestowed upon me that I believe embodies the life and the lessons and the legacy of John Lewis that I will share today in his Honor.

"May God bless you with a restless discomfort about easy answers, half-truths, and superficial relationships, so that you may seek truth boldly and love deep within your heart."

"May God bless you with holy anger at injustice, oppression, and exploitation of people so that you may tirelessly work for justice, freedom, and peace among all people."

"May God bless you with a gift of tears to shed with those who suffer from pain, rejection, starvation, or the loss of all that they cherish so that you may reach out your hand to comfort them and transform their pain into joy."

"May God bless you with enough foolishness to believe that you really can make a difference in this world so that you are able, with God's grace, to do what others claim cannot be done."

Thank you, Mr. Lewis, for living those lessons and those words. Godspeed.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), a cardinal on the Appropriations Committee.

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

In October 1995, the Black clergy in my community asked if I could get Congressman John Lewis of Georgia to come to New Haven for our local elections. I was honored to welcome John to my hometown. Here is what I said about him that evening.

"John Lewis is a true hero of the cause of progress. It is often said that John Lewis is 'one of the most courageous persons the civil rights movement ever produced.' The most astonishing thing about that sweeping statement is that it probably doesn't go far enough to describe the heroics of the man you see before you. John Lewis has dedicated his life to protecting human rights, securing personal dignity, and building what he likes to call 'The Beloved Community.' His display of ethics and morality has won him rare admiration from both his House

colleagues and from leaders around the world over."

He thanked me for the introduction, and he said to the congregation, "I love my sister ROSA DELAURO."

And I loved that our offices, when I first came to the Congress, were next to each other.

I served with Congressman John Lewis for 30 years, and I consider myself blessed. My grandchildren, Teo, Rigby, Sadi, and Jasper, met John Lewis. He signed for them his book, "March."

John Lewis' "March" tells the story of a poor sharecropper's son who transformed America and so much more. There are few in the world who change it. John Lewis changed it.

The Black clergy in my community, my grandchildren, my family, you can be sure we will carry on your work, John Lewis. Count on it.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOULTON).

Mr. MOULTON. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

When I was younger, we seemed to have a lot of American heroes around, from the Greatest Generation that won World War II to the civil rights leaders of the 1950s, to the men who walked on the Moon. To call one of them a colleague was one of the greatest honors of my life, and it hit me every day I saw John Lewis on the House floor.

"Good morning, sir," was may usual greeting. Not because of my Marine background or his age—most people in Congress are older than me—but simply because there is nobody in Congress who had more respect. Nobody.

But he was much more than just a towering figure. He was a loving, caring, indefatigably optimistic friend and mentor, especially to young people like me.

John and I took bets on the 2017 Super Bowl, with the winner committing to visiting the loser's district. After the Patriots had the greatest comeback in Super Bowl history, we started talking dates for his trip to Massachusetts. But with a few conflicts and his getting older, I proposed an alternative: a visit to some of the civil rights sites in his hometown.

Through all the turmoil of the last few years, there are only two times I have cried in Congress: visiting the prison in Hanoi with John McCain and visiting Atlanta with John Lewis.

If you ever doubt what a hero John and his fellow American patriots were, spend some time in Atlanta or Birmingham or Selma, where he came within an inch of his life fighting to uphold a nation's ideals even when the nation said they don't apply to you or your family.

I found myself wondering if I would have had the courage to join in those protests to be a freedom fighter, to change a nation. That is what John Lewis did. He changed America, and in so doing, he changed the world.

And he never lost faith in either as he did it.

During the impeachment trial, I asked him if he had ever seen it this bad. And while he told me never, not even during the civil rights movement, because he said there was more hope, more movement, he nonetheless maintained his characteristic optimism and looked at me confidently like a preacher to his Sunday school student and said: But, don't worry. We will get through it. Keep the faith, brother. Keep the faith.

We miss you, John.

□ 2115

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I would inquire how much time remains.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia has 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. DEAN).

Ms. DEAN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, like many others in this Chamber, the last time I heard Mr. Lewis' voice was on a Caucus call recently. Congressman Lewis implored us: Be bold. Be brave. Keep the faith. Keep your eyes on the prize. Keep working. There is much work to be done. Don't get weary. Continue the work.

John Lewis was a hero to all of us for causing "good trouble" and for standing on the right side of history, for standing for our common humanity.

His humility, strength, and belief in the greatness of this country never faltered. What a blessing it has been to me to serve with him.

I had the privilege of being with him on a visit in Florida to the detention camp where immigrant children were kept separated from their parents, and through an interpreter, he spoke to the children.

He had two messages. So whether he was speaking to us in Congress or to a President or to children, his message was the same, and the same was: Believe in the promise of America. Keep the faith. Be bold. Don't be disturbed.

His other message, his second message, was one of welcome, and the beaming children loved that. He said: Welcome to America. We welcome you.

His was a memory of kindness and humility and optimism for a better place, an America that was promised in our founding documents.

On many occasions, we have fallen short, short of the American promise of equality and justice for all. Mr. Lewis' scars revealed that.

His memory will be a beacon for justice and equality and for the unfinished business of the people to be a country of mercy, of decency, and of love.

Thank you, Mr. Lewis. Lucky us to have passed this way with you.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I didn't have the 52-year relationship with Mr. Lewis that SANFORD BISHOP talked about earlier. I wasn't even born when that relationship started. This very powerful and imposing face beside me, I have very little association with.

If Mike Collins goes back and looks in the files, I believe he will find that they turned down a young man named ROB WOODALL for a job back in 1994. It wasn't that I didn't try to get a good mentorship from John Lewis, I just didn't meet the John Lewis bar at that time.

But my experience with him has been Biblically based, as so many have. But mine has been: Let the children come to me. Do not hinder them, for to such belongs the kingdom of God.

If I could arrange it, I would walk down the steps behind John as he was going down the Capitol steps after a vote, because children from all over the country would come running up, "Mr. Lewis, Mr. Lewis," just wanting to say hello.

Whether it was the steps of the Capitol, the busiest airport in the world at Hartsfield International, or anywhere in between, I never once saw John in too much of a hurry with too much on his mind to take the time to make sure the next generation understood what happened in the last generation and the difference they could make for yet another generation.

The story has already been told that staff members would say the only thing they want to do on Capitol Hill is meet Mr. Lewis before they leave.

Time and time again, that is the story of any Georgia Member because, growing up, Mr. Lewis was Mr. Lewis. He always says, "Call me John," but he is always Mr. Lewis and always will be.

So much of the story that we have heard told about John tonight, Madam Speaker, has been about John the fighter. It is so meaningful to me that the other half of the stories we have heard tonight are about John the embracer.

We have plenty of fighters in this institution, and we have our fair share of embracers in this institution. We don't have as many folks who are every bit as good at embracing as they are at fighting.

We will miss John's leadership in that respect in the great State of Georgia, Madam Speaker, and we will miss him here in this institution.

Madam Speaker, I thank my colleagues for coming out tonight, I know, to honor their friend and their colleague, but certainly to honor our great son from Georgia.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

HONORING CONGRESSMAN JOHN ROBERT LEWIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. JACKSON LEE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. CLARK) for 30 minutes.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and ex-

tend their remarks on the topic of tonight's Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Madam Speaker, what a privilege it has been not only to serve with John Lewis, but to be witness tonight to the remembrances of our icon, the peace-maker, the justice seeker, Congressman John Robert Lewis.

Personally, I never got used to working with John Lewis, and I struggled to call him "John."

I met him right after I got sworn in, in a special election, near the chair in which he often sat. I was completely tongue-tied.

Whether it was a casual hello, a walk back and forth from the Capitol for votes, or planning a sit-in, every single interaction with John was profound.

John knew oppression and he knew racial violence. He had been beaten, clubbed, spat on, and denigrated. John had experienced the worst forms of bigotry. He had seen the worst in people, and yet it steeled his determination and it deepened his faith.

John Lewis is the kindest man I have ever known. Love, compassion, integrity were the hallmarks of everything he did, big or small.

Like so many of you, I was fortunate enough to be able to go to Selma on several occasions with John and walk the Civil Rights Trail.

To hear John Lewis speak on the Edmund Pettus Bridge is transformative. That bridge is an unusual structure. It has a steep rise as it comes up, it flattens in the middle, and then there is a steep descent.

I could imagine John Lewis, as I saw him speak from that bridge, being a young man leading, with Hosea Williams, a column of 600 marchers and getting to the middle of that bridge and for the first time being able to see what awaited them, the sea of State troopers, of angry crowds. I am sure he could feel the violence in the air like electricity.

But John did not turn back. He did not falter in the face of hatred and of violence. He was fortified by the moral clarity of why he was marching: to ensure that every American had the right to vote.

And we know what happened. We know they were beaten, trampled, and gassed. But they reconvened and marched to Montgomery and made the Civil Rights Act the law of the land.

Today we find ourselves again in this country in the middle of the bridge, and we can see the danger ahead. We can see those who seek to divide this country, suppress the vote, and cut off opportunity. While John Lewis cannot physically lead us across that bridge, he has taught us what to do.

Many of us have referenced what would be the last words for us to hear from John Lewis, and he spoke, as always, inspirationally about the true

sorrow he felt for the soul of America, that in the wake of the brutal murder of George Floyd we were not in a better place, and that those poisonous, toxic roots of slavery still entangled our institutions and our Nation.

But he also said to us that he had never been more optimistic, watching the peaceful protesters across this country assemble.

He told us, as he always did, to be bold, to not be weary. He told us that the winds of change are blowing.

So we must honor him by continuing our work, by unfurling those sails to catch that wind, and to live for justice; to see, as he saw, the divinity in not only John Lewis, but in all of us; and to know that, collectively, we can continue the march that he started for us, and we can bring this country to live up to the ideals of justice and equality for all.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. RUIZ), a distinguished Member.

Mr. RUIZ. Madam Speaker, when I stood in John Lewis' presence, I stood in awe, in reverence, and with great respect.

John Lewis was an extraordinary man of faith, perseverance, virtue, and kindness. He endured ridicule and beatings during his nonviolent fight alongside Dr. King.

He spent a lifetime fighting against injustices, poverty, white supremacy, and racism, and for equality and human dignity. He was a social justice and civil rights warrior who inspired me, all of us in this Chamber and this Nation.

He was a man of God on a relentless mission of peace to create the kingdom and bring to Earth life as it is in Heaven.

As great a man as he was, he was always humble and gentle. He was always faithful in his fight for freedom from oppression.

John was also a friend. He always asked how my daughters, Sky and Sage, were doing on the House floor and in the hallways, and even visited them during their birthday parties in my D.C. office.

He will undoubtedly be greeted in Heaven by our creator with the words, "Job well done, my humble servant," an honor well-deserved and greater than life itself.

May John Lewis rest in God's almighty power.

I love you and I miss you, brother.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ESPAILLAT).

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Madam Speaker, I represent the 13th Congressional District in New York. It has many wonderful neighborhoods in it, the iconic neighborhood of Harlem, which has given birth to many luminaries, including the great late Adam Powell and, of course, the Lion of Lenox Avenue, Charles B. Rangel.

But when I came here, Madam Speaker, there sat John Lewis in his dig-

nified serenity. He brought to this Chamber and he bore the wounds and the scars of a struggle over 400 years old, and they could not be ignored.

Even in his dignified serenity, beyond his great words that were conciliatory and peaceful in scope, the scars and the wounds of the struggle that he bore in this august Chamber could not be ignored.

□ 2130

So, Madam Speaker, I say to John Lewis today, that from Harlem, and from all the Harlems in all the States of this great Union, a very important message I bring to this floor.

Rest in peace, great warrior.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Madam Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from the great State of Florida (Mr. SOTO); and I would ask my colleagues to keep their comments to 2 minutes.

Mr. SOTO. Madam Speaker, Mr. John Lewis has often been called the conscience of the Congress.

He also led our Democratic Caucus during some of our toughest moments. In 2017, there was a strong effort to repeal the Affordable Care Act. We were in the minority. We were demoralized. Things seemed hopeless.

It was in this darkest hour that the legendary John Lewis thundered; channeling Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., he said, We may have all come on different ships, but we are all in the same boat now. We have to stick together. We have to stand up. We have to do what is right. Millions of Americans are counting on us.

And as he thundered those words, chills ran down my spine, and a moral righteousness took over me as he brought our entire caucus to our feet. And we fought the good fight, though we lost the vote in the House. But we still inspired the American people.

The effort to repeal ObamaCare ultimately failed in the Senate, and Mr. John Lewis lit the spark with his words, his spirit, and his courage.

Rest in power, Mr. Lewis.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Madam Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO), my good friend.

Mr. TONKO. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

It is with the heaviest of hearts that I stand in tribute to Congressman John Robert Lewis this evening.

Brother John, your imprint on my heart and soul is forever.

The loss of John Lewis has left us with a deep, unanswerable sadness, and a resolve that will echo in this Chamber and within all of our hearts forever.

Time and again, John gave us the gift of his courage and lit our path with a humble but fierce moral light. He risked everything to teach us, to remind us what it really means to fight for liberty and justice for all; and why we must fight on, even after our great champion has fallen.

My thoughts, my prayers, and my heart go out to John's family, to Mi-

chael, and his staff, his community, and all who knew and loved this giant of a man.

May John's light always fill the halls of our Capitol. May his hope guide our hands, and his vision for a more perfect Union continue to inspire us with timeless faith and purpose.

Of late, when I would talk to Brother John, he had a concern that those wheels of progress toward a more perfect Union might roll backward. We cannot tolerate that. Brother John taught us that; that we will only go forward.

So if we truly loved this man, if we truly want to honor his spirit, let us make certain that those wheels of progress toward a more perfect Union, in fact, go forward and upward.

God bless you, my friend. You walked so humbly with your God. Rest in peace. Rest in power, my dear and so noble of a friend.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Madam Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER).

Ms. SPEIER. Madam Speaker, I rise to celebrate the life of a man I loved, our colleague, John Robert Lewis.

To John-Miles, his son, to Michael Collins, his remarkable and devoted chief of staff, to his entire staff, we grieve with you.

When I think about John Lewis, and to describe him:

A commitment to God? Immovable.

A commitment to believe that we are all equal before God? Immutable.

Belief that the law must support the biblical belief in the equality of all mankind? Unyielding.

Because his great-grandfather was the victim of grave injustice, he didn't have to watch a movie to hear the call of a slave master's voice in the wind. He rebelled against that voice to deliver justice during his life.

In the 1960s, he was deemed a radical, a radical with a passionate belief in peaceful civil disobedience, so much so that he was arrested 40 times and beaten multiple times.

John knew that the televised images of police beatings and cracked skulls animated the just souls of 1965 to build a chariot of liberty in the Civil Rights Act of that era.

John wept at the sight of George Floyd being murdered, but also saw that another moment to create a more just and perfect Union was upon us.

In the coming days, when the streets are filled with those who mourn John, we will see people in fine suits and people in rags. We will see laborers and professionals. We will see faces pained by disease or poverty. But all of them will rejoice that John Lewis lived.

There will never be another John Lewis. In fact, I believe no Member of Congress is greater than the John Lewis that has walked across the threshold of this Chamber.

God rest, good man. You changed our country. You were a purveyor of good trouble. You taught us what was non-

negotiable. You changed this country forever more.

I will end with his quote, and he said: "I say to people today, you must be prepared if you believe in something. If you believe in something, you have to go for it. As individuals, we may not live to see the end."

Well, my dear friend, you may not see the end, but before this year is over, the John Lewis Voting Rights Act of 2020 will be delivered; and I hope someday a statue of you will be in Statuary Hall so we can all pass by it and touch your shoes and have your spirit fill our hearts.

God rest your soul. Rest in power.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Madam Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN).

Mr. SHERMAN. Madam Speaker, John R. Lewis honored us with his presence on this floor for over 3 decades. That a man of such courage and such accomplishment would dedicate so much of his life to this House confirmed the decision of all of us to give up our private lives and private measures and to spend our time here in the people's House.

Five years ago, I was honored to go to TERRI SEWELL's hometown of Selma and on the 50th anniversary to walk with John Lewis across the Edmund Pettus Bridge where, 50 years prior to that time, John Lewis had been beaten down and his skull fractured. We walked forward across that bridge with John Lewis, and with the President of the United States, President Barack Obama, to prove that America walks forward, and that the progress that we have made cannot be turned back.

Years later, many of us joined John on this floor to make some good trouble when we took over the floor of this House to demand a vote on common-sense gun control.

President Barack Obama, when he awarded John the Presidential Medal of Freedom, said: "Generations from now, when parents teach their children what is meant by courage, the story of John Lewis will come to mind; an American who knew that change will not wait for some other person or some other time, whose life is a lesson in the fierce urgency of now."

And that is why I say now is the time to pass what should be called the John R. Lewis Voting Rights Act. John Lewis was too great a man for us to fail to provide a substantive memorial.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Madam Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GOTTHEIMER).

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. Madam Speaker, as someone who was on the battlefield of nearly every civil rights fight of the last century, Mr. John Lewis taught us that our Nation is always a work in progress, always perfecting our Union.

Through it all though, regardless of what he faced, John Lewis always walked gracefully with the wind, following the words of Isaiah: "They shall

mount up with wings like eagles; they shall run and not be weary; they shall walk and not faint."

My friend, our hero, John Lewis never grew weary, no matter what the fight, including his last.

It was a remarkable blessing, as we heard tonight, from so many, to serve with your hero, to have him meet and hug your children, to meet a true American hero. There was none like him in this Chamber, and I think there never will be.

I will never forget the last hug that I got from him when I told him how much he meant to me; how much I appreciated his counsel; when he visited, how much I appreciated him coming to my district to speak with my community, and just all he did for all of us.

And he whispered back, as he said to so many others, "Just stay strong, my brother."

Mr. Lewis, that is the least we can do for you is to always stay strong.

Congressman Lewis was an American icon, as we all know. But he was a gentle giant, and his life's work will live on forever. His presence, his humble kindness will always loom large over this House and over our great Nation.

As Congressman Lewis said: "If you see something that is not right, not fair, not just, you have a moral obligation to do something about it." And I think we all need to remember that, especially now. I know that I will.

Thank you, Congressman John Lewis, our friend. God bless you.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Madam Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from Iowa (Mrs. AXNE). But please, I urge my colleagues, our time is very short. We want everyone to be able to speak, so please try to keep your comments under 2 minutes. One minute would be preferable.

Mrs. AXNE. Madam Speaker, tonight I had the rare privilege to preside over the House as our colleagues spoke about our beloved colleague, John Lewis, an honor I will remember for the rest of my life.

And as I turned to hear the stories from both Republicans and Democrats, I was struck by the sentiments over and over about how John not only gave them hope, but made them better human beings because of his silent strength, his hopeful nature, and his love for all, even in the face of despair.

□ 2145

As a new Member who is truly here because I believe there is need for more good trouble in this world and the need for those who will stand up for what is right, I am blessed to have been in John's presence and to have learned from him even in quick moments on the floor. His hope was contagious, as was his love for God, our country, and his fellow Americans. His enduring teachings will live on in all who seek out justice.

God bless John Lewis, God bless his family, and may he live in peace and power.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Madam Speaker, I yield to the distinguished Member from New Mexico (Mr. LUJÁN).

Mr. LUJÁN. Madam Speaker, I rise today in remembrance of our friend and colleague John Lewis, the gentleman from Georgia, a great man, a treasure, and our brother.

Congressman Lewis spent his life fighting for justice. When Mr. Lewis spoke, he did so with a force and moral clarity.

He was an original freedom fighter who embodied what it means to be a humble public servant.

John never let anything stand in the way of doing what was right. His legacy will continue by the generations of brothers and sisters he inspired to get in good trouble.

It was a blessing to have known Congressman Lewis, and I know his light will continue shining bright in the courage and conviction of the American people. As we lay our friend to rest, the torch of justice shines bright. Let us honor Congressman Lewis by continuing his fight.

Rest in power, my friend.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN).

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, I thank Ms. CLARK for organizing this beautiful observance and testimony to our beloved colleague.

I want to praise John Lewis, not the Congressman, but John Lewis the member of SNCC, the Student Non-violent Coordinating Committee, a relative handful of students who began a process that transformed America forever and brought down the walls of American apartheid and Jim Crow through the extraordinary force of their physical courage, their moral courage, and their political courage to confront an entire system of racism bearing down upon them.

The end of their struggle was non-violence, to create a nonviolent society committed to justice and equality for everyone, and the means of arriving at that nonviolent society was non-violence itself. So even as the sheriffs and police officers unleashed the German shepherds and the billy clubs on them, the water hoses and the teargas, they still remained remarkably non-violent the entire way there.

I asked John Lewis when we got to travel down South on the civil rights tour with the Faith and Politics Institute about where he thought things were. I think he felt that, in terms of civil rights, we have been moving things forward, but in terms of violence, we still had not remotely turned the corner.

I said, what is going to make the difference? He said: When people realize that violence doesn't work. Leaving aside the morality of it, violence doesn't work.

We talked about the Vietnam war. We talked about the Iraq war. We talked about gun violence sweeping the

streets. And we talked about domestic violence.

I want to say that the spirit and the memory of John Lewis live in this body and this institution, which loves him. But I see the spirit of John Lewis today in the streets with the hundreds of thousands and millions of young Americans who are demanding non-violent, just, and peaceful transformation of our society. John Lewis lives in the young people today, and he would be so proud of the young people of America.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Madam Speaker, it is difficult to close such a remembrance and a celebration, and we will never close the chapter on our friendship, admiration, and reverence for John Lewis. But John Lewis, for me, has always been the embodiment of the words of Micah 6. John has shown us what is good: to love justice, love mercy, and walk humbly with your God.

Rest in peace, power, and glory, Brother John.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. GRIFFITH (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today on account of health concerns.

PUBLICATION OF BUDGETARY MATERIAL

REVISION TO THE AGGREGATES, ALLOCATIONS, AND OTHER BUDGETARY LEVELS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2021

COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, July 22, 2020.

MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (CBA), the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (BBEDCA), and the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2019 (BBA), I hereby submit for printing in the Congressional Record a revision to the aggregates and allocations set forth in the statement of aggregates, allocations, and other budgetary levels for fiscal year 2021 published in the Congressional Record on May 1, 2020.

This revision is for allowable adjustments for amounts for wildfire suppression, program integrity, Overseas Contingency Operations, and disaster relief, pursuant to sec-

tion 251 (b) of BBEDCA, as provided in bills reported by the Committee on Appropriations. The amounts for wildfire suppression are contained in the text of H.R. 7612, the Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2021. The amounts for program integrity are contained in the text of H.R. 7614, the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2021. The amounts for Overseas Contingency Operations are contained in the text of H.R. 7617, the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2021. Finally, the amounts for disaster relief are contained in the texts of H.R. 7668, the Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Act, 2021 and H.R. 7669, the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2021.

Accordingly, I am revising aggregate spending levels for fiscal year 2021 and the allocation for the House Committee on Appropriations for fiscal year 2021. For purposes of enforcing titles III and IV of the CBA and other budgetary enforcement provisions, the revised aggregates and allocations are to be considered as aggregates and allocations included in the budget resolution, pursuant to the statement published in the Congressional Record on May 1, 2020.

Questions may be directed to Jennifer Wheelock or Raquel Spencer of the Budget Committee staff.

JOHN YARMUTH.

TABLE 1.—REVISION TO ON-BUDGET AGGREGATES

(On-budget amounts, in millions of dollars)			
	2021	2021–2030	
Current Aggregates:			
Budget Authority	3,867,565	n.a.	
Outlays	3,834,593	n.a.	
Revenues	2,800,378	35,724,078	
Revision for the Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2021 (H.R. 7612):			
Budget Authority	2,350	n.a.	
Outlays	1,722	n.a.	
Revenues	—	—	
Revision for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2021 (H.R. 7614):			
Budget Authority	1,631	n.a.	
Outlays	1,302	n.a.	
Revenues	—	—	
Revision for the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2021 (H.R. 7617):			
Budget Authority	—	n.a.	
Outlays	1,500	n.a.	
Revenues	—	—	
Revision for the Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Act, 2021 (H.R. 7668):			
Budget Authority	143	n.a.	
Outlays	110	n.a.	
Revenues	—	—	
Revision for the Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2021 (H.R. 7669):			
Budget Authority	5,060	n.a.	
Outlays	1,365	n.a.	
Revenues	—	—	
Revised Aggregates:			
Budget Authority	3,876,749	n.a.	
Outlays	3,840,592	n.a.	

TABLE 1.—REVISION TO ON-BUDGET AGGREGATES—
Continued

(On-budget amounts, in millions of dollars)		
	2021	2021–2030
Revenues	2,800,378	35,724,078

n.a. = Not applicable because annual appropriations acts for fiscal years 2022 through 2030 will not be considered until future sessions of Congress.

TABLE 2.—ALLOCATION OF SPENDING AUTHORITY TO THE
HOUSE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

(Unified amounts in millions of dollars)		2021
Current Discretionary Allocation:		
BA	1,375,000	
OT	1,451,628	
Revision for Wildfire Suppression (H.R. 7612):		
BA	2,350	
OT	1,722	
Revision for Program Integrity (H.R. 7614):		
BA	1,881	
OT	1,512	
Revision for Overseas Contingency Operations (H.R. 7617):		
BA	0	
OT	1,500	
Revision for Disaster Relief (H.R. 7668):		
BA	143	
OT	110	
Revision for Disaster Relief (H.R. 7669):		
BA	5,060	
OT	1,365	
Revised Discretionary Allocation:		
BA	1,384,434	
OT	1,457,837	
Current Law Mandatory:		
BA	1,172,696	
OT	1,152,482	

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The Speaker announced her signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 4148. An act to extend the Chemical Facility Anti-Terrorism Standards Program of the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes.

S. 4209. An act to amend title IX of the Social Security Act to improve emergency unemployment relief for governmental entities and nonprofit organizations.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 4(b) of House Resolution 967, the House stands adjourned until 9 a.m. tomorrow for morning-hour debate and 10 a.m. for legislative business.

Thereupon (at 9 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, July 23, 2020, at 9 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

BUDGETARY EFFECTS OF PAYGO LEGISLATION

Pursuant to the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (PAYGO), Mr. YARMUTH hereby submits, prior to the vote on passage, the attached estimate of the costs of H.R. 7573, a bill to direct the Architect of the Capitol to replace the bust of Roger Brooke Taney in the Old Supreme Court Chamber of the United States Capitol with a bust of Thurgood Marshall to be obtained by the Joint Committee on the Library and to remove certain statues from areas of the United States Capitol which are accessible to the public, to remove all statues of individuals who voluntarily served the Confederate States of America from display in the United States Capitol, and for other purposes, as amended, for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

ESTIMATE OF PAY-AS-YOU-GO EFFECTS FOR H.R. 7573

By fiscal year, in millions of dollars—

	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2020–2025	2020–2030
Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Impact	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5
Components may not sum to totals because of rounding.													

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,
ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

4744. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of General David L. Goldfein, United States Air Force, and his advancement to the grade of general on the retired list, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 1370(c)(1); Public Law 96-513, Sec. 112 (as amended by Public Law 104-106, Sec. 502(b)); (110 Stat. 293); to the Committee on Armed Services.

4745. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's report on the Social and Economic Conditions of Native Americans for FY 2017, Focusing on: Curbing Opioid Abuse in Native American Communities, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 2992-1; Public Law 88-452, Sec. 811A (as added by Public Law 102-375, Sec. 822(12)); (106 Stat. 1299); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

4746. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — Indian Education Discretionary Grant Programs; Professional Development Program (RIN: 1810-AB58) received July 7, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

4747. A letter from the Program Analyst, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's Declaratory Ruling — Promoting Broadcast Internet Innovation through ATSC 3.0 [MB Docket No.: 20-145] received June 25, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4748. A letter from the Program Analyst, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Authorizing Permissive Use of the "Next Generation" Broadcast Television Standard [GN Docket No.: 16-142] received July 7, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4749. A letter from the Program Analyst, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's Declaratory Ruling — Implementation of State and Local Governments' Obligation to Approve Certain Wireless Facility Modification Requests Under Section 6409(a) of the Spectrum Act of 2012 [WT Docket No.: 19-250] (RM-11849) received June 25, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4750. A letter from the Director, Office of Acquisition Policy, Office of Government-wide Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's Small Entity Compliance Guide — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Federal Acquisition Circular 2020-07 [Docket No.: FAR-2020-0051, Sequence No. 3] received July 16, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

4751. A letter from the Director, Office of Acquisition Policy, Office of Government-

wide Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Technical Amendments [FAC: 2020-07; Item VI; Docket No.: FAR-2020-0052; Sequence No. 2] received July 16, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

4752. A letter from the Director, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Orders Issued via Fax or Electronic Commerce [FAC 2020-07; FAR Case 2018-022; Item V; Docket No.: FAR-2019-0010; Sequence No. 1] (RIN: 9000-AN80) received July 16, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

4753. A letter from the Director, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Evaluation Factors for Multiple-Award Contracts [FAC 2020-07; FAR Case 2017-010; Item III; Docket No.: FAR-2017-0010; Sequence No. 1] (RIN: 9000-AN54) received July 16, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

4754. A letter from the Director, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Modifications to Cost or Pricing Data Requirements [FAC 2020-07; FAR Case 2018-005; Item IV; Docket No.: FAR-2018-0006; Sequence No. 1] (RIN: 9000-AN69) received July 16, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

4755. A letter from the General Counsel, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting the Board's Semiannual Inspector General Report for the period October 1, 2019 through March 31, 2020, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, as amended; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

4756. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's Administration for Community Living's Elder Justice Coordinating Council 2016-2018 Report to Congress, pursuant to Title XX of the Social Security Act, Subtitle B, the Elder Justice Act of 2009; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4757. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's IRB only rule — Guidance on Waiver of 2020 Required Minimum Distributions [Notice 2020-51] received July 7, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4758. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final regulation — Guidance Under Section 6033 Regarding the Reporting Requirements of Exempt Organizations [TD: 9898] (RIN: 1545-BN28) received June 11, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4759. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's "Report to Congress — Annual Update: Identification of Quality Measurement Priorities and Associated Funding for the Consensus Based Entity (currently the National Quality Forum) and Other Entities", pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 1395aaa(e); Aug. 14 1935, ch. 531, title XVIII, Sec. 1890(e) (as amended by Public Law 115-123, Sec. 50206(b)); (132 Stat. 184); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

4760. A letter from the General Counsel, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting a report on the actuarial status of the railroad retirement system, pursuant to 45 U.S.C. 231f-1; Public Law 98-76, Sec. 502 (as amended by Public Law 104-66, Sec. 2221(a)); (109 Stat. 733); jointly to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure and Ways and Means.

4761. A letter from the General Counsel, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting the 2020 annual report on the financial status of the railroad unemployment insurance system, pursuant to 45 U.S.C. 369; Public Law 100-647, Sec. 7105; (102 Stat. 3772); jointly to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure and Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON
PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Ms. SHALALA: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1060. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 7608) making appropriations for the Department of State, foreign operations, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2021, and for other purposes (Rept. 116-459). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Ms. BASS (for herself, Mr. RESCENHALER, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, and Mrs. LESKO):

H.R. 7718. A bill to address the health needs of incarcerated women related to pregnancy and childbirth, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER (for himself, Ms. BONAMICI, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. NORTON, Mr. BEYER, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. COOPER, Mr. CORREA, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. GOMEZ, Ms. HAALAND, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. KENNEDY, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LEVIN of California, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MOORE, Ms. PINGREE, Mr.

RASKIN, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. TONKO, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. COHEN, Mr. PAYNE, and Ms. OMAR):

H.R. 7719. A bill to limit the use of Federal law enforcement officers for crowd control, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CISNEROS (for himself and Mr. BACON):

H.R. 7720. A bill to permit child care providers that receive payment for services provided under the of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 to use a portion of such payment to pay the cost of sanitation and other costs associated with the COVID-19 public health emergency, necessary to protect the health of participating children and child care workers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

H.R. 7721. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a refundable credit against tax for farmers who hire unemployed workers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FORTENBERRY (for himself and Ms. CRAIG):

H.R. 7722. A bill to limit the price of insulin drugs accessible for participants, beneficiaries, and enrollees enrolled in group or individual health insurance coverage and group health plans and for uninsured individuals who have diabetes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. TONKO, Mr. CÁRDENAS, and Mr. TRONE):

H.R. 7723. A bill to establish the position of Interagency Coordinator for Behavioral Health to coordinate the programs and activities of the Federal Government relating to mental health, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. MENG (for herself, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. COOPER, Mr. VELA, Ms. SHALALA, Mr. PAYNE, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. GALLEGO, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. RUSH, Ms. NORTON, Mr. NADLER, Ms. HAALAND, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. WELCH, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. POCAN, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. TITUS, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. SOTO, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. SIREN, Mr. PANETTA, and Ms. GARCIA of Texas):

H.R. 7724. A bill to prohibit the use of Federal funds to implement, administer, or enforce the Presidential Memorandum on Excluding Illegal Aliens From the Apportionment Base Following the 2020 Census, issued on July 21, 2020; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. MOORE (for herself and Mr. ESTES):

H.R. 7725. A bill to amend part D of title IV of the Social Security Act to allow States to use incentive payments available under the child support enforcement program to improve parent-child relationships, increase child support collections, and improve outcomes for children by supporting parenting time agreements for noncustodial parents in uncontested agreements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL:

H.R. 7726. A bill to permit child care providers that receive payment for services provided under the of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 to use a portion of such payment to purchase personal protective equipment, and other equipment, necessary to protect the health of participating children and child care workers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PAPPAS (for himself, Mr. PALAZZO, and Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire):

H.R. 7727. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to ensure that grants provided by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs for State veterans' cemeteries do not restrict States from authorizing the interment of certain deceased members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces in such cemeteries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee (for himself, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. BILLRAKIS, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, Mr. BOST, and Mr. BERGMAN):

H.R. 7728. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish presumptions of service-connection for members of the Armed Forces who contract COVID-19 under certain circumstances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RUIZ:

H.R. 7729. A bill to release the City of Banning, California, from all restrictions, conditions, and limitations on the use, encumbrance, conveyance, and closure of the Banning Municipal Airport; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. SUOZZI (for himself, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. ZELDIN):

H.R. 7730. A bill to extend the special air traffic rule for civil helicopters operating VFR along the North Shore, Long Island, New York, to require the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration to promulgate a new special air traffic rule, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. VAN DREW:

H.R. 7731. A bill to promote workforce recovery through the provision of additional training services and workforce investment activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ (for herself, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. MENG, Mr. PAPPAS, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. SHALALA, Ms. SCANLON, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, and Mr. MFUME):

H.R. 7732. A bill to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services, acting through the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, to carry out a national campaign to increase awareness and knowledge of the virus that causes COVID-19; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CHABOT:

H. Res. 1061. A resolution condemning war crimes committed in Idlib, Syria, by the regime of Bashar Al-Assad and its backers and calling for a political solution to the Syrian civil war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

185. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 11, to memorialize the United States Congress and the Louisiana congressional delegation to remove the revenue sharing cap on the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act of 2006 for Gulf producing states and to take such actions as are necessary to rectify the federal revenue sharing inequities between energy producing states; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

186. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 16, to memorialize the United States Congress and the Louisiana congressional delegation to take such actions as are necessary to clarify and provide guidance regarding the ability of freshwater fisheries affected by the COVID-19 pandemic to receive assistance funding from CARES Act dollars; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements, are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Ms. BASS:

H.R. 7718.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 7719.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section VIII of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. CISNEROS:

H.R. 7720.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, of the United States Constitution

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

H.R. 7721.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Sec. 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have the power to ... to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.

By Mr. FORTENBERRY:

H.R. 7722.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The constitutional authority for this bill is pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

H.R. 7723.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8

By Ms. MENG:

H.R. 7724.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution

By Ms. MOORE:
H.R. 7725.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8

By Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL:
H.R. 7726.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. PAPPAS:
H.R. 7727.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution states that “Congress shall have the authority to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.”

By Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee:
H.R. 7728.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, which states “[t]he Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States”

By Mr. RUIZ:
H.R. 7729.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution, to provide for the general welfare and make all laws necessary and proper to carry out the powers of Congress.

By Mr. SUOZZI:
H.R. 7730.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution, Congress has the power “to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or any Department or Officer thereof”.

By Mr. VAN DREW:
H.R. 7731.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ:
H.R. 7732.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 555: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 645: Mr. FOSTER, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. RUSH, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, and Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 733: Ms. MOORE.
H.R. 874: Mrs. FLETCHER.

H.R. 906: Mr. PENCE, Ms. HOULAHAN, Mr. FULCHER, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. CORREA, Mr. REED, Mr. TAYLOR, and Mr. HURD of Texas.

H.R. 1074: Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois.
H.R. 1164: Mr. FOSTER.
H.R. 1255: Ms. PINGREE.
H.R. 1434: Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina.
H.R. 1636: Mr. NEAL and Ms. DEGETTE.
H.R. 1799: Mr. UPTON.
H.R. 2150: Mr. RASKIN.
H.R. 2350: Mr. BEYER.
H.R. 2442: Mr. SERRANO, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. HECK, Mr. UPTON, and Ms. TLAIB.
H.R. 2653: Mr. SAN NICOLAS.
H.R. 2859: Mr. STEUBE.
H.R. 2908: Mr. KHANNA.
H.R. 3711: Mr. TRONE.
H.R. 4052: Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. SCANLON, and Ms. DEGETTE.

H.R. 4104: Ms. SHERRILL, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. BEYER, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mrs. TRAHAN, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. ESCOBAR, Mr. ROSE of New York, Mr. CONNOLLY, and Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 4236: Ms. PRESSLEY.
H.R. 4248: Ms. FINKENAUER.
H.R. 4549: Mrs. MILLER.
H.R. 4764: Mr. HECK and Mr. TRONE.
H.R. 4903: Mr. WALTZ.
H.R. 5002: Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. KIND, and Mr. GAETZ.

H.R. 5306: Mr. GROTHMAN and Mr. SOTO.
H.R. 5416: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 5902: Mr. KIND.
H.R. 6129: Mr. TRONE.
H.R. 6143: Mr. TRONE.
H.R. 6144: Mr. TRONE.
H.R. 6297: Mr. KATKO.
H.R. 6364: Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER.
H.R. 6384: Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. COHEN, Mrs. LURIA, and Mr. SAN NICOLAS.

H.R. 6561: Mr. DEUTCH.
H.R. 6646: Mr. SAN NICOLAS.
H.R. 6697: Mr. KELLY of Mississippi.
H.R. 6802: Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana and Mr. ZELDIN.

H.R. 6909: Mr. SERRANO.
H.R. 6939: Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 6950: Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 6962: Mr. SAN NICOLAS.
H.R. 6975: Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois.
H.R. 7019: Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana.
H.R. 7023: Mr. NEWHOUSE.
H.R. 7058: Mr. COSTA and Mr. LAHOOD.
H.R. 7061: Mrs. HARTZLER.
H.R. 7079: Mr. REED.

H.R. 7092: Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. YOUNG, Ms. DELAULO, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, and Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 7153: Ms. HOULAHAN, Mr. PETERS, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. SOTO, Mr. NEGUSE, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Ms. GARCIA of Texas.

H.R. 7197: Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. DEAN, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. CLAY, Ms. MATSUI, and Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 7200: Mr. KELLER.
H.R. 7211: Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina.
H.R. 7224: Mr. RIGGLEMAN.
H.R. 7292: Mr. TRONE and Mr. SOTO.
H.R. 7321: Mr. VAN DREW.
H.R. 7327: Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. HAALAND, and Mr. MOULTON.
H.R. 7328: Mr. COSTA.
H.R. 7334: Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee.
H.R. 7349: Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee.
H.R. 7355: Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee.
H.R. 7414: Mr. CARTWRIGHT and Mr. DEUTCH.

H.R. 7433: Ms. NORTON, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. CÁRDENAS.

H.R. 7449: Mr. CÁRDENAS.
H.R. 7456: Ms. PINGREE.
H.R. 7457: Mr. STAUBER, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. ROUZER.
H.R. 7496: Mr. COSTA and Mr. O'HALLERAN.
H.R. 7497: Mrs. HARTZLER.
H.R. 7499: Mr. SOTO.
H.R. 7512: Mr. LATTI.
H.R. 7515: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
H.R. 7520: Mr. CASE and Mr. THOMPSON of California.

H.R. 7521: Mr. DEFazio, Mr. POCAN, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. COHEN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. EVANS, Ms. TLAIB, and Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 7531: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 7550: Mrs. HAYES.
H.R. 7551: Mr. YOUNG.
H.R. 7562: Mr. KIND.
H.R. 7566: Mr. GOLDEN.
H.R. 7578: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 7587: Mr. TRONE.
H.R. 7601: Mr. RESCHENTHALER.
H.R. 7606: Mr. TAYLOR and Ms. ESCOBAR.
H.R. 7615: Mr. SMUCKER, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. FLORES, and Mr. LATTI.
H.R. 7642: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. PINGREE, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 7650: Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL.
H.R. 7651: Mr. LONG and Mr. UPTON.
H.R. 7652: Mr. BABIN.

H.R. 7674: Ms. PINGREE, Mr. COHEN, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. RYAN, and Mr. TED LIEU of California.

H.R. 7679: Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. BALDERSON, and Mr. CONAWAY.

H.R. 7693: Ms. BARRAGÁN.
H.R. 7700: Mr. WELCH, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, and Mr. RYAN.

H.R. 7710: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. MEUSER, Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee, and Mr. WALKER.

H.R. 7714: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.
H.J. Res. 14: Mr. GARCÍA of California.
H. Res. 702: Mrs. DAVIS of California.
H. Res. 902: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H. Res. 1042: Mr. PAYNE, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Ms. KELLY of Illinois.

H. Res. 1043: Mr. SAN NICOLAS.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII, petitions and papers were laid on the clerk's desk and referred as follows:

121. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Hamburg, NY Town Board, relative to a resolution addressing the dire need for direct funding from the federal government to state, town, village, and city governments to assist in alleviating some of the financial distress caused by the COVID-19 global pandemic; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

122. Also, a petition of Mr. Gregory D. Watson, a citizen of Austin, TX, relative to respectfully requesting enactment of Federal legislation that would completely halt the issuance of H1-B visas and Optional Practical Training visas — or renewals of such visas — to immigrants and aliens during periods of decline in the Gross Domestic Product of the United States, during periods in which the nationwide unemployment rate in the United States exceeds 5%, or during periods of a Presidentially-declared public health emergency in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 166

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JULY 22, 2020

No. 129

Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. GRASSLEY).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal spirit, grant to this Nation and to all people a social conscience built on the vision of the ancient prophets who saw sufficiency for every person and a time when anxiety would overcome chaos and hopelessness. Hasten the day when the small and weak can make their contributions alongside the great and powerful. Lead us to the day when we will see peace among the Nations of the Earth, when swords shall be beaten into plowshares. Use the Members of this body to bring us to the time when Your will is done on Earth, even as it is done in Heaven.

Lord, we trust You with our future. Let Your glory cover the Earth as the waters cover the sea.

We pray in Your mighty Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. LOEFFLER). The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I ask permission to speak for 1 minute in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SREBRENICA

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, there is an area in Bosnia that goes by the name of Srebrenica. This month is the 25th anniversary of a massacre that

took place there. It happens to be the worst genocide on European soil since the Holocaust.

Twenty-five years ago, 8,000 Bosnians were murdered out of ethnic and religious hatred. Many Bosnians, who witnessed this horrific atrocity, became refugees and found a home in my State of Iowa. We must remember for those Bosnians, Iowans, and for all Bosnians who suffer as they continue to deal with unimaginable memories. It is also important for the rest of us to make a point of remembering what has happened so we can prevent it from happening again.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, this week, the Senate will pass the 60th annual National Defense Authorization Act. Every year, this legislation lets the Senate make our top priorities for protecting our homeland, our allies, and our global interests into law, and, certainly, the recent behavior of our adversaries world over shows why this task is as urgent as ever.

Even as our Nation is focused on fighting the pandemic at home, our servicemembers have contended with dangerous behavior from would-be competitors all around the world. The

Russian military has kept probing the bounds of U.S. airspace, and Putin's regime has kept its sights on cyber war and destabilization by proxy.

China continues to treat international commercial lanes like its own private pond, choke freedom and autonomy out of Hong Kong, and try to ethnically cleanse Xinjiang.

Both countries continue to modernize their military capabilities from sea to space. And Iranian meddling, North Korean saber-rattling, and the persistent violence of terrorist groups like ISIS and al-Qaida demand our attention as well.

Amid these threats and many others, the American people and the entire free world look to the men and women of the U.S. military to preserve order and peace. The open and bipartisan process led by Chairman INHOFE and Ranking Member REED has produced strong legislation that will advance their missions.

It is the product of intense committee work; it contains more than 200 bipartisan amendments; and it builds on the historic progress which this administration and this Republican Senate have secured over the past 3 years.

After years of cuts to our military that weakened readiness, imperiled modernization, and called into question our commitment to preserving our global interests, we have reversed the tide. We have invested in strength. We built a new national defense strategy and are investing in rebuilding and modernizing our military to help achieve it.

This legislation will carry the progress even further—more support for defense research and innovation, resources for military housing and healthcare, tools to deepen our commitments with regional partners in Europe and the Pacific.

For most Americans, investing in the greatest fighting force in the world is not controversial. It is a no-brainer. But lest we forget, the radical energy

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S4363

on the far left is sparking some truly extraordinary behavior among our Democratic colleagues.

Case in point, later today, we will vote on an amendment that was advertised in an opinion essay by the junior Senator from Vermont titled “Defund the Pentagon: The Liberal Case.” This is the junior Senator from Vermont—an essay titled “Defund the Pentagon: The Liberal Case.”

You heard correctly. We have moved on from defunding local police to defunding the U.S. Armed Forces. Maybe we will be sending social workers on overseas deployments, when they aren’t too busy responding to violent crimes. I am not sure. Senator SANDERS’ amendment would literally decimate the defense budget. It would rip 10 percent of it right out and pour the money into all the socialist fantasies—free rent, free college, free everything for everyone.

Now, in light of the long-held views of our colleague from Vermont, a proposal like this may not be particularly shocking. What is remarkable is that the Democratic leader—the leader of their caucus—felt pressured into endorsing it.

Let me say that again: The Democratic leader, who in almost every floor speech tries to accuse this administration of being too soft on America’s adversaries, wants to literally decimate our defense budget to finance a socialist spending spree.

This turns out to be something of a pattern. On the Democratic side, it sometimes seems like we have hawks when it comes to speeches but chickens when it comes time to make policy. When they are on the sidelines, there is plenty of bark, but whenever they actually call a shot, there is zero bite. Lots of bark, little bite; all hat, no cattle.

That is how we end up with spectacles like the Democratic leader playing acting as a Russian hawk, when about a decade ago, he was publicly arguing we should cozy up to Putin, send Russia billions of dollars of cash, pull the plug on NATO missile defense pacts that hurt Putin’s feelings, and concede to him, “Russia’s traditional role” in the Caspian Sea region.

That was the Democratic leader in 2008. Pay off Putin, and let him have his sphere of influence. And now today, he wants to decimate defense spending. But in between, he spent years insisting that Democrats want to get tough—want to get tough on foreign policy.

You see how the game works: sound like hawks on television, act like chickens when making policy.

Defense spending demonstrates our will to defend ourselves and our interests in a dangerous world. Keeping our Nation safe is our foremost constitutional duty. We cannot shirk it.

My colleagues who profess concern over Putin’s efforts to interfere in our politics, or Xi’s efforts to rewrite the rules of the international system, must

know that we will never—never be able to deter such behavior if we sell our own soldiers short and surrender our technological edge.

I assure you, Beijing and Moscow will be watching this vote. I ask my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to reject this far-left fantasy. Defeat this amendment. Throughout the Cold War, we maintained a bipartisan commitment to American strength, American alliances, and a global peace built on American values. We will reinforce that stand when we sink—sink the reckless Sanders-Schumer amendment and again when we pass this bipartisan bill.

FREE SPEECH

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, on a final matter, since the spring, our Nation has engaged in important conversations about racial justice in policing.

Most people understand that continuing our Nation’s tremendous progress toward justice does not mean battling against American principles or American history. Progress means fulfilling our values, not attacking them.

Yet a group of radicals have latched onto this moment to say we should repudiate our country itself. We have watched as mobs have dragged statues of Washington, Jefferson, and Grant through the dirt. And, in parallel, inside many elite institutions, self-styled intellectuals say we should similarly discard the basic principles they fought for.

One of the key pillars of our Nation is the rule of law. In a civilized society, the same laws need to apply to everyone. The times our Nation has fallen short on this score, particularly for all the years when Black Americans were completely denied the equal protections of law, it has been to our great shame. This has been central to the cause of civil rights. There is a reason the 14th amendment insists on “the equal protection of the laws.”

Yet, in recent months, local leaders have violated this basic tenet. As riots rocked major cities, we saw politicians decline to act. They seem to fear far-left critique more than looting and chaos. And we saw the uneven application of other rules, like when mayors cheered on mass demonstrations but continued to prohibit religious gatherings. That is the rule of law in jeopardy. Of course, the last example is also a First Amendment issue. And the freedom of expression itself is another principle that has come under threat.

As I said a few weeks back, this goes deeper than just constitutional law. America has always prized the spirit of the First Amendment. We citizens must want to protect an open, civil discourse—a true marketplace of ideas. But, lately, the political left has embraced something totally different.

Today’s far left is not interested in winning debates with better arguments. They prefer to shut down de-

bate all together. They don’t try to win the contest. They just harangue the referees to stop the game. If they don’t like an op-ed, they want it unpublished. If they don’t like a tweet, they want to track down the author and get them fired. If they don’t like a tenured professor, they throw around Orwellian accusations that his or her ideas make them feel unsafe.

This hostile culture is getting results. According to one brand-new survey, it is only the far-left Americans who do not feel compelled to self-censor their views because of a hostile climate. Everyone but the left feels the threat.

And 50 percent of self-identified strong liberals say that simply contributing to the Republican Presidential candidate ought to be a fireable offense for a business leader. Let me say that again. Fifty percent of self-identified strong liberals say that simply contributing to the Republican Presidential candidate ought to be a fireable offense for a business leader. In this country?

We recently saw the New York Times apologize for publishing a straightforward policy argument from a U.S. Senator. Since, an editorial staffer resigned from the paper because even center-left opinions were not liberal enough and led to her constant harassment. That was a recent editorial staffer resigning from the New York Times because her center-left opinions were not liberal enough and led to her constant harassment at the times. You see, the safe spaces only go in one direction.

On elite campuses such as Princeton, we see faculty turning on their tenured colleagues and even administrators weighing in to chastise people with unpopular views.

We see online platforms such as Facebook threatening to ban political advertising altogether, chilling our democracy, because far-left employees and outside pressure groups berate them for letting the very speakers use their platform.

Even at a time when there is significant appetite in Congress to take a second look at the legal protections afforded to those supposedly neutral platforms, they still contemplate giving an angry minority of agitators a veto over Americans’ political speech.

The author Salman Rushdie, who was himself threatened with death for controversial speech, once said this:

Two things form the bedrock of any open society—freedom of expression and rule of law. If you don’t have those things, you don’t have a free country.

Free expression and the rule of law—exactly the two things we have seen eroded in recent months.

Rushdie recently signed an open letter with other intellectuals—many liberals—sounding the alarm on this cultural poison. “Editors are fired,” they wrote, “books are withdrawn . . . journalists are barred from writing on certain topics . . . professors are investigated . . . steadily narrow[ing] the

boundaries of what can be said without the threat of reprisal.”

Well, you can guess what happened next. The grievance industrial complex came after the letter itself. The authors were accused of advancing bigotry and the cycle of nonsense started all over again.

The United States of America needs free speech. We need free expression. And all of us, from all perspectives, need the courage to speak up and defend it.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2021—Resumed

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 4049, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 4049) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Inhofe amendment No. 2301, in the nature of a substitute.

McConnell (for Portman) amendment No. 2080 (to amendment No. 2301), to require an element in annual reports on cyber science and technology activities on work with academic consortia on high priority cybersecurity research activities in Department of Defense capabilities.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

CORONAVIRUS

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, Democrat Senators returned to Washington on Monday prepared to work in a bipartisan way on the next phase of coronavirus relief.

After stalling for months while COVID-19 surged in more than 40 States, Senate Republicans finally said that now—the end of July, more than 3 months after the CARES Act passed—would be the time for another emergency bill. But here we are. It is in the middle of the week, and the Republican Party is so disorganized, chaotic, and unprepared that they can barely cobble together a partisan bill in their own conference.

Indicative was Leader McConnell's speech. He rants and raves about the

New York Times and cancel culture, but there is not a word about COVID. People are ready to lose their unemployment benefits, to lose their apartments and be evicted. Local governments are laying off people because they don't have the dollars. We are in a national crisis.

We don't hear a word out of Leader McConnell as we are on the edge of so many cliffs. Instead, there is lots of talk about the New York Times and cancel culture. That may be fodder for the far right. That is not what America needs.

When Leader McConnell, at this crucial moment, can't even mention COVID-19, it shows what a knot the Republicans are tied in. The bottom line is this: The White House Chief of Staff said Republicans “were on their own 20 yard line” when it comes to their legislative proposal—their own 20-yard line, 2 months and a week after we passed the COVID 3 bill, after millions more Americans applied for unemployment, after many small businesses went under, and many more died and were hospitalized as COVID-19 rages in many Southern States. We are still on the 20-yard line? Where have the Republicans been?

I have never seen a political party in the middle of a crisis so tied in a knot that the majority leader can't even mention it in his speech and spends time ranting against favorite targets of the far right and can't come up with a proposal.

This is not a game. This isn't typical Republican dysfunction about whether or not they did or didn't see the President's last tweet. The disarray on the Republican side has real consequences. Americans will suffer unnecessary pain and uncertainty because of it.

The only reason there hasn't been another relief package in Congress already is due to this Republican incompetence and reckless delay. Even after all of these months, the White House and Senate Republicans are starkly divided about what to do. The White House is insisting on policies, like a payroll tax cut, that would do nothing to help millions of unemployed Americans and that many Senate Republicans don't even support. The Republicans can't even seem to agree on whether to provide any new aid for State and local governments or if the States should be able to more flexibly use the support we have already given.

A few of my friends on the other side of the aisle hardly want to spend any more money to help our country in this once-in-a-generation crisis because it might add to the national debt. Giant corporate tax cuts—\$1.5 trillion to \$2 trillion of them—are OK, but fighting the greatest public health crisis in a century and forestalling a depression is a bridge too far? Where are the priorities on the other side of the aisle? I guess they are for helping big corporate fat cats—wealthy people—but not average people who are hurting. That is the trouble with the Republican Party.

Seriously, there are only 3 weeks left until the August work period, and the Republicans are still in the opening phases of preparing their bill. We don't have time for this mess that the Republicans are in. The moratorium on evictions that we passed in the CARES Act expires in 2 days. The Wall Street Journal reports that nearly 12 million adults live in households that missed their last rent payments and that 23 million have little or no confidence in their ability to make the next ones.

Next week, the enhanced unemployment benefits we passed in the CARES Act will expire while 20 to 30 million Americans will still be without work. A recent study showed that those enhanced benefits prevented nearly 12 million Americans from slipping into poverty—12 million. Yet, because the Republicans can't get their act together, those benefits might expire next week.

Congress needs to act quickly. The Senate Republicans and the White House need to get on the same page, produce a proposal—not just drop it on the floor but start negotiations. Better yet, we could start negotiations on the Heroes Act, which already passed the House, and, unlike the developing Republican proposal, it would actually match the scale of this crisis.

Speaker Pelosi and I met yesterday with Chief of Staff Meadows and Secretary Mnuchin. Even with all of this chaos, we have had some indications about what the Republicans are trying to do in their bill. Over the weekend, we heard that the administration was trying to block additional funding for coronavirus testing and contact tracing. President Trump has also ended the CDC's data collection efforts, potentially risking access to data that public health experts so vitally need. So, when we met with Chief of Staff Meadows and Secretary Mnuchin, Speaker Pelosi and I told them to back off these counterproductive and dangerous ideas.

In addition, we will be sending a letter to the administration to demand answers on how data is being reported to the White House, as well as pushing for legislation in the upcoming bill to ensure that COVID-19 data is fully transparent and accessible without there being any interference from the administration.

We know Donald Trump likes to hide the truth. He thinks, when the truth doesn't come forward and when he muzzles government officials, that it changes things. It doesn't. The virus still rages and will rage unless we do something about it, not simply hide the statistics that show his depth in mendacity. We will make sure that those statistics are made public so all of America, including the President, will know how bad the situation is, because that is what we need—the truth to set us free and then to act on it. Let me repeat: If the administration refuses to reverse course, the Democrats will insist on data transparency in the next COVID relief bill.

All of our efforts to bolster the economy, help the unemployed, save small businesses, and ensure our children are safe at school will be meaningless if we don't stop the spread of the virus. Hiding COVID data from the CDC, as well as foot-dragging on more testing and tracing, is absolutely incomprehensible and imperils everything else we are working on. So we need to make a law, and we need to make it soon. Right now, the infighting and partisanship on the Republican side and cockamamie ideas, like hiding data from the CDC, are only adding to the delay.

We also saw the return of President Trump's coronavirus press briefings yesterday. It is remarkable that President Trump has lowered the bar so much that his performance yesterday was seen as a change in tone. It is a very sad state of affairs in our country when one day of the President's reading statistics is hailed as leadership when that is what he should have been doing all along. The mere acknowledgment by the President that COVID-19 is raging through our country is some kind of breakthrough. Is that what people believe? Is that what Trump wants the people to believe? It is crazy.

The truth is, every time the President takes the podium, he is a risk to public health. We are 6 months into the coronavirus, and the President has only just come around to the idea that wearing masks would be a good idea. He deserves criticism for that belated admission, not praise. We are 6 months into the crisis, and the President said yesterday that his administration is in the process of developing a strategy that is going to be very, very powerful—6 months in. Countries in Europe and East Asia developed national testing regimens ages ago. That is why they are way ahead of us in fighting this crisis.

Americans must be hanging their heads in shame and disbelief that this administration is still trying to sort out the basics. Then, when he says he is going to try and sort out the basics months and months too late, as the crisis has raged, people think he should get praise? No, he should be criticized because he hasn't done what he was supposed to have been doing for months.

President Trump started his press conference by labeling COVID-19 the "China virus," which shows the President is still trying to deflect blame and play political games with this deadly, serious virus—games that are divisive. The truth is, more than anything or anybody else, the responsibility for America's failure to deal competently with COVID-19 falls squarely on President Trump's shoulders. It is long past time for the President to start acting like it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic whip.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I read this morning that more Americans have died in the last 3 months

than in any 3-month period in the history of the United States. That is a stunning statistic. We are searching the records to make sure that it is an accurate statement, and I am afraid it is.

So far, we believe 140,000 Americans have died of this COVID-19 crisis that we are facing. This is not a moment of American greatness. They have just done a review of the nations across the world and the safety of living in those nations that face this pandemic. Where does the United States rank among the nations of the world in terms of safety in dealing with the coronavirus? It ranks 58th—two ranks ahead of Russia.

How could we have reached this moment in time when this pandemic has been so devastating in the United States, more so than in many other countries around the world—countries that are supposedly not even close to us in terms of economic development and strength? They have handled this far better than the United States. Yet what are we doing about it now? It is a valid question.

I know that the President has decided he doesn't want the likes of Dr. Tony Fauci by his side any longer when it comes to talking about this pandemic, but Dr. Fauci and Dr. Collins, of the National Institutes of Health, were interviewed over the weekend and were asked directly about the issue of testing.

Why does it take so long in the United States to get results, and what kind of problems does that create?

Well, we know. If people suspect they are positive for this virus and go in for a test, they are worried that they may be endangering their own lives, not to mention the lives of others. Then, they have to wait 1 day, 2 days, 3 days, 6 days—more—for the test results. That is unacceptable. We need to invest more money in testing and more money in finding tests to provide quicker results.

You would think that it would be obvious to everyone, but it is not obvious in this negotiation that is taking place now in the U.S. Senate. There are Republican Senators who are resisting the idea of putting more money into testing in the United States. What country do they live in? Do they ever go home from Washington to see what is happening in the rest of this country? We closed down the testing facilities in my hometown of Springfield, IL, this last week. It was disappointing, for we needed it, and we need more.

If we are serious about opening this economy, if we are serious about stopping the spread of this pandemic, and if we are serious about opening our schools and making certain that teachers and pupils are safe, we need more testing. Yet here we are, tied in knots, as Senator SCHUMER said earlier.

The Republicans can't agree among themselves about the issue of putting money into testing in the midst of this pandemic. It is hard to believe. It was more than 2 months ago that the House

of Representatives passed the Heroes Act. Senator MCCONNELL has come to the floor regularly to ridicule that effort because he doesn't like the provisions in the act. It is his right to have a difference of opinion, but the obvious questions to Senator MCCONNELL are these: Where is your alternative? What have you been doing for the last 2 months? You should have been writing a bill that we should be voting on as soon as we finish the one that is pending on the floor.

Apparently, the White House and the Senate Republicans can't come to any agreement about how to move forward. There are some who are basically saying: Enough. We are not going to spend another penny. We are not going to waste any more money on any type of COVID-19.

I have seen their testimony. I have seen their statements before the microphones. That is hard to imagine.

I wonder if some of the Senators from States like Kentucky and Texas who have stepped up and said, "We have spent enough money on this," have been home recently. Have they been there to meet people who are unemployed, out of work, or who have been laid off who are receiving the Federal unemployment benefits to keep bread on the table and to pay for the their mortgages and their health insurance?

This \$600 a week may sound like a pretty generous amount of money to some. Try living on it. Try living on \$600 a week when it costs you \$400 a week for health insurance. Yes, that is the average on COBRA premiums—almost \$1,700 a month. So, when you talk about \$600 a week, take out \$1,600 or \$1,700 off the top of that, and tell me what is left to take care of your family.

As for the last Federal unemployment payment under the CARES Act, Senator SCHUMER is right. It ends on July 31—a week from Saturday. We have been told that the last checks will be mailed this Saturday, which is just a few days from now.

Three days from now, the last check goes out. While that check is making its way through the mail, is it even possible that the Republican leadership, with the White House, will come up with a proposal to deal with this? It has been 2 months. Senator MCCONNELL said, during those 2 months, that he didn't feel any sense of urgency—no sense of urgency. Can you imagine the sense of urgency if you can't make your mortgage payment? Can you imagine the sense of urgency if that utility bill is so large you can't pay it? That is the reality facing a lot of families who have been laid off and are unemployed. I believe—and many agree—that one of our highest priorities is to make sure that the resources are there for the families.

I also want to say that we are in the midst of this conversation about public health while the President and his party are trying to kill the Affordable Care Act in the Supreme Court. More

than 140,000 Americans have died from this pandemic, and President Trump and the Republican Party are trying to kill the major source of health insurance for millions of Americans. For 10 years, the Affordable Care Act has been the law of the land, and before it was the law of the land, there were some things going on when it came to health insurance which we should not forget.

Routinely, health insurance companies discriminated against women before we passed the Affordable Care Act and prohibited their practices. There was a time when insurance companies were allowed to charge women more than men for the same health insurance policies. It was common for women to pay three or four times what men pay for on the identical plans.

Important women's healthcare was often excluded from most insurance plans. For instance, most individual policies refused to cover maternity or newborn care.

Insurance companies were allowed to deny coverage and charge higher premiums to Americans with preexisting conditions. That particular discrimination hurt women much more than men. Approximately 24 million American men have preexisting conditions; 30 million American women.

Insurance companies could consider a host of medical conditions to be preexisting conditions: breast cancer, C-sections, victims of domestic violence, asthma, acne, heart disease—all preexisting conditions. Before the Affordable Care Act, that is what the health insurance companies pointed to when they charged women and others more because of it.

The Affordable Care Act put an end to that, and now the Republicans want to put an end to the Affordable Care Act. Well, you must say, they must have a much better idea. There must be a Republican proposal out there far better than the Affordable Care Act. There isn't. We haven't seen any. They have no alternative. They just want to kill anything that might have the name "Obama" on it.

We have to do something about this to protect health insurance for the future, and the notion that the Republicans and President Trump are fighting the Supreme Court to eliminate the Affordable Care Act in this moment in American history, when we are fighting this pandemic, is impossible to explain.

AMENDMENT NO. 1788

Madam President, I have been honored to work on the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee since December of 2012, when Senator Dan Inouye, the legendary Senator from Hawaii and recipient of a Congressional Medal of Honor, passed away. Since I have taken that job, I have been impressed many times over by the extraordinary Department of Defense and the actions they have taken—the development of technology like GPS, investing in critical medical research, and the abiding commitment to women and men in uni-

form, who make so many great sacrifices for our country. But I have also discovered at the same time how poorly we manage the Department of Defense. Our procurement system seems designed to generate redtape, delays, and cost overruns. Our top adversaries around the world develop game-changing technologies at a fraction of the cost that it takes us to develop them.

There is going to be an amendment on the floor today about future spending in the Department of Defense offered by Senator SANDERS. I heard what Senator MCCONNELL had to say about it earlier. He seems to believe that any suggestion that there is misspending in the Department of Defense is not patriotic. Somehow you are a chicken if you raise any questions about waste in the Department of Defense. I couldn't disagree more.

The Sanders amendment proposes a 10-percent budget cut in the Department of Defense. Well, I have taken a look, as others have, at the failed audits, the cost overruns, and the sclerotic bureaucracy at the Department of Defense. I believe the American taxpayer deserves more.

One of my early hearings in the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee focused on the defense industrial base and the threat of sequestration. The lives of our servicemembers often depend on the equipment and training provided. When managed well, the defense industrial base generates the best equipment, next-generation technology, good jobs, and powerful weapons. However, I am concerned that holding defense contractors accountable for poor performance has not been the priority it should be today.

Listen to this: From 2016 to 2019, military spending rose by 18 percent. During the same period of time, the Department of Defense accumulated \$18 billion in cost overruns for weapons programs. What about the contractors who generated those cost overruns? The top five defense contractors in America saw their profits increase by 44 percent in that same period. This doesn't add up.

Businesses have the right to earn a profit, but taxpayers have the right to demand accountability. With defense spending on such a steep rise, we should be driven by the motto "pay for performance." I don't believe that is the culture at the Department of Defense today.

Senator SANDERS wants to direct \$74 billion to communities across the country—including many needy communities in my State of Illinois—for housing, healthcare, childcare, education, and jobs. Senator MCCONNELL comes to the floor and calls that socialism. Socialism when it comes to education and childcare? I don't agree with him.

There is considerable merit to what Senator SANDERS has to say about the run-up in cost at the Department of Defense, but I do not agree with his basic approach of across-the-board

cuts. When you start exempting things like military pay and healthcare, it means the remaining items take a deeper hit.

The 14-percent cut that has been proposed for the remaining items at the Department of Defense would be a hard hit, no question about it. As I have said many times, sequestration didn't work, and we ought to learn a lesson from it.

The National Guard should not have a 14-percent cut. Special victims counsels and sexual assault prevention programs should not be cut by 14 percent. Cleaning up PFAS contamination at military bases should not be cut by 14 percent. Instead, we ought to look at the Department of Defense budget more carefully, not with an across-the-board cut.

Let's start with the \$16 billion OCO gimmick. OCO is the account created to fight a war. We started this account years and years ago, when we actually were engaged in a war. We have kept it alive to this day because it is a way to escape budget rules.

The OCO gimmick funds were requested for routine Army, Navy, and Air Force operations that have nothing to do with fighting a war in Afghanistan or any other place. The administration requested these funds for the sole purposes of evading the caps on the base defense budget. Beyond that—listen to this—the President of the United States, who is arguing for this budget, was the first to raid it and take \$8 billion or more out for his medieval wall on the southern border of the United States.

The \$18 billion in weapons systems overruns that I mentioned earlier—what could we do with \$18 billion in cost overruns? Well, you could increase the budget for the National Institutes of Health medical research by almost 50 percent. That is one thing. You could provide student loan forgiveness for healthcare workers or hazard pay for these same men and women who risk their lives for us every day.

I have to tell you, there is need for us to look to space in terms of our future defense. I still haven't been sold on this concept of the so-called Space Force. Putting millions of dollars into additional bureaucratic costs is hard for me to understand or explain.

Ultimately, the Sanders amendment is going to be considered in this authorization bill, but if it is going anywhere in concept, it will be in the Appropriations Committee, where I serve. Our work as appropriators is to examine the details of the budget and make the best decisions for the taxpayers and for our national defense.

I believe Senator SANDERS is on the right track to demand accountability and to ask that we find cost overruns and expenditures that can be changed without jeopardizing our national defense. His exact approach is not one that I would endorse, but I have to say that I stand behind his concept that we need to ask harder questions about this massive spending.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Madam President, I rise to comment, along with my colleague Senator DURBIN, about the Sanders amendment. I must commend how thoughtful and knowledgeable Senator DURBIN is about all these subjects. He has pointed out how there are too many military programs that are not well moderated and that have cost overruns that result in excess cost to the American public. We have to do something about those things, and we also understand that we have huge demand with respect to nondefense spending that we have to meet also.

The Sanders amendment, as Senator DURBIN pointed out, would impose an across-the-board cut to the Department of Defense, except for military personnel accounts and the defense health programs. What he would call a 10-percent across-the-board cut, when you take out health and personnel, becomes really a 14-percent cut to all the accounts at the Department of Defense.

The danger, as so well illustrated by Senator DURBIN, is that this type of indiscriminate getting rid of the good and paying for the bad that doesn't really work. It doesn't make sense. It reminds us all of the battles we had over sequestration, where Departments—not only the Department of Defense but the civilian Departments—had to fund programs because they met the cap and then cut other programs that were much more valuable because they exceeded the cap. That is not a way, as they proverbially say, to run a railroad, nor the Department of Defense.

So we do have to look for specific areas to cut, and, as Senator DURBIN said, a great deal of that is done and will be done in the Appropriations Committee where he is the ranking member. I am a colleague on the committee, and each year we have the challenge of taking the authorization that says “you may do this” and actually putting in the money to do it, and that effort is usually valuable, as is the authorization effort, and critically important.

We have to make sure that a result of our deliberations is, first, the resources that are necessary to protect the men and women in the Armed Forces who protect us and also provide for the quality of life of their families and ultimately, of course, that we are able to deter any threat, and if not, defeat that threat decisively.

This is a very important endeavor, and, again, suggesting that we just cut across the board and then put it somewhere else is not, I think, commensurate with the kind of approach that we must take and we have to take going forward.

The other factor, too, is that there are real ramifications for this that are not sometimes obvious. There are literally thousands and thousands—not just military personnel but civilian

workers and construction workers and equipment manufacturing workers—who, in this indiscriminate, across-the-board cut, would lose their jobs at a time when we can't lose any jobs. This approach would be disruptive. I would not want to make a point to the disadvantage of the thousands and thousands of men and women who are working hard to take care of their families all across this country.

Again, we do have to make serious investments in communities across this country that have been neglected, and I have been consistent in support of those efforts. We do have to make investments in our infrastructure for our economic liability and our economic efficiency. We do have to provide support in many, many different ways that transcends and goes beyond just the Department of Defense. In fact, one could say that just as vital a part of our national defense as our military budget is our education budget and our healthcare budget because our strength is not just military forces; our strength is knowledgeable citizens, our strength is healthy citizens, and our strength is an efficient economic system.

But I think this approach, as I suggested today and I think the suggestion from Senator DURBIN also was that this just across-the-board approach is good for a headline, it is good to make a point, but we are here to make policy, and I hope we do make policy. I hope we can continue in this National Defense Authorization Act to try to argue about issues that people feel are not appropriate spending or if, in fact, we need more spending and that in the appropriations process we will do that once again.

Just as a reminder, this bill adheres to the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2019. It is the final year of the Budget Act. So the numbers we are talking about today for the Department of Defense are not willy-nilly; they were not negotiated without the context of non-defense spending. It was a bipartisan agreement to set the levels of spending for both defense and nondefense, and that is what we are doing here today.

We need a serious discussion about national spending priorities, not just defense spending priorities but priorities that look back to poor communities, industrial policy, infrastructure, education, daycare, the impact of artificial intelligence on the workplace. We have a lot to do, and I think we should get on to doing it but not with the shorthand message of “let's cut everything here, and put it over there.” Let's look at the serious issues, and let's confront them, and let's propose serious solutions.

So because of these indiscriminate cuts, I will be forced to oppose this amendment by Senator SANDERS.

There is another amendment that will come before us today proposed by Senator TESTER, and that is one I do support. Senator TESTER's amendment will add additional diseases to those

that the Veterans Administration already presumes are the result of exposure to Agent Orange by veterans during their military service in Vietnam.

We know that exposure to the toxic chemical Agent Orange has had severe health consequences for veterans who answered the Nation's call to military service during the Vietnam conflict. Recognizing this, the Veterans Administration already presumes that certain diseases affecting these veterans are service connected as a result of the exposure to Agent Orange. These diseases include non-Hodgkin's lymphoma, soft tissue sarcoma, respiratory cancers, myeloma and type 2 diabetes.

We also know that there are other diseases that are not yet covered and that there are veterans who suffer from these diseases, and this conclusion is supported by a scientific review by the National Academy of Medicine. Parkinson's, bladder cancer, and hypothyroidism should share the same presumption of service connection as the diseases already presumed to be service connected.

Our Vietnam veterans should not have the burden of proving by independent evidence that their diseases were caused by exposure to Agent Orange. The failure to add these conditions to the Veterans Administration's presumptive list continues to deny sick and aging veterans the healthcare and compensation that they have earned through service to our Nation and that they desperately need.

Senator TESTER's amendment begins to remedy this inequity, and I urge all Senators to vote for the Tester amendment.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SASSE). The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, in about an hour we are going to take a vote that our servicemembers around the world will likely be watching. It is a critical vote on the amendment of my colleague from Vermont to blindly cut defense spending, taking a hatchet to the already agreed-upon Bipartisan Budget Act.

We have heard from my colleague JACK REED from Rhode Island, who is part of the strong leadership on the Armed Services Committee and just spoke out against it, and I am going to speak out against it.

I am going to spend some time explaining what this means. This is not just one amendment. This has national implications, and if you are watching in America, I want you to think about what is really going on here.

First of all, my colleague from Vermont says that it is a 10-percent cut, but it is going exempt military personnel and healthcare accounts—which is true as part of the amendment—but it is actually going to compensate for the other cuts, so it is actually a 14-percent across-the-board cut to the Department of Defense. That is the amendment we are going to vote on.

To paraphrase one of our great Presidents, Ronald Reagan: There they go again. There they go again.

I chair the Subcommittee on Readiness of the Armed Services Committee. One of the reasons I ran for the Senate in 2014 was exactly this issue of military readiness. As a colonel in the U.S. Marine Corps Reserve, I had a little bit of an up close and personal view on it.

The readiness of our Armed Forces in the second term of the Obama administration was plummeting. In the second term of the Obama administration, defense spending was cut by 25 percent, and, with that, the readiness of the men and women in the military plummeted. By the way, at the same time defense spending was cut by 25 percent, Russia was increasing defense spending by 34 percent, and China was increasing by 83 percent.

So let me just give an example. These numbers actually were classified, and they have been declassified. In 2015, when I arrived in the Senate, these were some of the numbers relating to readiness. Remember, we are supposed to be in charge of readiness here. Three of the 58 brigade combat teams in the U.S. Army—the brigade combat team is the 5,000 men and women deployed block in our military, and 3 of the 58 were at the tier 1 level of readiness that you want for a deployed unit. You can understand why that was classified in 2015 because we certainly didn't want our adversaries to know that. So 5 percent of the U.S. Army was fully ready to fight. Less than half of Marine Corps Navy aviation could fly—another classified number, now unclassified. Training and flight time for all military pilots plummeted.

When I arrived in 2015, the Obama administration proposed a cut of another 40,000 Active-Duty troops for the U.S. Army. One of the units they were looking to cut was the 4th Brigade of the 25th Infantry Division—the 4-25 at JBER in Alaska, the only airborne combat team in the Asia Pacific. I put every ounce of my energy into fighting that misguided decision. The 4-25 was not cut, thankfully. All the rest of the 40,000 were cut. We are still digging out of that hole.

So I want to throw something out there because people don't think about it. Imagine if there had been a major contingency or, yes, a war in 2015 with these readiness numbers. Sometimes wars hit us when we are least expecting them. I am going to talk about that.

I will tell you this: It would have been very ugly—not only for our national security but more importantly for our troops—for the men and women we are supposed to make sure are trained so that they never have to go into a fair fight, so we know they are always going to win.

We just celebrated the 70th anniversary of the outbreak of the Korean war on June 25, 1950. I am a bit of a Korean war history buff. I will tell you this: What we didn't celebrate was actually what happened in the summer of 1950 at the outbreak of the Korean war.

Here is what happened. The greatest military power in the world in 1945 was the U.S. military. We had just won World War II. By 1950, due to dramatic defense cuts, lack of training, lack of readiness, our military had a very difficult time halting the invasion of a third-world army, the North Korean army.

For the history buffs who understand Korean war history—the military certainly does—they know what Task Force Smith was. It was the first American unit that went in to stop the North Korean army. Task Force Smith was obliterated. Hundreds were killed in the summer of 1950. As a matter of fact, thousands of young Americans died horrible deaths during the summer of 1950 because the leadership in Congress, the leadership in the executive branch, and the leadership in the Pentagon let the readiness of our Armed Forces plummet. Let me repeat that: 70 years ago right now—if you look back 70 years ago in the summer of 1950 on the Korean Peninsula—thousands of young Americans were being killed because they weren't trained and they weren't ready.

This was probably one of the biggest derelictions of duty in U.S. history. Because it is a forgotten war, not many people know about it. But it was a dramatic failure of leadership in the Congress, the executive branch, and the military. The military even has a saying for this: "No more Task Force Smith." We will never ever—ever—let our young men and women go fight a war where they are unprepared, and because of that, they die.

I agree we need to do all we can to address many of the social issues that my colleague from Vermont highlights, particularly during this pandemic. But we must never, as a Congress, gut our military readiness to such a degree that our young men and women come home in body bags as opposed to victors. That is what happened in the summer of 1950.

We were on a path toward this dangerous lack of readiness during the second term of the Obama administration. I cited the numbers. I chair the Subcommittee on Readiness. I have been all focused on this issue of rebuilding our readiness.

Here is the good news. With the Republicans in control in the Senate and the White House, we have begun to dramatically rebuild our military and our readiness. This has been a priority of ours. This has certainly been a priority of mine. Many of my colleagues, Democrats and Republicans, particularly on the Armed Services Committee, have been working on rebuilding our military. When we were looking at these numbers, so many people on the Armed Services Committee, including JACK REED, who just gave a very eloquent speech, recognized, whoa—dangerous world, dangerous neighborhood, and a military that is not ready. So we got to work.

I enjoy my bipartisan work here in the Senate. Some of my best friends

are from the other side of the aisle, but there are principle disagreements on key issues between some on this side of the aisle and the other side. One of them is about the degree to which we support our military and national defense.

I know all of my colleagues are patriotic. I don't like doing the patriotism argument. Every Member of this body, all 100—we love our country. But there are some impressions when you look at what goes on here, when you look at the sweep of history with regard to readiness and funding our military.

Again, to my Democratic colleagues on the Armed Services Committee, Defense Appropriations, who, like me, attend the hearings regularly, dig into the issues, know the threats our country faces, I think we work together to rebuild readiness. But at the national level, here are the facts. Think about it. Carter, Clinton, Obama, Biden—what do those administrations all have in common? They get into power, and they cut our military, and morale plummets, and readiness plummets.

Let me go a little bit closer to home. Since I have been elected, the No. 1 bill my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have filibustered—the No. 1 bill when they want to take something hostage—is the Defense appropriations bill. Ten times, since I have been in this body, the funding for our men and women has been pulled in as a hostage—ten times. No other bill in the last 5½ years, since I have been here, has been filibustered more than the Defense appropriations bill.

Our friends in the media never report on this, but that is one of the issues that really burns me up here because it happens all the time. Trust me, our troops know it. They watch it, and they know it.

Now we have a Sanders amendment for across-the-board DOD cuts of 14 percent just as we are digging out of the readiness hole that we all know that we are in. If you don't acknowledge it, you are not paying attention.

The Senate minority leader has recently come out in favor of the Sanders amendment. I wonder where Joe Biden is on the Sanders amendment.

Of course, as my colleague from Illinois just mentioned, the Pentagon must do a better job of managing waste and cost overruns. I fully agree with that. In fact, the Trump administration was the first administration to finally undertake an audit of the Pentagon. Again, Democrats and Republicans on the Armed Services Committee pressed for it, and we finally got it. It took decades, but an audit of the Pentagon has finally happened.

Make no mistake, the Sanders amendment is the first salvo in the national Democratic leadership's goal of defunding the military across the board. If you don't want to take my word for it, here is the POLITICO op-ed from Senator SANDERS about his amendment titled: "Defund the Pentagon: The Liberal Case."

"Defund the Pentagon"—there they go again. This is a really important issue. I hope my colleagues on both sides of the aisle defeat this amendment overwhelmingly—overwhelmingly. The men and women of the military are watching this amendment. The men and women of the military know that their readiness 5 years ago was in a really bad state.

The vote today and what is going to happen later—literally, if you look at history, we never know when the next conflict is coming. We didn't know that in the summer of 1950, the military was going to be rushed to the Korean Peninsula and would barely be able to hold its own. Thousands died because they weren't ready because of defense cuts by the Congress and the executive branch and the Pentagon.

So this is an important vote. The lives of the men and women in our military and their readiness could well depend on this vote, and I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to strongly reject it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

REMEMBERING JIM POSEWITZ

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, before I call up my amendment and get to the issue of our veterans in this country, I want to say a few words about a good friend and a legendary Montana conservationist named Jim Posewitz, who passed away a few weeks ago.

He was a towering figure in Montana and in the history of conservation in our great State. He was a man who knew right from wrong, and Montanans know that he was almost always right and seldom wrong.

Poz's accomplishments are too long to list, but any Montanan who fished in the Missouri River, learning the ethics of hunting or hiking in Montana's Rocky Mountain Front, owes a deep debt of gratitude to Poz's more than 30 years of work for the Montana Fish, Wildlife, and Parks and to his post-retirement work as a conservation advocate, ethicist, and leader.

The Wilderness Act of 1964 says that America's wildest places are those where man himself is a visitor. Poz understood that power, that magic, and the importance of these places. He was relentless in his fight to protect them, and he was uncompromising in his faith that they bring us closer to nature, to each other, and to ourselves. He never stopped fighting for Montana and for the wild places in Montana.

My heart goes out to Poz's family, including his life partner Gayle; his sons, Brian, Allen, Carl; Matthew and Matthew's wife Heather and their daughters, Sarah and Lindsay; his son Andrew and Andrew's wife Kelly and their daughters Madison and Charlotte; his stepdaughter Ann and Ann's husband Nate and their children, Joslin and Lyzander; his stepson Clayton and Clayton's wife Michelle and daughter Ayla. Poz is also survived by his brother John and John's wife Mary and their four children.

He will be greatly missed. He is somebody they only make one of, an incredible human being.

AMENDMENT NO. 1972, AS MODIFIED

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 1972, as modified, and ask that it be reported by number.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Montana [Mr. TESTER] proposes an amendment numbered 1972, as modified, to amendment No. 2301.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To expand the list of diseases associated with exposure to certain herbicide agents for which there is a presumption of service connection for veterans who served in the Republic of Vietnam)

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. ____ ADDITIONAL DISEASES ASSOCIATED WITH EXPOSURE TO CERTAIN HERBICIDE AGENTS FOR WHICH THERE IS A PRESUMPTION OF SERVICE CONNECTION FOR VETERANS WHO SERVED IN THE REPUBLIC OF VIETNAM.

Section 1116(a)(2) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraphs:

“(I) Parkinsonism.

“(J) Bladder cancer.

“(K) Hypothyroidism.”.

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I want to turn to the issue of the day, and that is this amendment to the National Defense Authorization Act.

Senator REED talked about it a few minutes ago because, quite frankly, justice is long overdue for thousands of veterans who are currently suffering and dying from illnesses related to exposure to Agent Orange in Vietnam.

You know, one of our most sacred duties is to take care of those who are wounded in service to this country, and the fact is, this administration, the Trump administration, has refused to expand the list of presumptive health conditions associated with Agent Orange to cover illnesses such as bladder cancer, hypothyroidism, and Parkinsonism. They don't seem to think that exposure to these toxic chemicals in Vietnam is a cost of war. Well, let me tell you, they are wrong. It is a cost of war. The fact is, this administration wants to outlive the Vietnam veterans, and they don't want to pay for it.

Every time we get in a situation—and I should say the last time we got in a situation, for sure—we sent off our young men and women in the military, and we put the cost on the credit card for our kids to pay and don't think a thing about it, but when they come back and they are changed, all of a sudden, we don't want to pay for it, especially when these conditions, in particular, already meet the historical standard to be added to the Department of Veterans Affairs' presumptive list for service connection.

Now, this is not just me talking. This is the National Academies of Medicine weighing in with their reviews of scientific evidence—scientific evidence. Each day this administration stone-

walls benefits, more and more veterans are forced to live with the detrimental effects of their exposure without the assistance that not only they have earned but that we owe them—veterans like Bill Garber from Great Falls, MT.

In 1967, Bill enlisted in the U.S. Army, and within 6 months he was sent to fight in Vietnam, where he served as a combat engineer and demolitions expert with the 11th Armored Cavalry Regiment, 1st Brigade Combat Team of the 101st Airborne Division. During his yearlong tour in Vietnam, Bill saw heavy combat, and like most military folks who were in Vietnam, was exposed to Agent Orange.

Now, more than 50 years later, after his service and his sacrifice, Bill suffers from tremors diagnosed as Parkinsonism, one of the three conditions that would be covered by the Department of Veterans Affairs if this amendment passes. Bill's story is heroic, but the truth is, he is one of tens of thousands of Vietnam veterans in this country who are still waiting for this White House to grant them the benefits they have earned.

No more waiting. No more trying to outlive the Vietnam veteran. My amendment directs the Department of Veterans Affairs to acknowledge the overwhelming scientific evidence already put forward by veterans, scientists, and medical experts, and provide Vietnam veterans with the benefits they have earned in service to our country.

Today, we have an opportunity to end the needless suffering and disappointment for an entire generation of veterans who are counting on Congress to simply do the right thing. The reality is that taking care of our veterans is a cost of war and is a cost that must be paid. We must hold this administration accountable on behalf of thousands of veterans like Bill who gave so much for this country, and I urge my colleagues to get this done with a “yes” vote on this amendment so we can end the wait for veterans who have already sacrificed greatly and who shouldn't be forced to wait 1 minute longer.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, in a few minutes we will vote on the Sanders amendment, which I support. As vice chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, I have worked with the Republican leadership and with Chairman SHELBY in recent years to strike budget agreements that resulted in parity between defense and nondefense spending. At the same time, amid a national and international public health crisis, the need to infuse more resources into public health, education, and business development programs has never been greater.

I have heard from my Republican colleagues on the floor objecting to the Sanders amendment. I would say to them that if they feel that strongly—

this is not authorized—but if they feel that strongly, they should tell their Republican leadership to allow the appropriations bill to come up so they can actually vote on the Defense bill. Right now, this is just idle chatter when they object to Senator SANDERS' amendment, and yet they are unwilling themselves to actually vote up or down on the appropriations bill for not only the Department of Defense bill but the other Departments. The Sanders amendment, after all, maintains full support for the personnel needs of the Department of Defense, as well as the critical medical research supported throughout the Department. It would also take some of the Department's sweeping budget and reserve it for underfunded domestic needs. This is long overdue.

I again call on my Republican colleagues to stop talking about the money you want or don't want to spend. Tell the Republican leader to allow the appropriations bills to come to the floor and vote up or down.

REMEMBERING JOHN LEWIS

Mr. President, on another issue, I have had such an incredibly heavy heart since I heard Friday night my dear friend and hero, John Lewis passed away. I stand here on the Senate floor today to talk about him.

When I got a call at our home in Vermont late that night, my wife, my son, and I just sat there and talked about John for hours and cried. We knew America lost a genuine hero—an unwavering lodestar who, over decades of selfless activism and public service, drew us closer to our ideals.

I remember when he invited me in to watch actually a sit-in by Democratic Members in the House of Representatives when the Republican Speaker had closed down the House for them to have votes. He saw me outside, and I asked him what is going on, and he said: You are my brother.

He took me by the arm, brought me in, and sat me down in the well of the House to watch what was going on. I was always humbled and honored to be called his brother, as he often did when we were together, including an unforgettable visit he had with us in Vermont just last year.

I have been thinking so much of what we can say, and there aren't enough words—there certainly aren't—in paying tribute to a man whose life was defined by the relentless and fearless pursuit of equality. John bled, literally, and his bones were broken, literally, for the causes of civil rights. He came to Congress bearing those scars—a living, breathing reminder that our society's progress on racial equality came through the sacrifices of heroes like him.

In Congress, John Lewis stood with equal moral clarity, serving as its conscience and reminding us that our work to build a genuinely equal and just society remains unfinished. His thundering words just months ago echo even more loudly today. He said:

When you see something that is not right . . . you have a moral obligation to say something. To do something. Our children and their children will ask us, "What did you do?"

That is a question all of us must ask ourselves.

VOTING RIGHTS ADVANCEMENT ACT

Mr. President, there is one thing I am doing today that I want to share with my fellow Senators and Americans. Today, I am reintroducing the Voting Rights Advancement Act, and we are renaming it the John Lewis Voting Rights Advancement Act.

This is bipartisan legislation. It has 47 Senate cosponsors. It would safeguard what John fought over a lifetime to achieve: equality at the voting booth. The bill would restore the Voting Rights Act to end the scourge of minority voter suppression.

Now, the House already passed a companion to the John Lewis Voting Rights Advancement Act in December. Now let's do our part. We can't claim to honor the life of John Lewis if we refuse to carry out his life's work. Of course, if we stand in the way of that work, that would be the wrong thing to do.

So I would urge my fellow Senators, join me in calling on Senator MCCONNELL to allow a vote up or down on the John Lewis Voting Rights Advancement Act.

Let's do that for John, but let's not do it simply because it is named after him but because it is precisely what John would do. And if we have a moral compass, we should do it and take action to forge a more perfect Union, protect our democracy, and above all, do what is right.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

AMENDMENT NO. 1788

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 1788, and I ask that it be reported by number.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment by number.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS] for himself and Mr. MARKEY, proposes an amendment numbered 1788 to amendment No. 2301.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To reduce the bloated Pentagon budget by 10 percent and invest that money in jobs, education, health care, and housing in communities in the United States in which the poverty rate is not less than 25 percent)

At the end of subtitle A of title X, add the following:

SEC. ____ . REDUCTION IN AMOUNT AUTHORIZED TO BE APPROPRIATED FOR FISCAL YEAR 2021 BY THIS ACT; ESTABLISHMENT OF GRANT PROGRAM TO REDUCE POVERTY AND INVEST IN DISTRESSED COMMUNITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The amount authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2021 by this Act is—

(1) the aggregate amount authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2021 by this Act (other than for military personnel and the Defense Health Program); minus

(2) the amount equal to 14 percent of the aggregate amount described in paragraph (1).

(b) ALLOCATION.—The reduction made by subsection (a) shall—

(1) apply on a pro rata basis among the accounts and funds for which amounts are authorized to be appropriated by this Act (other than military personnel and the Defense Health Program);

(2) be applied on a pro rata basis across each program, project, and activity funded by the account or fund concerned; and

(3) be used by the Secretary of the Treasury to carry out the grant program described in subsection (c).

(c) GRANT PROGRAM.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the Department of the Treasury a grant program through which the Secretary of the Treasury shall, in coordination with the Secretary of Education, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, provide grants to eligible entities in accordance with the requirements of this subsection.

(2) APPLICATION.—An eligible entity that desires a grant under this subsection shall submit to the Secretary of the Treasury an application in such form and containing such information as the Secretary may require.

(3) PURPOSES.—

(A) PERMISSIBLE PURPOSES.—An eligible entity that receives a grant under this subsection may use the grant funds for any of the following:

(i) To construct, renovate, retrofit, or perform maintenance with respect to an affordable housing unit, a public school, a childcare facility, a community health center, a public hospital, a library, or a clean drinking water facility if any such building or facility is located within the jurisdiction of the eligible entity.

(ii) To remove contaminants, including lead, from infrastructure with respect to the provision of drinking water if that infrastructure is located within the jurisdiction of the eligible entity.

(iii) To replace, remove, or renovate a vacant or blighted property that is located within the jurisdiction of the eligible entity.

(iv) To hire public school teachers to reduce class size at public schools within the jurisdiction of the eligible entity.

(v) To increase the pay of teachers at public schools within the jurisdiction of the eligible entity.

(vi) To provide nutritious meals to children and parents who live within the jurisdiction of the eligible entity.

(vii) To provide free tuition to residents within the jurisdiction of the eligible entity to attend public institutions of higher education, including vocational and trade schools.

(viii) To provide rental assistance to residents within the jurisdiction of the eligible entity.

(ix) To reduce or eliminate homelessness within the jurisdiction of the eligible entity.

(B) IMPERMISSIBLE PURPOSES.—An eligible entity that receives a grant under this subsection may not use the grant funds—

(i) to construct a law enforcement facility, including a prison or a jail; or

(ii) to purchase a vehicle for a law enforcement agency.

(4) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection—

(A) the term "eligible entity" means—

(i) a county government with respect to a high-poverty county;

(ii) a local or municipal government within the jurisdiction of which there are not fewer than 5 high-poverty neighborhoods; and

(iii) a federally recognized Indian Tribe that exercises jurisdiction over Indian lands (as defined in section 824(b) of the Indian Health Care Improvement Act (25 U.S.C. 1680n(b))) that contain high-poverty neighborhoods;

(B) the term “high-poverty county” means a county with a poverty rate of not less than 25 percent, according to the Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates of the Bureau of the Census for 2018;

(C) the term “high-poverty neighborhood” means a census tract with a poverty rate of not less than 25 percent, according to the 5-year estimate of the American Community Survey of the Bureau of the Census for years 2014 through 2018; and

(D) the term “public school” means a public elementary school or secondary school, as those terms are defined in section 8101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801).

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I thank Senator LEAHY for his support of our amendment, for his beautiful words on John Lewis, and for his insistence that this Senate makes sure that every American has the right to vote. That is not asking too much, and that is a bill we should deal with.

Mr. President, I rise to speak in support of the amendment I have filed for the National Defense Authorization Act to cut the bloated \$740 billion Pentagon budget by 10 percent and use that \$74 billion in savings to invest in human needs here at home.

This amendment is being cosponsored by Senators MARKEY, WARREN, MERKLEY, WYDEN, and Senator LEAHY and will receive a rollcall at 12:10 p.m.

This amendment has been endorsed by more than 60 organizations representing millions of working people, environmentalists, and religious leaders, including Public Citizen, the Union of Concerned Scientists, and Physicians for Social Responsibility.

In America today, we are experiencing an extraordinary set of crises unprecedented in the history of the United States of America. We are in the midst of a public health crisis that is worse than at any time since the Spanish flu of 1918. Over the past 4 months, the coronavirus has infected more than 3.7 million Americans and caused nearly 140,000 deaths.

We are in the midst of the worst economic downturn since the Great Depression. During the COVID-19 pandemic, 119 million Americans have seen a decline in their income—unbelievable. One hundred and nineteen million Americans have seen a decline in their income, 50 million have filed for unemployment, and American households have lost over \$6 trillion in wealth.

All over this country—in the State of Vermont and in every other State in America—people are going hungry in America. People are going hungry. And many, many people are frightened to death that they will soon be evicted from their apartments or will lose their homes to foreclosure.

That is where the American people are today: loss of jobs, loss of income, hunger, eviction.

On the other hand, there is another reality going on in America today. We

don't talk about it much, but we should, and that is that 600 billionaires in our country have seen their wealth go up by \$700 billion during the pandemic. So we entered this pandemic with massive income and wealth inequality since the pandemic, and the very rich have become even richer, while working people have seen a significant decline in their income and wealth.

The current crisis, or series of crises, have revealed the extraordinary inequities in our economy. If people didn't know it before, they surely know it now.

In the United States today, over half of our workers live paycheck to paycheck. Not surprisingly, when you live paycheck to paycheck, and the paycheck stops coming in, you are in financial distress. That means that your economic situation goes from poverty, which is low wages, to desperation, which is no income coming in at all. That means that you go hungry. It means that you may become homeless. It means that when you get sick, you no longer have health insurance or the income to see a doctor.

What the pandemic has taught us is that a relatively low unemployment rate, which is what we had before the pandemic, does not adequately guarantee for the security and well-being of working families.

When tens of millions of our people earn starvation wages, that is not a good economy. When 40 percent of our people do not have the savings to pay for a \$400 emergency, that is not what I would call a good economy. When over half a million Americans are homeless and 18 million families spend at least half of their incomes on housing, that is not a good economy. When 87 million people are uninsured or underinsured, that is not a good economy. In other words, to create a good economy, we are going to have to do a whole lot better than that.

Further, over the last few months, hundreds of thousands of Americans have taken to the streets to demand justice for the murders of George Floyd, Breonna Taylor, Rayshard Brooks, and Ahmaud Arbery, among many others, and to end the rampant police brutality that we see in America today. These tragic killings of unarmed African Americans have highlighted the urgent need to rethink the nature of policing and to fix a broken and racist criminal justice system.

On top of all of that—on top of a pandemic, on top of an economic collapse, on top of systemic racism—we have to address the existential threat facing this planet of climate change.

A few weeks ago, temperatures in Siberia—the coldest region on Earth—topped 100 degrees, shattering records. If we do not get our act together and transform our energy system away from fossil fuel and into renewable energy, we will be leaving this planet increasingly unhealthy and uninhabitable for our kids and future generations.

That is where we are today: hunger, homelessness, racism, a warming and dangerously warming climate. These are the issues that we have to focus on. Our attention must be on improving the lives of ordinary Americans—working people, lower income people—and doing what we can to work with countries around the world to help the billions of people living in economic distress.

With that, I rise today to make it abundantly clear that if we are going to address those issues, if we are going to protect the working families of this country who are now under so much stress, it is absolutely imperative that we change our national priorities.

The status quo and conventional wisdom that we see on TV every day and that we hear on the floor of the Senate is no longer good enough. History has overtaken us. Unprecedented crises have overtaken us. The status quo is not good enough. We must respond.

We must finally have the courage to stand up to powerful special interests and all of their campaign money and understand that we cannot allow these people to continue to have so much power over the economic and political life of this country; that we must start developing policies that work for working families, not just the rich, not just the powerful, and not just those who contribute to super PACs.

Fifty-three years ago, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., challenged our country to fight against three major evils: “The evil of racism, the evil of poverty, and the evil of war.” That was what Dr. King said 53 years ago. And if there were ever a moment in American history when we need to respond to Dr. King's clarion call for justice and demand, as he stated, “a radical revolution of values,” now is that time. This is the moment for us to bring about what Dr. King called “a radical revolution of values,” whether it is fighting against systemic racism and police brutality, whether it is transforming our energy system away from fossil fuel, whether it is ending a cruel and dysfunctional healthcare system, or addressing the grotesque level of income and wealth inequality in our country, now is the time for change, real change.

In my view, given all of the unprecedented crises our country faces, now is not the time to increase the Pentagon's bloated \$740 billion budget, which is 53 percent of all discretionary spending in America. Let me repeat that. The military budget alone is 53 percent of all discretionary spending in this country.

At a time when 28 million Americans are in danger of being evicted from their homes, now is not the time to be spending more on the military than the next 11 nations combined.

At a time when 30 million Americans have lost their jobs, now is not the time to be spending more on national defense than we did at the height—the height—of the Cold War or the wars in

Korea or Vietnam. Let me repeat: spending more in real, inflation-accounted-for dollars today on the military than we did during the Cold War or the wars in Korea or Vietnam.

At this unprecedented moment in our history, now is the time to provide jobs, education, healthcare, and housing in American communities that have been ravaged by the global pandemic, by extreme poverty, by deindustrialization, and mass incarceration.

If this horrific pandemic we are now experiencing has taught us anything, it is that national security means a lot more than building bombs, missiles, jet fighters, submarines, nuclear warheads, and other weapons of mass destruction. National security also means doing everything we can to improve the lives of our people, many of whom have been abandoned by our government decade after decade.

The amendment that I am offering today would cut the \$740 billion budget—Pentagon budget—by 10 percent and use that \$74 billion in savings to invest in distressed communities in every State in this country, communities that have been ravaged by poverty, mass incarceration, and other enormous problems.

Under this amendment, distressed cities and towns would be able to use this \$74 billion to create jobs by building affordable housing, new schools, childcare facilities, community health centers, public hospitals, libraries, sustainable energy projects, and clean drinking water facilities. These communities would also receive Federal funding to hire more public school teachers, provide nutritious meals to children, and offer free tuition at public colleges, universities, and trade schools.

Over and over again, our Republican friends—my colleagues here—have told us we cannot possibly afford to address the enormous problems facing working families: We just can't afford it. We don't have the money to deal with homelessness and hunger and inadequate education.

That is what they say every day. We have been told that we cannot afford to make public colleges and universities tuition-free or to provide a decent income for every man, woman, and child. But when it comes to spending \$740 billion on the military, well, suddenly, hey, money is no problem; we can spend as much as we want. Hey, let's listen to all of the lobbyists from the military-industrial complex who flood Capitol Hill and tell us all their needs. We have to listen to them, but we don't listen to the children in this country who may not have enough food to eat or the workers in this country who are sleeping out in their cars. We don't listen to them, but when it comes to the military, hey, no end to the money that we can provide.

To my mind, that is unacceptable. We don't need more nuclear weapons. We don't need more cruise missiles. We

don't need more fighter jets. What we do need in this country, desperately, is more healthcare, more housing, more childcare, and better schools.

Now is the time to fundamentally change our national priorities, and that is what this amendment is all about. This amendment in itself is not going to do anywhere near what we need to do as a country, but it is an important step forward in changing the way we think about our needs.

Let me be clear. If we were to institute a 10-percent cut in military spending, that \$74 billion could provide high-quality childcare to every family in America. Imagine that. We could solve the childcare crisis in America just by cutting the military budget by 10 percent.

We could, by cutting the military budget by 10 percent, provide section 8 housing vouchers to all of the 7.7 million families in America who are paying more than half of their limited incomes on rent.

A 10-percent cut to the Pentagon could provide a free college education for 2 million low-income students.

A 10-percent cut to the Pentagon is enough to hire 900,000 teachers in the poorest schools in America.

So I am a little bit tired about hearing that we don't have enough money for nuclear weapons, that we need more money for missiles and tanks and guns—that we need more for all of that, yet we are turning our backs on Americans who are hurting the most.

I believe this is a moment in history when it would be a very good idea for all of my colleagues, Democratic and Republican, to remember what former Republican—Republican—President Dwight D. Eisenhower said in 1953. I think we all recall that Eisenhower knew something about military budgets and the war because he was the four-star general who led the Allied forces to victory in Europe during World War II. He was not a passivist. He was not an anti-war activist. He was a four-star general.

Dwight D. Eisenhower said:

Every gun that is made, every warship launched, every rocket signifies, in the final sense, a theft from those who hunger and are not fed, those who are cold and are not clothed. This world in arms is not spending money alone. It is spending the sweat of its laborers, the genius of its scientists, the hopes of its children.

Right now, when the world is searching for treatment of the coronavirus, when we are searching desperately and spending billions looking for a vaccine, maybe it might be a good idea to be educating our young people to figure out how we deal with disease—with cancer and schizophrenia and Alzheimer's and diabetes—rather than putting more and more scientists into figuring out how we can blow the world up a dozen times over.

What Eisenhower said was true—profoundly true—67 years ago, and it is true today, maybe even truer today.

When we analyze the Defense Department budget, it is interesting to note

that the Congress has appropriated so much money for the Defense Department that the Pentagon literally does not know what to do with it. Between 2013 and 2018, they actually returned more than \$80 billion in funding back to the Treasury. They had more money than they could spend.

In my view, the time is long overdue for us to take a hard look not only at the size of the Pentagon budget but at the enormous amount of waste, cost overruns, fraud, and at the financial mismanagement that has plagued the Department of Defense for decades.

Let's be clear. We don't talk about it, but let's be clear. About half of the Pentagon's budget goes directly into the hands of private contractors, not our troops. Over the past two decades, virtually every major defense contractor in the United States has paid billions of dollars in fines and settlements for misconduct and fraud, all while making huge profits on those government contracts. Virtually every major defense contractor has been found guilty of misconduct or fraud.

Since 1995, Boeing, Lockheed Martin, and United Technologies have paid over \$3 billion in fines or related settlements for fraud or misconduct. Further, I find it interesting that the very same defense contractors that have been found guilty or reached settlements for fraud are also paying their CEOs excessive—excessive—compensation packages. Last year, the CEOs of Lockheed Martin and Northrop Grumman both made over \$20 million in total compensation, while around 90 percent of these companies' revenue came from defense contracts. In other words, for all intents and purposes, these companies are basically government agencies. Ninety percent of the revenue coming in comes from the taxpayers of this country. Meanwhile, the CEOs of those companies make over 100 times more than the Secretary of Defense makes. It is not too surprising, therefore, that we have a revolving door where our military people end up on the boards of directors of these major defense companies.

Moreover, as the GAO has told us, there are massive cost overruns in the Defense Department's acquisition budget that we continue to ignore year after year. According to the GAO, the Pentagon's \$1.8 trillion acquisition portfolio currently suffers from more than \$628 billion in cost overruns, with much of the cost growth taking place after production.

A major reason why there is so much waste, fraud, and abuse at the Pentagon is the fact that the Defense Department remains the only Federal agency in America that has not been able to pass an independent audit. Many of us will recall what then-Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld—George W. Bush's Secretary of Defense—told the American people on the day before 9/11. It never got a lot of attention—the day before 9/11. Rumsfeld said:

Our financial systems are decades old. According to some estimates, we cannot track \$2.3 trillion in transactions.

I don't know that the situation has changed very much since 2001 and Rumsfeld's remarks. Yet, nearly 20 years after Rumsfeld's statements, the Defense Department has still not passed a clean audit, despite the fact that the Pentagon controls assets in excess of \$2.2 trillion or roughly 70 percent of what the entire Federal Government owns.

I believe in a strong military, but we cannot keep giving more money to the Pentagon than it needs when millions of children in this country face hunger every day and 140 million Americans cannot afford the basic necessities of life without going into debt.

In 1967 Dr. King warned us that "a nation that continues year after year to spend more money on military defense than on programs of social uplift is approaching spiritual death." I believe the time is long overdue for us to listen to Dr. King.

At a time when, in the richest country in the history of the world, so many of our people are struggling, now is the time to change our priorities because, as Dr. King stated, we are approaching spiritual death.

At a time when we have the highest rate of childhood poverty of almost any major country on Earth, at a time when 60,000 Americans die each year because they can't get to a doctor on time and 1 out of 5 Americans cannot afford the prescription drugs their doctors prescribe, we need to start focusing on those people, not on the military-industrial complex.

At this moment of unprecedented national crisis—a pandemic, an economic meltdown, the demand to end systemic racism, and an unstable President—it is time for us to truly focus on what we value as a society and to fundamentally transform our national priorities. Cutting the military budget by 10 percent and investing that money in human needs is a modest way to begin that process.

Let me conclude by once again quoting Dwight D. Eisenhower. I don't know that I have ever quoted a Republican quite as much as I have during these remarks, but he is somebody whom I respected very much.

This is what Eisenhower said when he left office. This was back in 1961. He was out, and John F. Kennedy was coming in. This is what he said. I hope we can all remember this. He said:

In the councils of government, we must guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by the military-industrial complex. The potential for the disastrous rise of misplaced power exists and will persist.

Eisenhower was right then, and, if anything, the situation is worse today. Now is the time for us to stand up to the greed and irresponsibility of the military industrial complex. Now is the time to address the needs of working families, the elderly, the children, the sick, and the poor.

Let us vote for the Sanders-Markey-Warren-Merkley-Wyden-Leahy amendment to cut the Pentagon budget by 10 percent and invest in human needs here at home.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LANKFORD). The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I am proud to speak in support of my amendment with Senator SANDERS to prioritize investments in our communities over a bloated Pentagon budget. I thank Senator SANDERS for his leadership on this issue, bringing forth this fundamental tension that exists within our society.

The men and women of the Armed Forces deserve our admiration, our respect, and our support. Day in and day out, they defend our country's interests in all corners of the world, and their families sacrifice alongside them. But what makes America the envy of the world is not simply the strength of our military but the strength of our people.

And 2020 has brought historic challenges: a global pandemic, a growing recession, a reckoning on the systemic racism that pervades our country. We have also seen an estimated 5.4 million American workers lose their health insurance between February and May, leaving them even more vulnerable to a virus surging in every corner of this country.

The Sanders-Markey amendment states that we cannot afford, in this, our moment of national crisis, to spend three-quarters of a trillion dollars on bloated defense spending—spending that is supposed to protect our country yet did nothing to inoculate against the most profound public health emergency in a century.

This amendment is also in keeping with President Eisenhower's warning, as Senator SANDERS said, that "we must guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by the military-industrial complex. The potential for the disastrous rise of misplaced power exists, and will persist."

Persist it has. This \$740 billion fiscal year 2021 budget before us is the fulfillment of Ike's worst fears. In his address to the American people, President Eisenhower also predicted that a permanent arms industry would come to call the shots. After Japan surrendered aboard the USS *Missouri* in 1945, ending the Second World War, that permanent arms industry made its fixture.

After we emerged victorious in a historic and ideological struggle against the Soviet Union that brought us to the brink of nuclear holocaust, Eisenhower's feared permanent arms industry stuck around and retooled to advocate for new weapons to fight the endless war to come.

The catastrophic attacks of September 11 led to more than a doubling of the Pentagon's budget. Multiple Presidents have stretched a limited authorization of military force to go after

those responsible for the 9/11 attacks—to fight new enemies in new geographies, outside of Afghanistan.

All told, so far, we have spent \$6.4 trillion in the wars in Afghanistan, Iraq, Syria, and other places since 2001. Even as those wars wind down, the defense industry is pushing for costly new acquisition programs to maintain superiority over China and Russia.

The forecasted "permanent arms industry" begins to explain why the Pentagon accounts for half of the entire fiscal year 2021 U.S. discretionary budget. Our military budget is larger than the next 10 countries combined. Our battle fleet is larger than the next 13 navies combined, with 11 of those 13 navies represented by our allies or our partners.

However, every dollar spent on the Pentagon is one fewer available to fight the scourge of poverty in this country, to strengthen the social safety net and protect American families. Our communities have suffered while we spend ourselves into extreme U.S. military dominance.

I fear that the Pentagon budget we debate today shows to a child that we don't prioritize giving him or her a quality education; shows mothers and fathers that, in the wealthiest country in the world, they will forever remain one illness away from financial ruin; shows a family that the dream of homeownership, much less affordable rental housing, will remain out of their grasp; shows frontline heroes working in hospitals and nursing homes in Chelsea, MA, and across the country that they have no choice but to go work sick because their employer does not offer paid leave.

I reject the false choice between a strong U.S. military and strong American communities. Trillions of dollars in defense spending did nothing to protect us from the coronavirus pandemic. The defense spending can't protect us from the destruction of the environment and the worsening climate crisis. Yet we are due to spend nearly 70 times more on defense than we will to protect against the next pandemic and other global health challenges.

We must no longer equate national security with our inventory of planes, missiles, and nuclear weapons system, and if coronavirus is truly a war, as President Trump says it is, he is duty-bound to embrace the fact that national security also means health, housing, and financial security, and national security means doing everything we can to save and improve lives in American communities, particularly communities of color, that have been neglected for too long and that have born the worst of the coronavirus impacts.

Our amendment begins that important work by making smart cuts of 10 percent to the budget of the Pentagon for this fiscal year and redirecting those funds to the Department of the Treasury to administer a grant program to strengthen vulnerable, low-income communities.

For example, in Massachusetts, we would be eligible to receive up to \$1 billion in Federal funding to create jobs by building affordable housing, schools, childcare facilities, community health centers, public hospitals, libraries, and clean drinking water facilities, removing lead pipes and replacing vacant or blighted properties; to improve education by hiring more public school teachers to reduce class sizes, increasing teacher pay, providing universal nutritious meals, and providing free tuition to attend public colleges, universities, or trade schools; and to make housing more affordable by providing rental assistance and eliminating homelessness.

We should prioritize eradicating poverty, not war. We should prioritize battling global killer diseases, not developing a new weapon designed to eradicate the human race. It is time we funded education, not annihilation—Medicaid, not missiles.

Where do we start to make Defense Department cuts? First, we must end the war in Afghanistan, which would save tens of billions of dollars. The time is long overdue to bring our men and women home. And it is time to double down on other tools of U.S. statecraft—diplomacy and development—to shape a better future for Afghanistan, particularly Afghan women.

As we work to put a stop to endless war and repeal the 2001 AUMF, the Pentagon must realign its budget to reflect the cold, hard wisdom of Ronald Reagan that “a nuclear war cannot be won and must never be fought.”

Between the Departments of Defense and Energy, we are due to spend nearly \$50 billion on nuclear weapons in fiscal year 2021. Over the next three decades, we are on course to spend \$1.7 trillion on nuclear weapons overkill. We can field a safe, secure, and effective nuclear deterrent—one that assures our allies and partners—all without breaking the bank.

Our people, not our military parades, are the source of American greatness. Over the past few months, this country has experienced a reckoning, as Americans from all walks of life have had enough. They have had enough of being lied to by the President about the true threat of a deadly disease. They have had enough of people of color being murdered in cold blood by the very police forces meant to serve and protect them. And they have had enough of being told there just isn't enough money to support the well-being of their communities, while they can see billions in taxpayers' dollars going to unnecessary wars and nuclear weapons programs and to benefit the President's friends and family.

The choice today is very clear. We are ready to take the smallest step, a 10-percent cut, to begin to address the gap in resources in this country. This is the time for us to stand up. We are about to have a debate on how much money we have to help families in this country through this pandemic. We are

being told that money is not there for unemployment insurance; for cities and towns not to have to lay off teachers; for cities and towns to have the testing, the contact tracing, and the personal protective equipment to protect families in our country; to make sure we can provide sick care leave; and to make sure we can provide childcare for families in this country. We are told there is not enough money. Yes, there is, and that money is in the defense budget of the United States of America, so that we can protect those families.

Too many people right now are nostalgic for a time that never was, instead of having the idealism which we need to battle the issues of today. But for the poor, the sick, the elderly, the disabled, the Black and Brown and immigrant families in this country, the past is just a memory and the future is their hard reality.

This is the time for the U.S. Senate to stand up and to begin the funding of the programs which every family needs to protect themselves. I urge an “aye” vote on this amendment, and, again, I thank Senator SANDERS for his incredible progressive leadership on this issue and for so many others.

I yield back.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 1788

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question occurs on agreeing to the Sanders amendment No. 1788.

The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 23, nays 77, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 135 Leg.]

YEAS—23

Baldwin
Blumenthal
Booker
Cantwell
Cardin
Casey
Durbin
Gillibrand

Hirono
Klobuchar
Leahy
Markey
Merkley
Murphy
Murray
Sanders

Schatz
Schumer
Smith
Udall
Van Hollen
Warren
Wyden

NAYS—77

Alexander
Barrasso
Bennet
Blackburn
Blunt
Boozman
Braun
Brown
Burr
Capito
Carper
Cassidy
Collins
Coons
Cornyn
Cortez Masto
Cotton
Cramer
Crapo
Cruz
Daines

Duckworth
Enzi
Ernst
Feinstein
Fischer
Gardner
Graham
Grassley
Harris
Hassan
Hawley
Heinrich
Hoeven
Hyde-Smith
Inhofe
Johnson
Jones
Kaine
Kennedy
King
Lankford

Lee
Loeffler
Manchin
McConnell
McSally
Menendez
Moran
Murkowski
Paul
Perdue
Peters
Portman
Reed
Risch
Roberts
Romney
Rosen
Rounds
Rubio
Sasse
Scott (FL)

Scott (SC)
Shaheen
Shelby
Sinema
Stabenow

Sullivan
Tester
Thune
Tillis
Toomey

Warner
Whitehouse
Wicker
Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 23, the nays are 77.

Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for the adoption of this amendment, the amendment is not agreed to.

The amendment (No. 1788) was rejected.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 1972, AS MODIFIED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is on agreeing to the Tester amendment, No. 1972, as modified.

Ms. HASSAN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 94, nays 6, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 136 Leg.]

YEAS—94

Alexander
Baldwin
Barrasso
Bennet
Blackburn
Blumenthal
Blunt
Booker
Boozman
Brown
Burr
Cantwell
Capito
Cardin
Carper
Casey
Cassidy
Collins
Coons
Cornyn
Cortez Masto
Cotton
Cramer
Crapo
Daines
Duckworth
Durbin
Enzi
Ernst
Feinstein
Fischer
Gardner

Gillibrand
Graham
Grassley
Harris
Hassan
Hawley
Heinrich
Hirono
Hoeven
Hyde-Smith
Inhofe
Johnson
Jones
Kaine
King
Klobuchar
Lankford
Leahy
Loeffler
Manchin
Markey
McConnell
McSally
Menendez
Merkley
Moran
Murkowski
Murphy
Murray
Perdue
Peters
Portman

Reed
Risch
Roberts
Romney
Rosen
Rounds
Rubio
Sanders
Sasse
Schatz
Schumer
Scott (SC)
Shaheen
Shelby
Sinema
Smith
Stabenow
Sullivan
Tester
Thune
Tillis
Toomey
Udall
Van Hollen
Warner
Warren
Whitehouse
Wicker
Wyden
Young

NAYS—6

Braun
Cruz

Kennedy
Lee

Paul
Scott (FL)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROMNEY). On this vote the yeas are 94, the nays are 6.

Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for the adoption of this amendment, the amendment is agreed to.

The amendment (No. 1972) was agreed to.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on amendment No. 2301 to Calendar No. 483, S. 4049, a bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal

year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

Mitch McConnell, Mike Crapo, Pat Roberts, John Cornyn, John Barrasso, Cory Gardner, Roy Blunt, Thom Tillis, Marsha Blackburn, Mike Rounds, Shelley Moore Capito, Kevin Cramer, John Thune, James M. Inhofe, Jerry Moran, Joni Ernst, John Boozman.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on amendment No. 2301 offered by the Senator from Oklahoma to S. 4049, a bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 87, nays 13, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 137 Leg.]

YEAS—87

Alexander	Ernst	Perdue
Baldwin	Feinstein	Peters
Barrasso	Fischer	Portman
Bennet	Gardner	Reed
Blackburn	Graham	Risch
Blumenthal	Grassley	Roberts
Blunt	Hassan	Rosen
Boozman	Hawley	Rounds
Braun	Heinrich	Rubio
Brown	Hirono	Sasse
Burr	Hoeven	Schatz
Cantwell	Hyde-Smith	Schumer
Capito	Inhofe	Scott (FL)
Cardin	Johnson	Scott (SC)
Carper	Jones	Shaheen
Casey	Kaine	Shelby
Cassidy	King	Sinema
Collins	Klobuchar	Smith
Coons	Lankford	Stabenow
Cornyn	Leahy	Sullivan
Cortez Masto	Loeffler	Tester
Cotton	Manchin	Thune
Cramer	McConnell	Tillis
Crapo	McSally	Toomey
Cruz	Menendez	Udall
Daines	Moran	Warner
Duckworth	Murkowski	Whitehouse
Durbin	Murphy	Wicker
Enzi	Murray	Young

NAYS—13

Booker	Markey	Van Hollen
Gillibrand	Merkley	Warren
Harris	Paul	Wyden
Kennedy	Romney	
Lee	Sanders	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERDUE). On this vote, the yeas are 87, the nays are 13.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion was agreed to.

The Senator from Iowa.

CHINA

Ms. ERNST. Mr. President, the coronavirus doesn't come with a label saying "Made in China," but perhaps it should. This pandemic, which began in Wuhan, China, has flooded the world just like so many products from China

that we all now rely upon to protect ourselves against the spread of the contagion. The situation underscores the conundrum our Nation faces balancing the need to work with the Chinese Government and the challenges of holding the Communist Party accountable for its devious deeds.

Plain and simple: The Chinese Communist Party attempted to cover up the outbreak of COVID-19 from the very beginning and continues to do so today. Rather than containing the spread of the virus, the regime has focused on containing knowledge of the outbreak, going so far as punishing Chinese scientists who dared to warn about the virus's imminent danger.

As a result, we now face a worldwide pandemic that has claimed countless victims and could impact every aspect of our lives for months, if not years, to come. China doesn't play by the rules. They constantly seek to undermine the law. And if you ask an Iowa farmer, they will tell you the same.

For years, China has stolen intellectual property and reneged on their trade agreements. While we have seen China still purchasing some of our corn and soybeans, they haven't completely held up their end of the deal when it comes to China phase one.

Folks, when China cheats on trade deals, the impact is real: American jobs are lost and wealth is transferred from the United States to the Communist Party of China. This is unacceptable, especially after the damage already caused to our economy by China's mis-handling of the coronavirus outbreak.

For decades, our leaders in Washington played along, remaining quiet as China stole American intellectual property and scientific research, cheated on trade deals, and violated basic human rights. Those days are over.

President Trump is standing up to China by taking decisive actions against the Communist regime for its flagrant violation of trade deals and crackdown on the autonomy and rights of Hong Kong.

I have heard this from farmers in Iowa. They know that this President is standing up for them and pushing back on China. And here in the Senate, my colleagues and I are also holding China accountable.

Right now, I am laser-focused on decreasing our dependency on China for critical supplies. The COVID-19 pandemic has been what I call a great awakening when it comes to the vulnerabilities in our supply chain. The United States has become far too dependent on Communist China for items like personal protective equipment, prescription drugs, and other essential medical supplies. We need to fix that. And that is what I am fighting to do.

During my military service, including as a logistics battalion commander in the Iowa Army National Guard, I learned firsthand the importance of securing the defense supply chain. We cannot continue to rely on our adversaries, like China, for critically important national security materials.

That is why, in this year's annual Defense bill, I made it a priority to boost support for university research in places like Iowa to ensure we can make and manufacture metals and materials here at home. This will help make sure China doesn't corner the world market on key materials.

Retaking our supply chain from Red China also means removing unnecessary redtape imposed by Washington. I am working to waive the tax penalties for manufacturing and medical supply companies that choose to relocate to America.

I have also demanded the Treasury Department investigate how Chinese companies are avoiding taxes that U.S. businesses have to pay.

Iowans across the State have told me how much they appreciate this President standing up for them by pushing back on the years of bad actions by the Communist Party. They also want to end our dependence on that same Communist regime.

Yes, we can and we should continue trading important agricultural products. But at the same time, we should bring jobs back and make critical supplies ourselves so that when you look at a product's label, it proudly reads "Made in the U.S.A."

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I want to thank Senator ERNST for putting this colloquy together. What she just said with regard to the importance of having reliable sources here in America is absolutely right.

The supply chain issue is one that I hope we will address in this COVID package—for starters, with regard to our personal protective gear, the PPE, because if we can't rely on having masks and gowns and other PPE made here in America, it is tough for us, particularly during an international pandemic like this, to build and rely on countries like China. Also, frankly, some of the product that comes from China has not been reliable itself.

I appreciate what you are doing there and also the work you are doing to encourage us to be more resourceful here at home, to be sure we are doing the things we have to do to protect ourselves from foreign influence, including China.

Part of our issue with China, I think, is that for the last several years, a lot of us point fingers at China and we are not pointing fingers, frankly, at our internal problems. We need to get our house in order here in America and protect ourselves better. We have legislation to do that, which we just reported out of the Governmental Affairs Committee today. It has to do with this issue of China coming to the United States and systemically targeting promising research and promising researchers, and saying: We would like to get that research.

The research is often supported by the U.S. taxpayer. It is sort of tough

here for us in America to lose our research and our innovation and our intellectual property to other countries. It is particularly tough when taxpayers pay for it, and \$150 billion a year of taxpayer money goes to the National Institutes of Health, the National Science Foundation, and the Department of Energy to do basic research.

That is good. We have helped to develop important therapies and cures for some kinds of cancer. We helped to develop the internet. It has been very helpful on manufacturing processes. A lot of great things have come out of that research.

But one thing that really troubles me is that for 20 years now, with China taking the lead and other countries, as well—Iran, North Korea, and others—they have again targeted these researchers and this research and said: We want to get that. And, frankly, they get it on the cheap because the research is being paid for by our tax dollars.

Let me give you an example of what I am talking about. Recently, in my home State of Ohio, there was a case along these lines. I applaud the FBI and the Department of Justice and our U.S. attorneys for finally getting on top of this issue. We spent a year studying this issue here in the Congress in what is called the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, which I chair. We found out that this was a huge problem and wrote a report late last year.

In the report, we implored our Federal law enforcement agencies to get on this issue. In fact, we had a hearing where an FBI agent testified and said that it is true. We haven't been focused on this, and we have to make that up now.

They are making up for it. They are arresting a number of people. They are doing the things that should be done to try to stop some of this stealing, really, of our seed corn, our technology, our innovation, our intellectual property.

Here is the Ohio example. Recently, the FBI announced that it had arrested a researcher connected with the world-renowned Cleveland Clinic and Case Western Reserve University. This individual had received a huge grant from the National Institutes of Health, or NIH. That grant was for about \$3.6 million. But then this same individual—of course, not telling NIH or telling Cleveland Clinic or Case Western or anybody else—had accepted money from China.

In the contracts that we were able to research during our investigation, these contracts with China say you are not allowed to reveal that you have this relationship with China, that you are getting the money from China. They not only gave this guy money—\$3 million—but they gave him a deanship at Wuhan University. They gave him money to hire people in Wuhan. They gave him the ability to travel around America recruiting others. We think he

recruited 30 or 40 people, according to the FBI.

Again, these are all allegations. His arrest has been made. He actually is alleged to have taken biological samples from Cleveland, OH, to China—this taxpayer-paid NIH research—literally, physically taking these to China. They also, by the way, provided lodging for him with a three-bedroom apartment in Wuhan. That is luxury.

This is about money. Unfortunately, this is about people who are not patriots but instead are willing to sell us out by selling their research, their expertise that our taxpayers have funded to China and other countries.

NIH, recently, by the way, fired or forced the resignation of 54 researchers—not 1 or 2 or 3, but 54 people. We have been pushing them hard to find out who these people are and what they are doing. They haven't been willing to reveal that yet because this is a matter under investigation. They have told us that of those who are under investigation at NIH, 90 percent have ties to China—90 percent.

Wake up, America. Here we are. We are in a situation where other countries, particularly China, have targeted American research, American researchers, and are now taking this back to China to benefit their military, to benefit their economy, and to benefit their healthcare system.

By the way, I do not believe this is for academic purposes. It is wrong what is happening, but it is even more wrong because this is not as if they are taking it back to do joint research on an academic basis.

Let me tell you what the State Department told us at our hearing on this topic at the end of last year. They said: "The Chinese Communist Party has declared the Chinese university system to be on the front line of military-civilian fusion efforts for technology acquisition."

This is our own State Department. That means there is a clear link between the research that is being taken in America and the latest advancement in China's military and its economy.

It has been happening for 20 years. It is time to put an end to it. The legislation that we were able to get through committee today takes a really important step in that direction. There are four or five elements of it.

One of the most important to me is giving the FBI and law enforcement the tools they need to go after these individuals by creating a new criminal law that says if you lie on these forms, if you are taking money from China, it is certainly a conflict of commitment and a conflict of interest. You can be taken to task for that and held accountable. Right now you can't.

They are arresting these people on things like mail fraud, tax evasion. It is a little like how they used to go after gangsters before there were laws directly related to racketeering and so on. This is something where we need to be sure that we are giving people the tools that they need.

We also help the State Department to keep these people out, and we help with regard to our universities to ensure that we are reporting and being transparent as to the money universities are receiving from China and other countries.

Again, I thank my colleague from Iowa for having this colloquy. I see we have two other colleagues here. I know they are really well-versed and involved in these issues, and I want to hear from them, as well.

I would just say that I hope, on a bipartisan basis—by the way, our legislation is bipartisan. Our investigation was bipartisan. I would say this is non-partisan. This is an American issue. We should all be standing up to protect the American research enterprise and to be sure that our taxpayers, when they pay for this important research, have the benefit of it rather than its being taken, in particular, by China to benefit their military and their economy, which has been going on for 2 decades.

It is time to wake up.

I yield to my colleague from Arizona. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Ms. MCSALLY. I thank my colleague from Ohio and others here from Florida and Iowa for coming together to talk about this important American issue and national security issue.

I served 26 years in the military. In my last years in service and since then, we have seen the threat of the rise of China. It is a threat to America's security, our jobs, and our role as a leader in the world. They are on a deliberate path to try to dominate the world and shape it into their vision. They need to be stopped.

When I was a cadet at the Air Force Academy, we had an honor code that said: "I will not lie, cheat, or steal, or tolerate among us anyone who does." China has been lying, cheating, and stealing for far too long. Americans are now waking up to this threat and are resolved to change the trajectory and hold China accountable, but this can't be done by us alone. Our European partners and others in the Pacific and elsewhere need to join with us and also wake up to China's dangerous path and work with us to stop them.

We have been calling this geostrategic shift a return to "Great Power Competition," as if to assume that we are all playing by the same rules. We aren't. China is playing by their own rules and cheating the system for their own gain and power. The Chinese Communist Party is a reckless, predatory adversary that is dedicated to subverting U.S. interests and supplanting our Nation as the world's dominant leader.

Over the past 10 years, China has increased their military spending by 85 percent. Their investment in defense has been used to build their navy, expand their missile stockpile, and emerge as a leader in technologies like hypersonics, cyber warfare, and artificial intelligence.

This buildup has been far from defensive alone. From their illegal maritime claims among several sovereign states, then building artificial islands where they didn't exist before to militarize them in the South China Sea with their maneuvers and exercises that are aggressive and belligerent, to their covert attempts to infiltrate the United States through our universities and stealing our technology, Chinese forces are expanding their tentacles far beyond our borders, to the detriment of American national security interests.

Congress must do our part to respond to this threat. For these reasons, I introduced several pieces of legislation that immediately stopped China from taking advantage of government funds and taxpayer dollars to purchase products and services from Chinese companies with ties to Chinese military.

To end our reliance on China's control and manufacturing of PPE, I introduced legislation to authorize the President to incentivize American companies to produce medical devices, equipment, and drugs.

We saw at the onset of the coronavirus that it was clear that outsourcing the production of PPE to an adversary was wrong and risky. I witnessed firsthand the ingenuity of Arizona companies that stepped up to help fill the gap. That is no excuse for ignoring the fact that we have to bring manufacturing home of vital medical equipment and PPE so that, once again, it is made in America.

Finally, the coronavirus outbreak has taken a catastrophic toll on our country and the world. Make no mistake. The virus began in China and spread globally because the Chinese Government lied about what they knew about it, and they destroyed evidence and silenced doctors and whistleblowers.

Like the rest of the Nation, Arizona has suffered devastating consequences due to this pandemic. Already, we have lost over 2,900 Arizonans, plus the economic toll.

Communist China unleashed this virus on the world, and it should face severe repercussions for their coverups and lies about the origins and spread. China's actions cost lives and devastated the world economy, and it must be held accountable.

I moved to do just that this week by introducing the Civil Justice for Victims of COVID Act. Americans who have been victimized by the lies and deceit of the Communist Party—to include those who lost loved ones, suffered business losses, or personally harmed—deserve the opportunity to hold China accountable and demand just compensation.

I appreciate many of my colleagues joining with me on this legislation. It is due time that we hold China accountable for their malevolent behavior—not just over the past several months but over several decades.

The United States must take immediate action and, with strength, dem-

onstrate that the greatest country in the world will not be taken for a fool. Our Republic and our freedoms that it stands for will allow our country to prevail over China's Communist and rogue agenda. With American will, American innovation, and the American spirit, we will prevail.

I appreciate my colleague from Florida joining as well.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. I want to recognize my colleagues from Arizona, Ohio, Texas, and Iowa for their commitment to holding Communist China accountable and supporting Americans.

I rise today to discuss the threat of Communist China—a threat that poses a huge risk to the national security of the United States, our allies, and the stability of world markets.

Communist China is simply stealing American jobs and technology and spying on our citizens.

General Secretary of the Communist Party Xi is a dictator and a human rights violator who is denying basic rights to the people of Hong Kong, cracking down on dissidents, threatening Taiwan, and militarizing the South China Sea.

Uighur prisoners in Communist China are being rounded up, blindfolded, shaved, and loaded onto trains to be taken to concentration camps simply because of their religion. You can't believe this is happening today in this world.

Communist China's deceptions surrounding the coronavirus pandemic should be the last straw for every American. It doesn't matter to Communist China that their lies and misinformation killed hundreds of thousands of people around the world. Communist China is on a mission to be the dominant world power. Chairman Xi will stop at nothing to grow Communist China's influence. For Communist China and Chairman Xi, this great power conflict is a zero-sum game. In order for China to be stronger, America and all freedom-loving countries around the world must be weaker. We can't allow that to happen. It is time we finally stand up and address the new Cold War occurring between the United States and the Chinese Communist Party.

For too long, Washington politicians have been more concerned with short-term political success than with the long-term threats to our way of life—but not anymore. It is time for action. We can no longer rely on countries like Communist China for our critical supply chain. We need to build up the national stockpile of PPE and our pharmaceutical industry with supplies from American-based producers. We can no longer accept Chinese technology that could be used to spy on us, and we are working to prohibit the Federal Government from purchasing drones from our adversaries.

We can no longer allow Communist China to steal from us. We have to be

aggressive in protecting American research and American innovation, including potentially lifesaving research into a coronavirus vaccine. We should do everything we can to stop buying products "Made in China" because, every time we do, we are putting another dollar into the pockets of those stealing our technology, denying their people basic human rights, and propping up dangerous dictators like Maduro in Venezuela.

We have to hold Communist China accountable and financially liable for its lies that led to the coronavirus. It is responsible for the devastation. We have to stand up and say that it is wrong to allow Beijing to host the 2022 Olympics. That is wrong. The world community cannot condone or reward its despicable behavior and human rights violations.

It is important to be clear-eyed. We have to see Communist China for what it is. We all must do our part to support our Nation and make it clear to Communist China that the people of the United States will not stand for its behavior.

I will not stop fighting until our future and the futures of all of our children and our grandchildren are secure from this threat.

I yield to my colleague from Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, I rise to join my colleagues in discussing the single greatest geopolitical threat facing the United States for the next century, and that is the rise of Communist China.

We are, right now, months into a deadly global pandemic that has sickened over 14 million people worldwide and has taken the lives of over 600,000 people. Why are we in the midst of a global pandemic? It is because the Chinese Communist Party deliberately lied to the world. It covered up the outbreak and allowed it to spread. The coronavirus pandemic has thrown into high relief the fact that China is our most dangerous threat.

For 8 years in the U.S. Senate, I have worked hard to lead the fight to address the threat of Chinese Communist power and aggression and hostility head-on, to make the U.S. economy as free and independent from China as possible, and to thwart the never-ending propaganda and censorship campaign from the Chinese Communists.

Last week, the Chinese Communist Government made the decision to sanction me personally, so I am now—I awoke to discover—prohibited from traveling to Communist China. Somehow, I think I will overcome that great burden, and I will tell you I wear China's sanction as a badge of honor. There is a reason they are lashing out. There is a reason it has decided to direct personal sanctions on me—because they are scared; they are terrified. The Chinese Communists are murdering, lying, torturing tyrants.

For a long time in Washington, there were politicians in both parties—Democrats and Republicans—who were apologists for China, who denied the threat was there, who insisted that the path forward was getting more and more and more in bed with the Chinese Communists. The most significant long-term foreign policy consequence of this global pandemic is that people's eyes are opening up on both sides of the aisle here in Washington and across the world. One need look no further than the United Kingdom's reversing its decision to allow Huawei to build its telecom infrastructure in order to understand how China's mendacity has been revealed to the world.

So how do we hold China accountable? How do we deal with the Chinese Communist Party?

First of all, we should sanction Chinese officials involved in the ongoing suppression of medical experts, of journalists, and of political dissidents, all of whom have been "disappeared" by the Chinese tyrants. I have introduced legislation to do just that. Over the past several years, I have introduced, roughly, a dozen separate pieces of legislation that have all focused on different aspects of addressing the China threat.

Another aspect is Chinese propaganda—Chinese propaganda that is reflected here in the United States. Big Business, giant corporations, the media, Hollywood all are terrified to take on Communist China. All see the billions they can earn from access to the Chinese markets as being more important than free speech.

With respect to Hollywood, sadly, too many movie producers here in the United States have been perfectly content to allow the Chinese Communists to censor American movies. For example, later this year, the sequel to "Top Gun" is scheduled to come out—"Top Gun," one of the greatest military recruiting films ever made. In the sequel, on the back of Maverick's bomber jacket, the flag of Taiwan has been removed and the flag of Japan, both of which the Chinese overlords deemed to be offensive, and our heroic First Amendment champions in Hollywood dutifully complied with censorship.

By the way, it needn't just concern geopolitical affairs in Asia. With another Hollywood movie, "Bohemian Rhapsody"—a fabulous biopic of Freddie Mercury, the lead singer for Queen—the Chinese censors decided it offended their sensibilities to have scenes in the movie that revealed that Freddie Mercury was homosexual. Now, I ask you to pause for a second and ask: How on Earth do you tell Freddie Mercury's life story without including the fact that he was gay? It was integral to who he was. Yet those in Hollywood, which on so many other issues are glad to be woke social justice warriors, dutifully complied when the Chinese censors said to take it out, and they deleted the scenes from "Bohemian Rhapsody."

I have introduced legislation in this body called the SCRIPT Act that will impose consequences when American companies allow the Chinese Government to censor our films. The consequences are simple. We don't have the power as the government to impose direct negative consequences, but what we do have the power to do is to use the incentives we have; namely, lots of movies borrow Federal assets. When you go watch a movie and see a plane or a ship or a tank or when you go watch a movie on the border and you see DHS assets, all sorts of Federal agencies allow movies to use equipment that is the property of the Federal Government. The SCRIPT Act is very simple. It says, if you are going to allow the Chinese Communists to censor your movie, the Federal Government is not going to loan you our equipment and materiel. We are not going to facilitate making a movie if you are going to give the Chinese Communists the editing and censoring pen.

Not only do the Chinese Communists engage in propaganda in Hollywood, but they also engage in espionage and propaganda on our university campuses—a very deliberate, systematic effort to steal and deceive. In the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019, I was proud to secure a funding prohibition for the Department of Defense from funding universities where the money could go to a Confucius Institute. As a result of that bipartisan legislation, which earned support from Republicans and Democrats, 17 Confucius Institutes have been shut down.

When it comes to our supply chain, we have seen, in recent months, the incredible foolishness of allowing the American supply chain to be dependent on China—medical equipment, pharmaceuticals, PPE. In the midst of this pandemic, one Chinese Government state-controlled newspaper explicitly threatened to cut off lifesaving pharmaceuticals to the United States of America as a tool of economic warfare. If it were to do that, that wouldn't just be economic warfare—that would be actual warfare. That is literally threatening the lives of millions of Americans.

We need to break our supply chain dependence on China, especially concerning critical infrastructure, and I have introduced hosts of legislation designed to do so with respect to pharmaceuticals, with respect to critical minerals. We have to keep the American people's lives and safety not dependent upon the whims of Communist China.

In my final point right now, in China today, there are, roughly, 1 million Uighurs in concentration camps—an Orwellian-style, dystopian government, where the government has all power to monitor what you say, to monitor whom you talk to, to monitor your beliefs. I introduced legislation to impose sanctions on any American technology companies that facilitate the monitoring and oppression of the Chinese

people. I am proud to say the Trump administration took major portions of that legislation I introduced and implemented them to increase the pressure to stop facilitating Chinese torture and oppression.

The overwhelming challenge for this body and for this country for the next century going forward is how we will stand up to the threat of China. China is waging a 1,000-year war. For the sake not only of Americans but for the sake of the free world, America needs to win this contest.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, I was thinking a bit earlier today about what we were doing at this time last year. We were busy hosting Tennessee Tuesdays and welcoming Tennesseans and families and children with such curiosity and bright eyes and lots of questions about our Nation's government, about these beautiful buildings in which we work every day, and about the job that we have in representing them. I like that curiosity, and I like that energy that, generally, is brought to our Chambers and to our work during the summertime. This year, things really are a little bit different. I think it is a very worthwhile exercise—and I appreciate that my colleagues are participating in this exercise—to remind ourselves why this year is different.

The answer, of course, as to why is this year different is the Chinese Communist Party. It is the one that is to be held responsible, to be blamed for the sickness, the chaos, for this crisis that we have had, which is a health, food, and financial crisis all rolled into one. It has happened because of decisions that China made, decisions that were made by the Chinese Communist Party's leadership.

There are some things that are the known knowns, if you will. They are the things that we know happened as you look back over what has happened with COVID-19.

What we know is this: On December 31, 2019, government officials in Wuhan, China, confirmed they were monitoring the spread of a disease that looked a lot like pneumonia. They didn't know exactly what it was. It didn't have all the markers, but a lot. But on New Year's Eve, they let us know: Hey, we have a problem out here. Just days later, they confirmed it was caused by a novel virus that had infected dozens of people. We now know it was hundreds of people.

It wasn't until January 23, however, that authorities shut off Wuhan from the rest of the country. By this time, the virus was spreading like wildfire. Let's pay close attention to what I just said. They shut off Hubei Province, they shut off Wuhan not from the rest of the world, not from other countries, but from the rest of China. Don't you dare go anywhere else in our country. This is contagious.

Now, as if that 23-day gap wasn't bad enough, credible watchdog reports revealed that the CCP—Chinese Communist Party—lied—they lied to global health officials about the danger posed by the virus for not just a day or two while they figured it out but for 51 days before they sounded the alarm and said: Listen up. Pandemic. Pandemic. Fifty-one days. This deception allowed a regional outbreak to spread into a global pandemic that has so far killed more than 140,000 Americans.

It would be easy to chalk all of this up to incompetence and overwhelmed bureaucrats, but every Member of this body knows that is not what happened. That is why, over the past few weeks, more and more of my colleagues here in the Senate have agreed to support legislation that will allow Americans to hold China accountable for the destruction caused by the pandemic.

On Monday, Senator McSALLY introduced the Civil Justice for Victims of COVID Act—a bill that I am very pleased to support and to be a cosponsor. This bill contains elements of my Stop COVID Act, which I introduced earlier this year. It would strip Chinese officials of their sovereign immunity for reckless actions that caused the pandemic and would give our Federal courts the authority to hear claims that China has caused or contributed to the COVID-19 pandemic. This is not an unusual step. We did this after 9/11 for the 9/11 families. What we would do is give them the opportunity to go to court and make their case—hold China accountable.

It is time for this body to reject the artificial backstops that some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle use to protect China from criticism, and I encourage those colleagues to ask themselves: What are you afraid will happen if we hold China accountable for what they have done? What do you fear?

We have known for years that Beijing uses every tool in its toolbox to spy on us. Look at what we have learned about Huawei. They embed the chips in the hardware. You do not know they are there until they activate. We know they steal our intellectual property. Look at what they have done to the music industry, to the entertainment industry, to publishers, and to automotive engineers. China—they can't innovate their way to success, so what do they do? They steal their way to success, and then they lie about it.

China continues to cause chaos on the international stage. Look at their work pushing into the South China Sea. Look at what they have done to the freedom fighters in Hong Kong. Look at how they act and how they pressure and try to stifle Taiwan. This is standard operating procedure for the Chinese Communist Party.

Now, because they chose to lie and not come forward, we have more than 140,000 Americans who are dead. Millions more have lost their jobs, and they have lost their sense of commu-

nity. How much further are we willing to let this go? I will tell you this: As I, every single day, talk to Tennesseans about China and what has happened with China and how China has not been an honest broker, not only in this but for decades, Tennesseans have had enough.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, the world is watching and dealing with COVID-19—the economic effects and health effects. It has affected every single one of our families in some way.

While the world is watching and we are dealing with all those issues here in the United States, we can't lose track of what is happening on the world stage because China is using this moment when the world is distracted to push its way into Hong Kong and to break its word.

When we deal with China, we know what they have done, the predatory tactics they have taken either on their own people or on countries around the world.

The United States of America—when we do foreign aid, we go help other countries gain more freedom, more security, more stability, and more economic growth. We don't ask anything in return. We engage with them to help them.

China is working with developing countries around the world by moving into different countries and taking collateral of their ports, of their airports, and establishing military bases around the world when poorer countries default on the loans they give them. They are not helping other countries; they are taking over other countries.

They are stepping into country after country and offering them great new technology from Huawei to help their cell phone systems. They are establishing security systems around their banks. But what they are really doing is monitoring their people and gathering data on people all around the world. The security systems aren't there to set up and prop up dictatorships in poor countries; they are there for the dictatorship of China to track what is going on there and any international development.

We should be aware of what China is doing, and we should not ignore this moment for the free people of Hong Kong.

Today, many Americans are aware of how China has handled the issue of protective equipment. The medical equipment that we desperately needed in March, April, May—much of it manufactured in China—we could not get because the Communist Government of China kept the materials from American companies that were manufacturing in China. The Chinese Communist Government wouldn't allow the exportation of that, and they just took that equipment over, putting all of the schedules behind. Suddenly, Americans woke up and understood that our sup-

ply chains are at risk. Our pharmaceutical supply chains are at risk, and our PPE supply chains are at risk.

What many people don't know is that our rare earth minerals and critical minerals supply chain is at risk. Lots of folks really like the solar panels and electric car batteries. Well, great—except we are completely dependent on China for the rare earth minerals that are in those.

If we don't develop our own sourcing for those rare earth minerals—and we do have those same rare earth minerals here—if we don't develop our own supply chain, if we don't develop our own manufacturing for pharmaceuticals and for the precursors of pharmaceuticals, we will continue to be vulnerable to the Chinese Government, and at the moment the Communist government determines, they will take over that supply, and we will be at risk.

For decades, the Confucius Institutes have thrived on college campuses, spreading a Communist philosophy all through our college campuses. It is now at a moment that college campuses and leadership in colleges are starting to wake up to say: Why are we allowing Communist indoctrination on our campuses?

It is a bill that I have pushed, that I will continue to push to be able to wake up our universities, to say: Why are we allowing this on our campus?

It is an issue that I have pushed for years, dealing with Chinese Communists spying on American technology, stealing technology, and also stealing our science and inventions.

They come over with a grant from the United States and say they are going to send over researchers, when really what they are doing is harvesting the research and taking it back to China.

They take materials, whether it be music or movies or any items of production, and all that manufacturing that comes to China, they then take that same technology, move it to a different factory, and literally compete against the first company, because to do business in China, you have to turn over all your intellectual property to the Communist government, which then takes it and uses it on their own.

The Chinese Communist Government is not the ally of freedom for the world, and we should be aware of that. Certainly the people of Hong Kong are aware of that.

In 1997, after 150 years as a British territory, Hong Kong became a part of China under the Joint Declaration. It was one country, two systems—that Hong Kong for 50 years would remain autonomous and free.

Well, just over two decades later, the Chinese Government has broken its promise, and Hong Kong is no longer free. While the world is consumed with what is happening with COVID-19, the Communist government has moved into Hong Kong and has taken it over. They passed a law in Beijing that they

sent over and declared in Hong Kong that they can't have any of what they call subversion, organization or perpetuation of what they call terroristic activities, collusion with a foreign country or an external element, which I will explain later.

This new security law literally was delivered to the people of Hong Kong at midnight, and it went into place immediately. Then the next step was that the Chinese Communist police—military law enforcement—moved into Hong Kong to begin to implement this.

Free speech immediately stopped. Those protesters who were out on the street just wishing to be able to vote and to speak their mind were immediately rounded up.

Teachers and academics have been arrested or fired or threatened. Communist Chinese leaders have contacted them to reprimand them about teaching about human rights in their classrooms, remembering that in Hong Kong it was required—it was a required class in Hong Kong just weeks ago—to learn about human rights and freedom, and now the Chinese Government is removing those teachers and threatening any other teacher who teaches about human rights that they will be removed.

Faith leaders have been squashed. You see, under this security law that has passed, you can't have any external element collusion. They define "external element" as any kind of worship of God as well that does not align with the Communist Government. So any faith-based group who is there in Hong Kong is immediately being squashed.

The Muslim Uighurs are gathered up in Communist China and put in concentration camps to reeducate them on how to be more Chinese. Now the people of Hong Kong are experiencing that same type of oppression as the first step has stepped in to take away their right to free speech, their right to gather and protest, and now also their right to have freedom of faith. Leaders of the democracy movement have already been rounded up and arrested. This is something that we should not ignore. We have said as a world "Never again," and we should engage.

I know many people in my State say we should focus on COVID-19, and we should. There is much that needs to be done. We cannot take our eyes off of freedom around the world, as well, and the people of Hong Kong. As they lose their freedom, the world loses freedom, and China sees it can move into one more place one more time. Taiwan is next, and they will continue to move in this same way. We should stay engaged.

There are multiple bills this body has already done on sanctions, and we should continue. We should continue to press in and speak out for those who cannot speak for themselves in Hong Kong. They are being isolated. Senator TIM KAINE and I just dropped a bill yesterday dealing with internet freedom for the people of Hong Kong, saying

that the American Government should be engaged in trying to break through what is called the great firewall in China. We know they will extend this firewall into Hong Kong, as well, and will prevent the people from Hong Kong from access to social media, information with each other, or information from the outside world, just as they have with the people of China. But the people of Hong Kong have grown up and lived in freedom, and they know what it means to get outside information, and the Chinese Government is actively working to shut that down. We should actively work to push back on that to make sure the free people of Hong Kong continue to communicate with each other and with the outside world. We can stay engaged with that basic function of human rights. That is why Senator KAINE and I are so passionate about this.

We should engage as a government to make sure that they can continue to have the free speech that we have. When anyone loses their human rights and dignities, the world loses human rights and dignities.

Again, I am aware that there are many things that need to happen with COVID-19 right now, and we are actively working on those things as well, and we should. But we should not lose track of freedom. Freedom is our responsibility to model and to live and to help other free people to guard. Let's stand with the people of Hong Kong.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 3627

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I am glad to have the opportunity to talk for a bit on the floor of the U.S. Senate on U.S. policy toward China because there has been no better friend for Chinese interests likely in our lifetime than President Donald J. Trump.

Articles suggest that when you survey Chinese Communist Party leaders, they are, to a person, rooting for the reelection of this President. I don't need to go through the litany of ways in which China has become more influential and more powerful all around the world because of this administration's policies, but at the top of that list is the abdication of the United States' traditional leadership role on human rights, which has allowed the Communist Party to march on the Uighurs and others. It is a failed trade policy that has allowed China to extend its influence into places like Africa and throughout the Silk Road. It is America's break with Europe that has shattered our ability to negotiate together the future rules of the economic order.

But what China is really ecstatic about is this President's performance since March in the wake of a virus that now shows the United States as having 25 percent of the world's COVID cases while having only 4 percent of the world's population.

My friend Senator BLACKBURN recited the early moments of this virus out-

break in China, and she is right that China was nontransparent and unhelpful in those early days. But do you know who the greatest cheerleader for China was in the first 2 to 3 months of COVID-19's outbreak there? President Donald Trump. On 45 occasions he went on social media or gave statements to the press in which he lauded China's response. He talked about how transparent they were and how they were doing a great job. The world community couldn't put pressure on China to open up with respect to what they knew about the virus in large part because the leader of the Nation's most powerful country was doing the bidding of the Chinese Government.

The second thing that this President has done that makes China very, very pleased is to essentially make the argument for the Chinese that the autocratic model that they are perfecting is the best method by which to organize society around the world, because they say: Listen, we got this virus under control in a matter of months, and the world's greatest democracy is still dealing with an epidemic that looks to be raging newly out of control. So as we engage in this broad fight between models of governance, our inability—this administration's inability—to get this virus under control is maybe the greatest gift that this President has given to China.

Here is what makes it so unconscionable: We know that democracy is inefficient. We know that capital markets can sometimes be inefficient when pressed up against the wall by emergencies. So we built into the statutes of the United States emergency powers to give to this President—to any President—so that when they are faced with an emergency, they can cure some of the inefficiencies of democracy.

We are on the floor today—Senators BALDWIN, STABENOW, BROWN, and I—to talk about one particular power this President has. It is an act called the Defense Production Act, and it allows the President during moments of emergency to commandeer parts of the manufacturing supply chain in this country to make sure we are making everything we need in order to repel a foreign invader. Sometimes that may be an army, but in this case it is a pathogen.

What we have known from the very beginning is that there was no way for this country to have enough personal protective equipment—masks, face shields, gowns, and gloves—and there was no way for this country to be able to have enough tests to know who has it so that we can track it and get rid of it without the Federal Government stepping up and utilizing the Defense Production Act.

Twenty percent of nursing homes today have less than a week's supply of PPE.

Doctors at one hospital in Houston, where the outbreak is raging out of control, are being told to wear their N95 masks for 15 days in a row when it is recommended for a single use.

The national strategic stockpile once had 82 million gloves. Today they have less than 1 million.

Guess what. It is going to get worse. More people need to be tested. Schools are about to reopen. The superintendent of the 100,000-student Jefferson County school district in Louisville, KY, says that he needs \$10 million to order face masks alone. It is going to cost schools across this country \$25 billion to purchase medical supplies, and these medical supplies are going up in price because the supply is so low. We have a solution: the Defense Production Act.

We also don't have enough tests. It now takes 7 to 10 to 14 days to get a test back. In Connecticut, it used to take just 1 day. You can't beat this virus if you don't get results for 7 to 10 days. That person who gets tested goes out and spreads it during that time.

James Davis from Quest Diagnostics said:

We would double our capacity tomorrow . . . but it's not the labs that are the bottleneck. [It] is our ability to get physical machines and . . . our ability to feed those machines with chemical reagents.

That is equipment that could be produced in the United States if the President took control of the manufacturing supply chain—not forever, but to the extent of this crisis.

So the Medical Supply Transparency and Delivery Act, which Senator BALDWIN and my colleagues will talk more about, essentially picks up the ball the President has dropped and commands the President to operationalize the Defense Production Act and put somebody in charge of its effectuation to make sure we are producing in this country all of the medical equipment—the masks, the gloves, the testing reagents, the cartridges—that it is possible to produce in this Nation.

The level of gleeful, willing, knowing, purposeful incompetence from this administration is absolutely stunning, and no one should normalize an administration that has the power to save lives and refuses to operationalize it.

Why won't this administration take control of the supply chain? Why are they willing to let people die? States can't run the supply chain by themselves. It is a national and international supply chain. Hospitals can't create their own supply chain. They need to be focused on saving lives, not being miniprocurement organizations.

We know that democracies and capitalist economies are by nature and design often inefficient when faced with these urgent crises. That is why we give Presidents these enormous but temporary powers to smooth out the inefficiencies of a multibranch, multidirectional democracy.

When it comes to calling in the Federal troops to beat the hell out of protesters, this President seems perfectly willing to exercise his powers as Commander in Chief, but when it comes to making sure that my kids' teachers or my local doctor has a mask this fall,

this President is all of a sudden impotent. It falls to us, Members of the U.S. Congress, to stand up and pass legislation, the Medical Supply Transparency and Delivery Act, to make sure—to make sure—that we are using the extent of the statutes provided to this government and this President to make sure that people are safe and make sure people are tested in the middle of an ongoing epidemic.

I am glad to be joined on the floor today by a number of my colleagues to talk about the need to pass this legislation. We are going to offer a unanimous consent request. Senator BALDWIN will do that. I have been very pleased to be a partner with her in developing this legislation to require the operationalization of the DPA, but before she speaks, let me turn it over to my colleague and our caucus's leader on issues of healthcare, Senator STABENOW.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CORTON). The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, first, it is wonderful to be here with my great friends from Connecticut, Wisconsin, and Ohio. This is such an important discussion we are having today and such an important bill that needs to be passed.

Let me start again by underscoring something that Senator MURPHY said, because despite what happened in the beginning as it relates to China and certainly over the years, I have not been shy to address concerns related to stealing our intellectual property rights or other issues related to China. The reality is, despite whatever the smokescreens are about China, you can't say that they are the reason that with 4 percent of the population, we have 25 percent of the cases of COVID-19 and 25 percent of the deaths in the world. There is much more to it, and, unfortunately, it lands right in this country with the lack of national leadership that has been completely AWOL when it comes to the kind of national strategy we need to get our people the equipment, the support they need, the testing they need, and to have a strategy to safely reopen the economy and our schools while, at the same time, putting the health and safety and lives of Americans first by addressing the pandemic.

So I rise today to urge the Senate to take up and immediately pass the Medical Supply Transparency and Delivery Act. I want to thank Senators BALDWIN, MURPHY, and BROWN for introducing this important legislation. I am very proud to be an original cosponsor of this bill.

As all of you know, throughout history—and I love history—perhaps no State was as crucial to our Nation's victory in World War II as was Michigan. My colleagues may debate that, but I have the mic, so I will talk about Michigan.

The truth is that more than half of Michigan men and women proudly served in uniform, including my own

dad. Back home, the people of our State were hard at work producing the bombers, the tanks, the trucks, the helmets, and the guns needed to win the war. In fact, Michigan was called at that time "the arsenal of democracy." We make things, and during World War II, we were making the things that were needed to win the war—the arsenal of democracy. Both at home and abroad, victory in many ways depended on the people of my State.

For the past 6 months, our Nation has been fighting a different kind of war, a raging health pandemic, taking over 141,000 American lives so far. Unfortunately, this time our national generals appear to be missing in action. How is it possible that 6 months after the first case of COVID-19 on January 20, our healthcare workers still are struggling to get the personal protective gear they need to treat patients while keeping themselves safe? How can that be?

How is it possible that 6 months after the first case of COVID-19 was detected in the United States, people are still struggling to get tested? Well, I will tell you how. It is because of the complete lack of Federal leadership coming from this White House that we have seen, since day one, in this crisis.

None of us want it to be this way. We all live here. Our families are here. We are desperately concerned about our families, our friends, and people in our States. We want this White House to be successful in fighting the pandemic. We all need to be successful in fighting this pandemic.

But the reality is that the administration could have immediately used the Defense Production Act to ensure that we have quality protective equipment and testing supplies in the right place at the right time. It could have happened immediately. Instead, we have the administration providing example after example of telling the Governors: OK, you do it. We don't want to do it. You do it. We will be right behind you.

Then Governors turn around, and nobody is there.

They don't want to support the Governors and local communities now that we were once required to step up. But you go ahead. Or they are putting together shady contracts—no-bid contracts—one after the other.

One I will mention to you is called Fillakit, which was a \$10 million no-bid contract to produce testing supplies by somebody who already had had problems in the past and who was given a no-bid contract after setting up a new company. We heard this over and over. And ProPublica reported that the testing tubes Fillakit produced were, in fact, repurposed miniature plastic soda bottles and described the packaging process as unmasked employees using "snow shovels" and dumping them into plastic bins before squirting saline into them all in open air. Well, Michigan received some of those so-called testing supplies, and needless to say, they were not useable.

Meanwhile, Governors, hospitals, and nursing homes have spent time, energy, and money bidding against one another and being pitted against one another for lifesaving PPE and testing supplies. This is no way to fight a pandemic. This is no way to fight a war, and, certainly, no way to win a war.

In Michigan, after the CARES Act passed, going back to the State, working with our State Governor and her team and our delegation, I, literally, was in a situation of reaching out—because of my work in healthcare—to people in the medical supply business, and we got some of the first masks because I knew a guy who knew a guy who knew a guy in China. That was how we got the masks—no national supply chain.

Masks were coming in. Fifty-cent masks were being bumped up to \$5, \$6, \$7 apiece—no accountability, nobody worrying about the United States and whether we could get the best deal and whether our hospitals were able to get what they needed. Frankly, it was chaos—complete chaos. Again, that is no way to fight a pandemic, and it is certainly no way to fight a war.

During World War II, Michigan didn't decide to become the arsenal of democracy on its own. The Federal Government saw a need and called on Michigan companies and workers to fill it, and we did. It is the same thing this administration should be doing right now, today—today—to produce the PPE and testing supplies we need to end this pandemic. Instead, doctors and nurses are wearing the same masks for a week or more. People are waiting more than 10 days for test results, and more than 141,000 Americans, so far, have died, including more than 6,100 in Michigan.

It is time to pass this important bill. It is past time. It is time to put our great American companies to work producing the supplies we need. It is time to win this war. We have done big things before, and we can do it again. I join with my colleagues in urging that this bill be taken up immediately.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I thank Senators MURPHY and STABENOW and Senator BALDWIN's terrific leadership on this. I echo Senator MURPHY's earlier comments about China.

I see on the other side of the aisle Senators and President Trump. It is campaign season. So it is time to bash China, even though they have been in the pockets of China.

I was in the other body when corporate interests came and lobbied the House of Representatives and lobbied the Senate asking for China to get all of these trade breaks and tax breaks so that American companies could shut down production in Milwaukee or in Cleveland and move overseas to China and get all kinds of tax breaks. And then my Republican colleagues were also pro-China because they wanted

these American corporations and their contributors, starting with Senator MCCONNELL down the hall, to get all of these advantages for China.

Now, if you are thinking about running for President of the United States in 2024 as a Republican, you bash China. If you are in a tough reelection right now for the Senate, you bash China. If you are a House Member and afraid of being defeated, you bash China. If you want to help the cause for Donald Trump, you bash China. It doesn't matter that President Trump has been the best friend of China. It doesn't matter the Republican leadership has been in the pocket of Chinese Communist interests because of their support for American corporations. It is just good politics to bash China. So we know that, and Senator MURPHY touched on that.

S. 4049

Mr. President, I want to say a few words first about Agent Orange and thank Senator TESTER for his work on behalf of the tens of thousands of Vietnam vets who suffered because of exposure to Agent Orange.

We all know what the issue is. The National Academy of Sciences has recognized the four illnesses that are suggestive or where there is sufficient evidence associated with Agent Orange. For years, we have known that. The VA has added illnesses in categories to the list of presumptive medical conditions associated with Agent Orange. They have resisted this.

Time is running out for these veterans. We did this to them. The American Government decided to spray Agent Orange. We knew it was harmful. We definitely know it is harmful now. If you were exposed to poison while serving our country, you deserve the benefits you earned, period.

For 3 years, in the Veterans' Affairs Committee—I sat in the Veterans' Affairs Committee—I begged the Veterans' Administration to recognize that these three illnesses are caused by Agent Orange and they should get Veterans' Administration benefits. I begged the Veterans' Administration, and no answers. I begged the President of the United States, and President Trump said he is a friend of veterans, but he couldn't be bothered to add these three illnesses on the list. So these veterans, individually, have to get down on their knees—figuratively, if not literally—and beg the VA for benefits when it ought to be automatic. That is what Senator TESTER's amendment does today. It makes it automatic.

Instead, the White House said no and the Veterans' Administration said no, but because of the work of Senator TESTER today, my colleagues are finally—it doesn't happen often around here. My Republican colleagues actually stood up to the President of the United States and said: No, Mr. President, you are wrong on the VA about covering these illnesses for Vietnam vets. And, finally, this Congress did the

right thing. I thank Senator TESTER for that work.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 3627

Mr. President, we know a lot of things. We know 144,000 Americans are dead. We have grown numb to these numbers. We can't forget who they are. They are our friends, our sisters, our brothers, our parents, and our neighbors.

As has been said, we are 4 to 5 percent of the world's population. We have accounted for almost 30 percent of the deaths in the entire world. That is not because we don't have skilled doctors. It is not because we don't have smart scientists. It is not because we don't work hard. It is because of leadership.

We know this President and the majority leader down the hall, who does the bidding every single day of this President, had chance after chance to get ahead of this virus. President Trump failed and Senator MCCONNELL failed. Now they have stopped even pretending to try.

The President demands that schools reopen—no plan to protect teachers and students. He demands businesses open up—no plan to protect workers and consumers. The American people have done their part and made incredible sacrifices. Essentially, they bought President Trump time in March, April, May, and June, and he wasted it.

This spring, people stayed home. They worked hard to flatten the curve. Members of both parties—both parties—begged him to use the Defense Production Act to scale up the production of medical supplies, including testing supplies, and coordinate their deployment. All the way back in March, we knew we faced shortfalls in N95 masks, gowns, and the materials we needed, most importantly, for test production, like cotton swabs. I immediately convened Ohio manufacturers back in March. I know Senator BALDWIN did the same thing in her State. I asked them what support they needed. I released a plan and sent a letter to the White House outlining Executive actions the President could take immediately. This was March. Since then—April, May, June, July—and essentially nothing happened. The Federal Government can acquire the resources our country needs and send them when they are needed most.

Senator CRAPO, a Republican from Idaho, and I worked together to include provisions in the CARES Act ensuring the President has the ability to use DPA authority he already has without delay. We worked with our colleagues in the Appropriations Committee to include \$1 billion in new DPA funding. Yet hundreds of millions of dollars just sit around waiting to be used.

Our States and our healthcare workers continue to face supply shortages. What exactly is the President waiting for? Imagine if he had used that DPA money and DPA authority in the spring and said we need to be producing a million tests a week by the end of summer, or imagine if we said our goal

is to be ready to open schools in the fall and I am calling on American businesses and American workers to manufacture the tests we need to do it? Look around the world. Other countries figured this out. We are being left behind. It is time for us to step up. If the President will not lead, we must. If the President will not use DPA on its own, Congress must use its authority to force him to.

That is why it is so disappointing to see my Republican colleagues objecting to Senator BALDWIN's bill. But, of course, they are objecting because they are doing the bidding of President Trump, and they want to blame China for everything, instead of take any responsibility themselves. But objecting to Senator BALDWIN's bill, which would force the President to actually do his job and coordinate a national response to a national crisis—that is the answer.

The American people should not have to fend for themselves again and again and again in the middle of a pandemic. I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. President, President Trump's response to this pandemic has been a failure of leadership. So we are here today to provide leadership in the Senate to do what the Trump administration has failed to do.

In April, with my good friend Senator MURPHY from Connecticut, the two of us introduced legislation called the Medical Supply Transparency and Delivery Act. That act would force President Trump to take action and scale up American production of things like test kits, swabs, reagents, personal protective equipment, and the medical equipment needed at the local level to address the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic in our country.

Three months later, States still do not have the supplies they need. Now more than 3.8 million Americans have been infected with the coronavirus, and, tragically, over 141,000 people have died in our country. For 3 months, our legislation has been in the majority leader's legislative graveyard.

Since this public health crisis started, the Trump administration has had no national testing plan, and they have never had a plan to provide States with the testing supplies they need to combat this pandemic. As a matter of fact, last month, the President said we needed to slow down testing, and, this weekend, as President Trump once again said the coronavirus would disappear, there were reports that the White House is trying to block Federal funding for States to conduct testing and contact tracing.

President Trump has not only abandoned each and every one of our States, he has also turned his back on front-line healthcare workers, who continue to face shortages of personal protective equipment, including gloves, gowns, face shields, and masks.

The Trump administration has created absolute chaos in the medical sup-

ply chain, leaving healthcare workers at hospitals and long-term care facilities at the forefront of this crisis to fend for themselves, rationing the scarce personal protective equipment that has been provided to them. In fact, just a couple of weeks ago, Vice President MIKE PENCE, who was put in charge of our pandemic response, said the administration will be issuing guidance encouraging healthcare workers to reuse personal protective equipment. This is the same Vice President who declared that the United States would "have this coronavirus pandemic behind us" by Memorial Day weekend. He was tragically wrong, and this White House continues to play catchup on a pandemic and a virus that is spreading faster than ever.

The person whom President Trump put in charge of our medical supply chain was his son-in-law, Jared Kushner. Jared Kushner predicted in April that by June we would be back to normal and that in July we would be "rocking again." It is July. It is July, and this is where we are.

Last Thursday, America had its highest number of new coronavirus cases in 1 day. And in my home State of Wisconsin, we had our highest case count ever yesterday—yesterday—and we have many hospitals across my State with less than a week's supply of face shields, goggles, gowns, paper medical masks, and N95 masks.

This public health crisis has not disappeared. We are not back to normal, and we are not "rocking again."

The fact is, President Trump has failed to lead, and this White House has taken us in a wrong direction in our fight against this pandemic. New coronavirus cases are rising in the States that we work for, which means we need more testing supplies, more testing, and more personal protective equipment for our workers.

The question this Senate needs to answer is whether we are going to let this President continue to take our country in the wrong direction, or are we going to lead and do what we all know needs to be done?

Not one of my Senate colleagues can make an honest case that their State has everything it needs to fight this pandemic.

In Wisconsin, we have been shortchanged by this administration. They have failed to provide adequate supplies for our State's clinical and private labs, paralyzing our ability to expand testing to the levels we need. In some cases, what we have received from the Trump administration were unsuitable and unusable testing supplies—foam applicators that cannot be used for swabs and saline tubes that were too short to transport swabs used in the majority of COVID-19 tests.

In addition, the majority of labs conducting COVID-19 tests in Wisconsin are clinical or private labs. These labs cannot access resources from the administration and are essentially being told to "figure it out." Over 80 Wis-

consin labs that are currently performing tests do not have access to a consistent supply of reagent.

We are not alone. States across the country have been abandoned by the Trump administration. They have been forced to go this alone, while President Trump has tried to pass off responsibility for his own failures.

Every single one of us knows that our States need more resources and supplies so we can ramp up testing, identify those who are infected, isolate positive cases, and safely trace all contacts so that the spread of this virus can finally be contained. We all know that President Trump's broken supply chain has been a failure, and my legislation with Senator MURPHY, supported by 46 Democrats, will help fix it.

In order to put people back to work and safely reopen businesses and schools, we need both a national testing plan and the supplies to implement it. This is true in Wisconsin and every other State in our Nation.

Our legislation will help respond to this public health crisis and prepare for the future by mobilizing a Federal response to increase our national production of the testing and medical supplies we need at the State and local level. Specifically, the bill will provide critical oversight of the distribution of medical supplies and put an expert in charge to oversee COVID-19 equipment production and delivery so we know we are putting science and facts over politics and private distributor profits when it comes to responding to this pandemic.

Finally, our legislation unlocks the full authority and power of the Defense Production Act so that we can produce and deliver tests, testing supplies, personal protective equipment, and medical equipment that we need to take on this pandemic, treat patients, protect workers, open businesses and schools, and save lives.

My friends on the other side of the aisle have a choice: They can continue to ignore President Trump's failure to respond to this public health crisis, knowing full well that until we confront it in the bold and effective way that we should, we will not solve our economic crisis, or they can choose to liberate themselves from this failure and support a solution that will serve the people who sent us here to work for them.

If my colleagues on the other side of the aisle believe, as this Vice President does, that this pandemic is behind us, then object. If my colleagues on the other side of the aisle believe, as Jared Kushner does, that we are rocking again in July, then object. If my colleagues on the other side of the aisle believe, as President Trump does, that the coronavirus will just magically disappear, well, then, object.

If you oppose the failures of this President and this administration in responding to the COVID-19 pandemic, then I ask for your vote to pass the Medical Supply Transparency and Delivery Act today.

So I ask unanimous consent that the Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee be discharged and the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 3627, the Medical Supply Transparency and Delivery Act. I further ask that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me say first that I appreciate my colleague from Wisconsin's work on this issue. It is an important issue. It is one that our committee has been working diligently on.

Since the beginning of the COVID crisis, we have held five hearings and a roundtable on exactly this issue—exploring and doing oversight on the national stockpile and its supply chain vulnerability. Just today, we marked up five pieces of legislation very similar to what my colleague from Wisconsin is introducing here and trying to pass by unanimous consent. The five pieces are the Federal Emergency Pandemic Response Act, Securing Healthcare Response and Equipment Act, National Response Framework Improvement Act, National Infrastructure Simulation and Analysis Center Pandemic Modeling Act, and finally—this one closest to my colleague's bill—the PPE Supply Chain Transparency Act, which is actually the piece of legislation we have had the most discussion on—two amendments, including a second-degree amendment to one amendment—before passing it unanimously. So our committee has done a lot of work.

My concern about what my colleague is doing here—trying to pass this by unanimous consent—is by and large bypassing the committee process. It is true her staff reached out to my staff a couple of weeks ago. We asked, have you vetted it through the Department? Apparently, she has begun that process, but this piece of legislation has not been properly vetted. It has not gone through the proper and full committee process.

Again, without expressing an opinion on a piece of legislation but also acknowledging the fact that our committee has done a lot of work—passed five pieces of legislation on a non-partisan basis today because we are concerned about this as well—I have to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

Ms. BALDWIN. I am, of course, very disappointed that we cannot move this forward.

I want to respond to a couple of the comments made by my colleagues from

the State of Wisconsin, the chairman of the Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee.

It is July. It is July, and cases are rising. Action was not taken in February, March, April, May, June, or so far in this month of July. We had more than fair warning that we had shortages of masks and gloves and gowns and face shields and testing swabs and testing media and reagents, and yet it is July.

As I said earlier, yesterday Wisconsin announced the most cases positive for coronavirus in a single day that we have seen since the pandemic began.

As we strive to reopen our economy, the President exhorts all schools to hold 5-day-a-week, in-person classes.

We know that the demand for testing and the demand for masks will only increase exponentially—the need to keep workers safe as they return to work and the need to keep customers safe as they enter and engage in commerce. To say that this needed to happen back in February is an understatement.

I am pleased that my colleague has held hearings, but this bill was filed in April when it became apparent that the President was not going to act. This bill has been available for committee review since April.

The House passed many elements of the Medical Supply Transparency and Delivery Act in their Heroes Act, which they passed 2 months ago. I just ask, where would we be today had this been put into law?

There has been time to review. There has been time to study. But it is past time to pass the Medical Supply Transparency and Delivery Act. I hope we can create another opportunity for the Senate to act on this in the days to come because it is so overdue.

I want to again thank my colleagues who joined me on the floor this afternoon—my coauthor, Senator CHRIS MURPHY of Connecticut; my colleague from Michigan, DEBBIE STABENOW; and my colleague from Ohio, Senator SHERROD BROWN; and the 45 other Members of the U.S. Senate who have joined me in sponsoring this bill.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I want to thank my colleagues, Senators BALDWIN and MURPHY, for their urgent words on this most important issue. I am proud to join them as we seek passage to pass legislation to finally require the President to invoke the full authority of the DPA, the Defense Production Act, so that the Federal Government can more speedily get testing supplies and PPE to the parts of our country struggling under the weight of the pandemic.

Make no mistake, medical professionals and frontline workers fighting this virus still—still—do not have the protective equipment and the testing supplies they need because the Trump administration failed to fully invoke the DPA earlier this year. This is a crisis of President Trump's making.

As we speak, COVID-19 continues to surge across the country. As cases keep growing, our testing supplies and our PPE, already in short supply, are reaching critical levels. From Seattle to Miami, people are waiting in line for hours to get tested, and their results might take days, if not more, to come back. In many places we are missing basic supplies—swabs, gloves. In certain hospitals it has been reported doctors and nurses are being told to reuse their N95 masks as many as 15–15–times.

It has been 6 months since we have been fighting this virus. How is this still happening? The problem should have been solved months ago, but the President has been derelict in his duty. His administration has been a total failure when it comes to testing and PPE.

Instead of fully invoking the DPA and ramping up the production of critical supplies early on, President Trump has left doctors, nurses, and medical staff fighting this disease with one hand tied behind their back. He has failed to keep us and those working on the frontline safe.

This bill, however, would finally—finally—force the President to do what he should have done ages ago. We have been talking about the DPA since way back in April. I called the President in April, got him on the phone, urged him to invoke it. He told me he would and then contradicted himself a few hours later. How typical, but how devastating for the American people. Then he quickly lost interest—again, typical of this President, whose attention span is much too short for the big fight that we have with COVID.

So what we say is the President's approach to the pandemic was—typically here—no followthrough, no strategy, no comprehension of the problem. The President's mind-boggling refusal to invoke the DPA shouldn't be piled on top of the challenges our medical workers and citizens already face.

I am sorry we didn't pass this legislation. I hope we can do it soon.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

REMEMBERING JOHN LEWIS

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, before I begin, I would like to take a moment to honor Congressman John Lewis, who died on Friday. A leader of the civil rights movement, he was one of the 13 original Freedom Riders and an organizer of the 1963 March on Washington. He was a man of conscience, conviction, and supreme courage.

“When you see something that is not right, not fair, not just, you have to speak up. You have to do something,” he would say.

John Lewis did something. Confronted by the great sin of segregation, John Lewis put himself front and center in the fight. He organized sit-ins. He led demonstrations. He marched for

freedom. And he paid for his convictions with his blood. A man who espoused nonviolence, he suffered incredible brutality at the hands of both police officers and civilian mobs. He was attacked and beaten an untold number of times.

During a march in Selma, AL—on a day that lives in infamy—a police officer fractured John Lewis's skull, leaving him with a scar that he carried to the end of his life. Yet John Lewis was unbowed. No matter how many times he was attacked or what he suffered, he got up again and rejoined the fight.

His death is a great loss, but John Lewis will live on in the annals of American heroes. May we all have his courage in fighting for the right.

CORONAVIRUS

Mr. President, so far, Congress has provided \$2.4 trillion to fight the coronavirus. Over the past couple of months here in the Senate, we have been closely tracking the implementation of this money and working with the administration on disbursement.

In June alone, we held 30 hearings in the Senate on COVID-related issues. All of this has helped us identify the priorities that need to shape our next bill, which we are hoping to pass in the next couple of weeks. Those priorities are kids, jobs, and healthcare.

First, kids: Getting kids back in school safely needs to be a priority. Being able to attend school in person is important for students' academic development and for their social and emotional well-being.

The American Academy of Pediatrics has stated: "All policy considerations for the coming school year should start with a goal of having students physically present in school."

Now, not every school may be able to fully reopen this fall, but we need to make sure that those schools that can reopen have the resources they need to reopen safely. That is why the legislation the Republicans are drafting here in the Senate would provide more than \$100 billion to help schools ensure they have what they need to safely welcome students back to class.

While our first priority in getting kids back to school is ensuring their academic and social well-being, getting students back in school is also important for families' economic health. There are a lot of parents in this country who can't afford to have one parent stay home to homeschool. We need to ensure that those parents have access to schools and childcare wherever possible so that they can keep or return to their jobs.

Enabling Americans to return to work is key to our economic recovery. Currently, there are more than 17 million unemployed Americans. While this is a significant improvement from where we were 2 months ago, that number is still much too high, and we have to do everything we can to get these Americans back on the job and receiving a regular paycheck.

That is why the legislation we are drafting will provide incentives for

businesses to hire and to retain workers. It will provide a refundable tax credit for Main Street businesses for the protective equipment and cleaning supplies that they need to keep their employees and customers safe and to encourage Americans to return to their businesses. It will provide another round of assistance to small businesses, with a focus on those that have been hit the hardest by the pandemic.

We also expect to issue another round of direct payments to hard-working Americans to help them get back on their feet and to stimulate the economy.

The third bucket of our coronavirus response is, of course, healthcare. We have to keep ensuring our healthcare professionals have the resources needed to treat patients, develop new treatments, and to find a vaccine to tame this virus once and for all.

The coronavirus legislation that we are drafting will address all three of those priorities.

Our legislation will also include another important priority that will protect jobs, schools, businesses, and healthcare workers, and that is liability protections. No matter how many precautions schools and businesses take, there is no way for them to completely eliminate all risk of employees, students, or customers contracting the virus, but an army of trial lawyers is waiting to levy lawsuits against even the most careful schools and businesses.

There is absolutely no question that schools and businesses should be liable for gross negligence or for intentional misconduct, but businesses and schools that are taking every reasonable precaution to protect employees and students and customers should not have to worry about facing lawsuits for virus transmission that they could not have prevented.

Healthcare workers giving their all on the frontlines to treat coronavirus patients should not have to worry that their efforts will be rewarded with lawsuits.

I would like to think that we can put a bipartisan bill together and get it to the President's desk in the next couple of weeks. Republicans are ready and willing to work with Democrats to get this done. We will introduce our draft shortly and be ready to negotiate with Democrats to arrive at a final bill, the same process that we followed with the CARES Act, our largest coronavirus relief bill to date.

This will work only if Democrats are willing to come to the table and negotiate a reasonable bill. My Democratic colleagues sometimes behave as if government money is drawn from a magical pot of gold that will never run out, but it is not. It is not.

Every dollar of the coronavirus funding we provided so far has been borrowed money, and every dollar we appropriate in the phase 4 bill we are drafting will likely be borrowed money as well.

It can be argued that it is money we need to borrow, but we need to remember that it is borrowed money and that the bill for that money will eventually come due. The more we drive up our debt, the greater the threat to the health of our economy, not to mention to the economic future of today's younger workers. We have an obligation to them to limit our borrowing to what is absolutely necessary to fight the virus.

The Democratic leader has come down to the floor the past couple of days and suggested that the Heroes Act—a \$3 trillion coronavirus bill the House passed is—"a good product to start with" when it comes to a phase 4 coronavirus relief bill.

That is ludicrous. The bill the Democratic leader is promoting—the bill he thinks is a good starting point for coronavirus legislation—is a bill that mentions cannabis—cannabis more often than it mentions the word "jobs."

Let me just repeat that. The bill the Democratic leader thinks is a good starting point for coronavirus relief legislation mentions the word "cannabis" more often than it mentions the word "job."

While the Democratic leader is certainly welcome to disagree with me, I don't think diversity studies in the cannabis industry have a major role to play in defeating this virus or getting Americans back to work, nor does federalizing election law—another priority the Democrats included in their bill.

Despite its \$3 trillion pricetag, the bill the Democratic leader is endorsing fails to meet one of the most basic requirements of any coronavirus relief bill, and that is providing a meaningful plan for getting Americans back to work. It is disappointing to hear the Democratic leader promoting such an unserious piece of legislation at a time that we should be devoting all of our efforts to getting a bipartisan bill to the President.

I hope my other Democratic colleagues in the Senate are ready to look beyond partisan wish lists and focus on negotiating a relief package that addresses the real priorities we are facing: helping kids and parents, getting Americans back to work, and providing the healthcare resources needed to fight this virus.

Republicans are ready to come to the table, and I urge Democrats to join us. I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. BLACKBURN). The Senator from Illinois.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 4243

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I am expecting the Senator from Utah to come to the floor momentarily to resume debate over an issue which was raised yesterday and suspended to move to a vote that had been previously scheduled.

Since this item, this issue, we are discussing is of such importance to so many individuals in our country

today—and many of them are following this carefully and closely—I wanted to make sure we returned to it today to at least consider one aspect of the debate.

Yesterday, when I made a unanimous consent request, Senator LEE said he had not had time to look at my proposal. That is why I waited until today to come back, so that he would have that opportunity.

Yesterday, I came to the floor to speak about the plight of immigrant workers who are suffering because of a serious problem in our immigration system known as the green card backlog. Many of these immigrants are essential workers who are helping to lead the fight against COVID-19, but the green card backlog puts them and their families at risk of losing their immigration status and being subject to deportation.

Under the current law, there are clearly not enough immigrant visas—also known as green cards—available each year. The numbers that we have established in 1990 are still applicable today, though our national economy has doubled since then. We are still talking about 140,000 employment visas each year.

These so-called green cards have resulted in many people waiting for long periods of times—literally for years—for the opportunity to become legal permanent residents and securing one of the green cards. While they are waiting, their families are at risk.

These backlogs are particularly difficult on children because as they wait, the children, of course, advance in age, and when they reach age 21, they are subject to deportation. I have met with these families, and I have talked with them. It is a heartbreaking situation.

The unanimous consent request, which I will make today, addresses the plight of those children directly. Senator LEE objected to it yesterday. He said he had not had a chance to look at it. I hope he will reconsider when I make the same request today.

These children who face, what we call, aging out at age 21 would be protected by this unanimous consent request, which I am making. In addition to the green card backlog, it is clear there is a solution to this issue, which I am afraid we are not going to be able to achieve. It is to increase the number of green cards available each year in this country.

These immigrant workers who are seeking green cards are already in the United States working legally. This is not a question of increasing the number of green cards, of bringing in new immigrants to compete with American workers. These workers are already here. It is about whether immigrant workers will continue to be able to work on temporary visas, where they have to depend on their employer for their immigration status and their future is uncertain.

I introduced legislation known as the RELIEF Act. My cosponsors are Sen-

ator PATRICK LEAHY of Vermont and Senator MAZIE HIRONO of Hawaii. The RELIEF Act would increase the number of green cards to clear the backlog for all immigrants waiting in line for green cards within 5 years—eliminate the backlog for green cards within 5 years.

This RELIEF Act would keep immigrant families together by treating children and spouses of green card holders as immediate relatives, just as the children and spouses of citizens are, so they don't count against the green card caps. The RELIEF Act would protect the aging-out children who qualify for a green card based on parents' immigrant petition.

The RELIEF Act that I am describing is not novel or controversial; it is based on a provision of the 2013 comprehensive immigration reform bill, which I helped to write with the so-called Gang of 8. That included Senator McCain, Senator GRAHAM, Senator Flake, as well as Senator RUBIO on the Republican side; myself, Senator SCHUMER, Senator MENENDEZ, and Senator BENNET on the Democratic side. We worked hard and passed that measure through the Senate Judiciary Committee and on the floor by a vote of 68 to 32.

What I am proposing is something I have proposed in the past, crafted, passed, and offered to the House of Representatives to help start to solve the immigration crisis, which we currently have in this country. Unfortunately, the Republicans, who controlled the House of Representatives when this measure came before them several years ago, refused to even take up this measure and debate it.

If they had, we wouldn't be here today. The green card backlog would not exist based on the provision which I offered with others in the comprehensive immigration reform bill. Unfortunately, some of the Republicans on the other side of the aisle are still unwilling to increase any number of immigrant visas. They want to keep the immigrant workers on a temporary basis, where they and their family are at risk of losing their immigration status and being deported.

The senior Senator from Utah, Mr. LEE, has introduced S. 386, known as the Fairness for High-Skilled Immigrants Act, to address the green card backlog. I have a basic concern with that bill. It includes no additional green cards. Without any additional green cards, S. 386 will not reduce the green card backlog. Without additional green cards, S. 386 will not reduce the green card backlog.

Don't take it from me. There are those who will disagree and say: Oh, DURBIN is wrong. He is just mistaken in saying that.

Please go to the nonpartisan Congressional Research Service. Here is what they said about S. 386, Senator LEE's legislation. "S. 386 would not reduce future backlogs compared to current law."

Despite my concerns about Senator LEE's bill, I agreed to sit down and

work in good faith with him to resolve our differences. Last December, we reached an agreement—I believed we did—on an amendment to the bill. The amendment doesn't address the core problem because it doesn't increase the number of green cards. As a result, it would not reduce the green card backlog, but there was an improvement in the amendment which we put together. I talked about it yesterday.

Let me highlight two key provisions of our agreement. We protected the families who are stuck in this backlog waiting for a green card. Immigrant workers and immediate family members would be allowed to "early file" for their green cards. That was a proposal that came to me from Senator LEE, and I thought it was reasonable. These individuals would not receive their green cards early, but they would be able, while waiting, to switch jobs and travel without losing immigration status. I think that is reasonable. Early filing adds a critical protection that wasn't in S. 386.

Listen carefully. Our agreement prevents the children of immigrant workers from aging out of green card eligibility so they will not face deportation while they are waiting for a green card.

Our agreement also would crack down on the abuse of H-1B temporary work visas. Really, I think this is at the heart of the problems we are running into. There are corporate entities in India, which have extraordinary power over the securing of these H-1B visas.

The amendment we put together would allow legitimate use of H-1B visas, but here is what it would say. It would prohibit a company from hiring additional H-1B workers in the future if the company's workforce is more than 50 employees and more than 50 percent of those are temporary workers.

The 50-50 rule is from a bipartisan H-1B reform bill that I authored with Senator GRASSLEY. This provision was included in the 2013 comprehensive immigration reform bill.

Senator LEE has said publicly: This is a commonsense reform to root out abuse. I think he is right. I know these companies despise this provision, and I think it is one of the reasons we find ourselves with no common ground today. If this is included, they don't want anything to pass, and they are doing their best to stop it.

The reality is that the top recipients of H-1B visas today are outsourcing companies that use loopholes in the law to exploit immigrant workers and offshore American jobs. In the most recent year for which data is available, 8 of the top 10 recipients of new H-1B visas were outsourcing companies.

Unfortunately, yesterday, Senator LEE objected to this proposal, which we had put together. Instead, he offered a revised version that included changes that were requested by the Trump administration. Let me explain Senator LEE's changes because I think they are basic, and I believe they are a problem.

First, he wants to remove a provision from our original agreement, known as the hold harmless clause. What it says is very simple. It assures immigrants already waiting in line for green cards that there is nothing we will do that will, in any way, injure or delay their pursuit of a green card; they can't fall further behind in line. We hold them harmless from any change we make. Why wouldn't we? Some of these people have waited for years. The hold harmless provision basically says we are going to protect wherever you stand in line.

The second thing that Senator LEE wants to do is to delay for 3 years the effective date of the 50-50 rule to crack down on outsourcing companies. I don't know why we want to wait 3 years to do that. We don't have to. We shouldn't. Why on Earth would we give these companies that are outsourcing American jobs and exploiting immigrant workers a free pass for an additional 3 years?

Third, Senator LEE wanted to delay for years early filing for people who are stuck in the green card backlog. The object behind the early filing, and the reason why it is so appealing to me, was that it would protect the individuals applying as well as their families from the start, and now the Senator suggested that we delay this. That just means that many children will age out during that 1-to-3-year period of time and be subject to deportation. We shouldn't do that to these children and these families.

Yesterday, I made a simple proposal to Senator LEE, which he hadn't seen personally, and that is why we had to come back today. While we continue to debate the best way to fix the green card backlog, let's make sure no children of the affected families are harmed or deported. It is just that simple.

I offered a new bill—very simply stated—the Protect Children of Immigrants Workers Act. This brief, three-page bill would ensure that children do not age out while waiting for a green card.

Imagine if you brought your family to the United States, worked on an H-1B visa, applied for a green card to stay in this country, and your children are waiting with you for the green card. You are paying for them to go to college because they don't qualify as American citizens for any type of Federal financial aid. You are making great sacrifices for them. Then the day comes when they reach the age of 21 and they can be deported and the family divided. Why would we want to let that happen?

This three-page bill, the Protect Children of Immigrant Workers Act, protects those children. It would not increase the number of green cards. It would not provide any special benefits. It would simply allow children of immigrant workers to keep their place in line for a green card and be protected from deportation until they can get that card.

Yesterday, Senator LEE said he had not had a chance to review it, so I wanted to return to the floor today. I believe this is timely and important, and now he has had a chance to look at it. Senator LEE's original bill does not offer any protection for those children, which I think is a major humanitarian problem caused by the green card backlog.

The early-filing provision in my agreement with Senator LEE will immediately protect the kids in the backlog under the age of 21. However, if early-filing is delayed, Senator LEE now proposes those kids would age out and lose their green card eligibility.

I have met many of these young people. It breaks my heart to hear their stories, that they may be reaching a point where they have aged out and could be deported. That is why I want to offer this specific single provision. There is no reason these children should be punished for a broken immigration system. It is beyond their control, but it is not beyond our control to help them.

I now am going to ask unanimous consent for the Protect Children of Immigrant Workers Act.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee be discharged of S. 4243, the Protect Children of Immigrant Workers Act, and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; further, that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Reserving the right to object, for well over 8 months, my friend and distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Illinois, has been publicly blocking legislation protecting the children of immigrant workers. Now there is something called the Protect Children of Immigrant Workers Act. He comes to the floor asking that we pass this bill by unanimous consent—a bill that, as he notes, was introduced just yesterday. Well, we must pass this right now, he says, because these children shouldn't have to suffer 1 more hour. With all due respect, they could have had relief months ago. They can still have relief today.

I have taken the time since yesterday to review Senator DURBIN's legislation, and I cannot support it. This legislation allows the children of H-1B workers to remain in the country for the 20 to 30 years that their parents have to wait in the green card backlog—the same green card backlog the Senator is now decrying.

When their parents die, children of immigrant workers will not be immediately deported. But this prolonging of dependent status is helpful only if the parent lives and works in this country until his or her green card application is actually adjudicated. It

does nothing for the child of an immigrant whose dead parent's green card application is ultimately denied because his or her job is no longer available—nothing.

To be honest, the 20 to 30 years is a short wait for most of the Indian nationals currently stuck in this awful, hellish green card backlog. In fact, it is a drop in the bucket. In 2020, the wait for an EB2 green card is not, in fact, 20 to 30 years for an Indian national. What is it, then? Is it 30? Is it 40, 50, 60? No, it is much longer than that. It is 195 years. This means that someone from India entering the backlog today would have to wait 195 years to receive an EB3 green card. Even if we give their children this limbo status, none of them will have a prayer of becoming a U.S. citizen.

To put this in perspective, 195 years ago, John Quincy Adams had recently been inaugurated as President of the United States.

The legislation purports to allow aging-out children to move to a student visa status, but it also fails to accomplish even this. Student visas require the applicant to have residency in a foreign country, which, obviously, these children do not have.

Perhaps these are merely drafting errors, but as such, they underscore my concerns about passing slapdash legislation just because it bears a title that compels us to believe that it will correct the most egregious problems and protect the most vulnerable populations.

Even if we generously overlook these "drafting errors," this legislation goes from sloppy to worse. Most egregiously, it will increase the existing green card backlog. If we pass this legislation on its own, high-skilled workers from highly populated countries will have fewer and fewer green cards available to them, meaning they will have to wait longer and longer for relief. In fact, by the time we stretch this out to 2030, the 195-year backlog I mentioned a moment ago would be extended out to a 400- to 450-year backlog. That is not fair. I can't imagine that is what the Senator from Illinois wants.

If we want to actually protect the children of immigrant workers, we need to end the inequities of the green card system. Real protection for the children is impossible unless we have a fair path forward for the parents.

I have worked for 9 years on a thoughtful solution to these problems in the Fairness for High-Skilled Immigrants Act. This compromise protects children, protects widows and widowers, and it provides an equitable path forward for all our high-skilled immigrants. That is why I call on Senator DURBIN to lift his hold on the Fairness for High-Skilled Immigrants Act and to provide relief to immigrant children and to their parents.

As to the suggestion that the changes made to this legislation were bad, that they were a departure from what we

agreed on, it is not true. The implementation delay simply allows the USCIS a time to develop the adequate infrastructure to implement what we had proposed, the 50-50 rule change. This 3 years is there to protect the H-1B visa holders who were already here. The hold-harmless provision was taken care of with the 3- to 9-year transition that now covers them.

In any event, this legislation—the one Senator DURBIN now tries to pass by unanimous consent, introduced for the first time yesterday that I have now reviewed—is sloppy. It doesn't solve the problem, and it would make a lot of things worse. I therefore object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, there is no question that there is a green card backlog for immigrant visas. We issue 140,000 employment-based visas a year and 226,000 family visas. There are some 5 million seeking them. I want to increase the number of green cards. The Senator from Utah opposes that. As a result, the bill that he introduced, according to analysis by the Congressional Research Service—this is not DURBIN's language; this is the Congressional Research Service: S. 386, the lead legislation, would not reduce future backlogs compared to current law.

When he talks about 195 years and John Quincy Adams or whatever his historical analogy was, he doesn't address that at all in S. 386.

The problem, of course, is that he is bound to a position of his party that will not allow one additional new immigrant—none. I don't take that position. These men and women and their kids have been living in the United States. Many of them have been here for years, some of them for decades. Some of them are doctors in hospitals in my hometown. I trust them, and I trust their kids. What I am asking him to do today is simply join with me in protecting their children while we resolve the other issues. He refuses. He refused yesterday. He refuses again today.

He calls my approach sloppy. Let's see the Lee alternative to protect the children. I would like to see what he would like to propose. Maybe it is language that is better, and maybe I can embrace it. But let's take care of that discrete part of this issue. Why would we leave these children now aging into adults at risk? That is just the wrong way to approach this. We can solve this problem, and we should. While we solve it, we should protect these children. It is within the ken of both Senator LEE and myself to sit down through staff and come up with that language. I believe we can.

I want to say I will continue to offer this opportunity for Senator LEE to protect these children until we can sit down in good faith and resolve any differences we have between us. I have heard this case over and over again

about the plight of these children. I am trying to address it. He continues to object.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Madam President, we have the opportunity right here to pass this right now. This bill fixes this problem.

As to the suggestion that we can't do any of this without increasing the total number of green cards—this is a poison pill. My friend and colleague knows that it is a poison pill. In fact, we had that very discussion. I don't ordinarily—in fact, I have a uniform policy against publicly talking about private conversations we have as colleagues. We have now brought it to the floor.

We talked about this. This was the basis upon which we reached a deal in his office in December. The point there was to understand that we can't pass something—certainly by unanimous consent—that increases the total number of employment-based green cards. It is not going to happen. So we are dealing here with that finite universe. That is the basis of the deal we reached in December.

As to the suggestion that we can't do anything without increasing the total number of green cards, the Senator knows that is not on the table. That is not fair. What we want to do is make this process fair, even if we only have a limited number of green cards to work with, which is the case. Whether you like that political reality or not, it is the political reality. It is the factual understanding that the Senator and I discussed and understood in December when we made that deal. The Lee alternative is the encapsulation of that.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 1044 and that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; further, that the Lee amendment at the desk be agreed to, the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed, and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DURBIN. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Just do the math; 140,000 EB visas and 226,000 family visas per year and 5 million people waiting. If you think you can solve this without changing the number of green cards, you can't. You may address it from one angle or another. You may help some who are waiting as opposed to others. You only give assistance to some at the expense of some other group.

I understand the Senator's position. I don't quarrel with the fact he made it clear from the start that, from his perspective and perhaps from his side of the aisle, there is just no appetite for increasing the number of green cards,

even for these people who have been living and working here in the United States for years and sometimes decades, even for physicians from India and other countries who are literally risking their lives today on COVID-19 patients. The Senator told me there is no appetite for giving them additional green cards so they can stay here on a permanent basis. I think that is unfair, and that is my position.

The Senator made it clear—and I am not saying otherwise—that he disagrees with me. So what I tried to do is come in and say that at least during the pendency, while they are waiting for green cards—which could be decades unless the law is changed—let's at least protect their families. That is all I basically said.

He has come back and said: I want to put in a provision that takes out the hold-harmless protection. I want to protect these people who are outsourcing companies in India that have captured the lion's share of these H-1B visas. I want to make sure that those who are going to be protected have to wait up to 3 years before there is any protection.

Why in the world would we do any of those things? I am willing to sit down and talk to you, but I am not going to accept these at this point unless we can find a starting point, which is protection for the children of these families. If you will agree to that, I will be more than happy to discuss the other provisions again, but because the other provisions are now what you are offering, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Madam President, the protection for the children is now found in the proposal, in the amendment at the desk—the one that was just objected to by my friend and colleague, the Senator from Illinois.

I would ask my colleague rhetorically or directly, as he may choose: If, in fact, he is unwilling and remains unwilling to negotiate on any bill addressing this problem without increasing the total number of employment-based green cards, why in the world did he waste months of my time? Why did he lead me to believe, while in his office, that he was open to such an agreement that was, in fact, the premise upon which we proceeded? We spent months on that, and I worked in good faith.

As I mentioned yesterday, it was against my better judgment that I agreed to announce with the Senator on the Senate floor that we had reached an agreement because I knew that we had to work out a few kinks, but I proceeded based solely on the feasibility and our ability to implement that bill. That was the only change that we made.

Now, if the Senator wants to make some adjustment to that, bring it forward. I would love to consider it. Yet what he is now telling me is that the premise upon which we proceeded on those negotiations and then spent

weeks and months working on was false in that the whole premise that we could reach some sort of compromise—an actual compromise—that wouldn't increase the number of total green cards available was illusory. I find that disappointing.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, the Senator has addressed a question to me, I believe.

Mr. LEE. Rhetorically or otherwise, the Senator is welcome to answer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I know other Senators are waiting to speak, so I will try to be as concise and brief as possible.

I understand the Senator's position. He doesn't want another green card. He believes Members on his side of the aisle don't want an increase in the number of green cards—period. I knew that going in. He made that abundantly clear. We can't solve the underlying problem without it, but we can make it better. That is why we continue to talk and negotiate, and I hope we will continue to talk and negotiate. Yet, for goodness' sake, the starting point ought to be the protection of these children.

Can we not agree that we will protect the children and then proceed to continue the negotiations on the premise that the Senator cannot accept one more green card? I can, and the Senator can't, but we will try to improve the system with that premise accepted. At the starting point, for goodness' sake, let's protect the children while we negotiate and debate. Hopefully, we can do it on a timely basis. That is my response.

I am willing to continue to work. I understand the Senator cannot issue another green card. The math never works with 5 million people waiting and 140,000 employment green cards and 226,000 family visas a year. It is never going to work, but I am willing to try to make the system better, with the understanding that I will increase the number of green cards and that the Senator will not.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Madam President, I am always happy to discuss any counterproposal. If the Senator would make one, I would love to see it. It is not fair to say I don't care about those kids because I am unwilling to create additional green cards. If the Senator wants to protect these children, pass this bill. Pass it today. Pass it at this very moment.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 4019

Mr. MARKEY. Madam President, I rise to speak in support of S. 4019, the Juneteenth National Independence Day Act—legislation that I have introduced along with Senator CORNYN. We have 54 cosponsors and broad bipartisan support that would make Juneteenth a

Federal holiday. In a few minutes, I will ask unanimous consent that the Senate take up and pass this important bill.

Our country is in the midst of a long overdue reckoning on race and justice. The murder of George Floyd by members of the Minneapolis Police Department has galvanized the Nation as protesters have taken to our streets, demanding justice—justice for George Floyd, justice for Breonna Taylor, and justice for countless other Black and Brown Americans who have been hurt or killed at the hands of law enforcement. Yet this reckoning goes well beyond seeking accountability for police officers who betray the trust we bestow upon them.

The disparate treatment and mistreatment of Black and Brown Americans permeates our society. It infects our courts, our schools, and our places of work. It reflects the unfulfilled promise of a nation built upon the notion that all are created equal, and it has its roots in our Nation's original sin—slavery—a crime against humanity that we have for far too long failed to acknowledge, address, or come to grips with.

One way to further the process of racial reconciliation and healing is to recognize, honor, and celebrate the formal end of slavery in the United States and to do so at the Federal level. Perhaps the most effective, direct, and far-reaching way to do that is with a Federal holiday commemorating that historic event.

For more than 150 years, the Juneteenth holiday, which marks the emancipation of slaves, has been observed one way or the other across our Nation, including in Texas, but it is long past time to place Juneteenth on par with other Federal holidays so that all Americans in all 50 States will celebrate Juneteenth alongside Veterans Day, Memorial Day, Martin Luther King Day, and other Federal holidays.

The celebration of Juneteenth dates back to June 19, 1865, when Union soldiers, led by MG Gordon Granger, traveled to Galveston, TX, with the announcement that the Civil War had ended and that the enslaved were now free. This was 2½ years after the date of President Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation, but either the news of Lincoln's order had not reached many, including those in Texas, or local officials had refused to enforce it.

On June 19, 1865, Major General Granger read to the people of Texas General Order No. 3, the first lines of which told them clearly and unequivocally: "The people of Texas are informed that, in accordance with a Proclamation from the Executive of the United States, all slaves are free."

Juneteenth celebrations followed as did the recognition of Juneteenth as the formal end of slavery in the United States. Since 1865, communities all across the Nation have celebrated Juneteenth with parades, cookouts, prayer gatherings, historical and cul-

tural readings, musical performances, and many other celebrations. These events have provided many with the opportunity for reflection, education, and a deeper understanding of our history as a nation—the whole history—and how it has affected and shaped the lives of Black Americans.

Nearly every State and the District of Columbia have passed legislation recognizing Juneteenth as a holiday or observance, and the Senate has passed a resolution designating June 19 as Juneteenth Independence Day, but Juneteenth has never received the higher status it deserves as a Federal holiday. The Juneteenth National Independence Day Act rights this wrong and makes Juneteenth a Federal holiday.

We still must travel a long and difficult road to justice and equality in the United States, but we cannot get there without recognizing the original sin of slavery and marking its end. It is incumbent upon all Americans to truthfully acknowledge and understand our past and how it affects our present and our future. Making Juneteenth a Federal holiday will not right all of the wrongs of the past or fix what remains broken, but it is an important step. It is the truth of our history and the missing half of the story of our Nation's freedom and independence. It is long past time to recognize Juneteenth as a Federal holiday.

Let me stop there and recognize my partner in this effort, the senior Senator from Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I will be brief.

Let me just tell the Senator from Massachusetts that I agree with everything he has said. It shows how people of, maybe, different political ideologies—certainly different parties—can come together and recognize that there is a moment available to us here in which we can demonstrate our nonpartisan support for this act of racial reconciliation in our country.

I agree that slavery was the original sin. Our founding documents said that all men and women were created equal, but that certainly wasn't the practice when it came to African Americans at the time who were officially designated as something less than fully human. It was an outrageous act at the time, and our country has paid a dear price for that over the years—from the Civil War to the violence that led up to the peaceful civil rights movement in the sixties. It is obvious from the recent events—George Floyd's death in particular—that we are not where we need to be. We still have room to grow as part of our developing that more perfect Union.

I know our friend and colleague TIM SCOTT, who has been at the forefront of this discussion with his advocacy for the Justice Act, has a lot of bipartisan ideas for police reform. He points out that, as an African American, his experience has been much different from

those who are non-African Americans. He said, over the last two decades, he has been stopped—as he puts it, “driving while Black”—about 18 different times.

At a roundtable that was sponsored by Mayor Sylvester Turner and that I had requested, I sat next to a pastor of a church in Houston who happened to be the local head of the NAACP.

He said: I honor the police. I respect the police. I support the police. Yet he said: My son is afraid of the police, and we have to do everything we can to cure that trust deficit.

In Texas, we have recognized Juneteenth as a State holiday for 40 years, obviously, because of the fact that this occurred as a result of the Emancipation Proclamation's being announced in Galveston, TX. Yet I recently cosponsored a bill with Congresswoman SHEILA JACKSON LEE to study a trail, basically, from Galveston to Houston as the possible designation of a national park in further recognition of this event.

I believe strongly that we need to remember our history because if we don't remember our history, in the words of one sage, “we will be condemned to relive it.” We have come so far, but we know we still have further to go. I do believe that the appropriate word to use is “reconciliation.” This is an opportunity for us to demonstrate our concern and our commitment to equal justice and equal treatment under the law by recognizing Juneteenth as a Federal holiday.

Mr. MARKEY. I thank the Senator from Texas. This is a thoroughly bipartisan effort, and it is long overdue.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration and that the Senate now proceed to S. 4019; further, that the bill be considered read a third time and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. JOHNSON. Madam President, in reserving the right to object, let me start out by saying that I agree with virtually everything my colleagues from both Massachusetts and Texas have said about celebrating the emancipation of the slaves. That was an important moment in U.S. history. It should be observed, and it should be celebrated. I have no disagreement whatsoever with that at all. The one area of disagreement is how the bill's sponsors have chosen to celebrate that holiday.

As the Senator from Massachusetts pointed out, since 1865, it has been observed with celebrations and cookouts, which is the appropriate way of doing this. I object to the fact that, by naming it a national holiday—and what they are leaving out of their argument and its main impact—it will give Federal workers a paid day off that the rest of America will have to pay for.

When I asked for a CBO score, the sponsors of the bill had not even obtained a score, and I still don't think they have obtained a score. The estimate, in terms of what it will cost American taxpayers in the private sector to pay for a paid holiday for Federal workers, is about \$600 million per year. The CBO score would come in at \$6 billion over 10.

In terms of why I object, let me just put a couple of facts to that \$600 million bill that hard-working taxpayers would have to foot in an era when we are \$26.5 trillion in debt and when 17 million of our fellow Americans are currently unemployed.

The first chart here—let's just talk about how many days off Federal workers get currently.

I have two columns—minimum and maximum. For paid holidays, they get 10, which is pretty generous. Most people in the private sector get something similar—7, 8, 9, or 10. For paid leave days, there is a minimum of 13, up to 26; for paid sick days, 13, minimum and maximum.

What we just added in last year's NDAA was paid parental leave, which allows an individual—either mother or father, with either a natural childbirth or an adoption—60 days of paid leave.

So for a total, at a minimum, there are 96 days, up to 109 days if they take paid parental leave.

Looked at a different way, as a ratio, if they take the maximum number of 109 days, that is, basically, for every 1.4 days you work, you get a day off. On a minimum basis with paid parental leave, for every 1.7 days you work, you get a day off.

Now, again, I realize the paid parental leave is a “just a few times in somebody's career” phenomenon, so let's take a look at this without paid parental leave, and it will show that the number of days with pay that Federal workers get off is still quite generous.

Again, paid holidays, they get 10; paid leave, 13, up to 26; paid sick leave, 13, for a total of 36 to 49.

So, again, going back to that ratio, the maximum number of days without paid parental leave, a Federal worker can work 4.3 days and then get a day off—basically a 4-day workweek for the entire year. That is quite generous.

So what I am objecting to is creating a national holiday that gives Federal workers another day off with pay, paid for by the American taxpayer, and we are collectively already \$26.5 trillion in debt.

Last slide. I would like to just, in general, talk about the private sector pay versus Federal worker pay. I know there are some disputes about this in terms of education and that type of thing, but still, this is pretty solid information.

The 2018 average annual wage—just wages, salary or wages—for Federal workers is over \$94,000. For private sector workers, the average is about \$63,000 or about 67 percent of what a Federal worker makes.

When you add in benefits, total compensation, the average total compensation for Federal workers in 2018 was \$136,000, just shy of \$136,000. In the private sector, the total cost of compensation is a little more than \$75,000—55 percent of what Federal Government workers make.

So if you strip out and just compare the benefits, again, we are talking about an extra paid day off, an extra paid holiday for only Federal workers to celebrate Juneteenth, paid for by American workers who make about \$12,000, on average per benefit, compared to \$41,000 in benefits for Federal workers. That is only 29 percent.

So those are the facts. Again, that is what I object to.

Again, I am happy to celebrate Juneteenth. I think we should celebrate the fact that we did remove that original sin by emancipating the slaves. That is a day of celebration. I agree with that. I simply don't believe we should make American taxpayers in the private sector pony up \$600 million a year, \$6 billion over 10 years, to give Federal workers, who already are paid quite generously and have quite a few days off one more paid day off.

So what I am proposing—again, I don't object to Juneteenth and a celebration, but if we are going to make that a Federal holiday, the main impact of that is giving Federal workers a paid day off. I would just suggest this: Why don't we take away one of their days of paid leave?

So I have an amendment at the desk, and I would ask that the Senator from Massachusetts modify his request to include my amendment at the desk; that the amendment be considered and agreed to; that the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed; and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator so modify his request?

Mr. MARKEY. Madam President, reserving the right to object, the Senator's proposal—rather than allowing this unanimous consent request to go through, the Senator proposes to hold it hostage to taking away the leave benefits that come with paid holidays for American workers. That is something we have never done before, and with good reason. We shouldn't be penalizing our workers by taking away benefits, especially not in the current environment and especially not as the price to pay for recognizing a long overdue Federal holiday.

I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Is there objection to the original request?

Mr. JOHNSON. Madam President, reserving the right to object, and to quickly respond to the Senator from Massachusetts, I am not taking anything away from Federal workers. I am just not willing to give them an extra day paid.

So if we create Juneteenth as a Federal paid holiday, they will get an extra day, and I am just saying let's keep them whole by removing a paid leave day, and then they will have the exact same number of days off as they have currently, and the American taxpayer will not be out an extra \$600 million per year or \$6 billion over 10 years.

I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

PRESCRIPTION DRUG COSTS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, before I speak, several of my colleagues on this side of the aisle, over the next several minutes—well, probably for more than a half hour—will be coming to the floor to discuss what I am discussing, which is a very important problem we have of rapidly increasing drug prices.

After I speak, these other Senators will come to the floor: Senator BRAUN, Senator CASSIDY, Senator COLLINS, Senator HYDE-SMITH, Senator MCSALLY. All of these people have been very favorable in support of the Prescription Drug Reduction Act, and I want to thank them for participating in bringing attention to this very important issue of unjustified increases in drug prices.

After these folks I just mentioned speak, I understand that my colleague from Iowa, who is in support of the legislation, is going to come at a later time today.

So thank you to my colleagues.

According to a recent Gallup poll, 9 out of 10 Americans are concerned about prescription drug prices. Specifically, they are concerned that the pharmaceutical industry will take advantage of the current pandemic to increase drug prices. That poll was published a month ago. Unfortunately, those concerns have become a reality now.

Two weeks ago, POLITICO reported that pharmaceutical companies have raised prices on hundreds of prescription drugs just during the pandemic. The report says that there have been more than 800—800—price increases just this year.

I have been working on a bill for over a year and a half to stem these increases and rein in drug prices. It would cap costs for Medicare recipients, cap increases to the rate of inflation, and save taxpayers nearly \$100 billion. It wasn't simple, but I am glad to have produced this kind of bill with Ranking Member WYDEN and my colleagues here with me today.

But I am disappointed. My partner and all of my Democratic colleagues who approved this bill in committee by a vote of 19 to 9 declined to cosponsor an improved version of the bill that they helped put together in the first place, and this is the work of about 18 months.

I can't be sure why, but I have to assume it is because it is an election

year, and, somehow, passing a bill that would do so much good in a time with so much hardship might help Republicans who also support the bill, hurting Democrats' chances of taking the majority.

As we consider a new relief bill, we ought to put aside that kind of politics-before-people method of legislating. We need to approve the Prescription Drug Pricing Reduction Act as part of this package. Our country is facing the most serious public health crisis in a generation—not just a generation, if you think back—in generations.

Millions of Americans are newly unemployed, and many small businesses have slowed or shuttered altogether. People across the country are stretching their paychecks and their savings to get through this virus pandemic.

In the CARES Act, passed in March, and in subsequent legislation, we helped slow the hurt caused by this virus. But there is only so much a stimulus check or tax relief can do when your bills just keep coming and going up—meaning the pharmaceutical bills.

These drug price increases are a weight that Americans shouldn't have to bear, especially seniors on whom the virus is taking a particular toll.

The increases aren't a result of a functioning marketplace or an industry with healthy competition. Addressing these price increases is also something we all largely agree on.

In 2016, the President campaigned on making the marketplace for prescription drugs fairer and more affordable for patients. He won. He even talked about that promise in a State of the Union message when he said that he wants Congress to send a bill for him to sign this year.

So the President made that campaign promise in 2016, and the President has done many things since then to carry out that campaign promise. He has even helped me in the development of this legislation.

That was 2016. This is 2020. In 2018, we have had many House Democrats campaign on making the marketplace for prescription drugs fairer and more affordable. Many of them won, and they took over the House of Representatives. It is time to put politics aside and finally act.

Just because Big Pharma was bankrupting patients before the pandemic doesn't mean that we should allow them to keep on doing it now. In fact, there is no better time to put an end to Big Pharma's price gouging than right now.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. BRAUN. Madam President, Senator GRASSLEY and I share a passion that I think most Americans do in that it is time that we end this stranglehold that the healthcare industry has on all of us because they pose as free enterprisers, but there is nothing free about the way they actually operate.

"Free enterprise" means you embrace competition. You are not putting up barriers to entry. You engage the consumer so that they can see what you are charging them. That does not occur. The alternative will be as clear on the other side of the aisle; they want to make government the business partner of healthcare. If the industry doesn't get with it and start doing what all the rest of us do when we go to the marketplace—embrace competition, be willing to compete, don't ask for barriers to entry, and, yes, we tell the customer what we charge them before they buy it. That doesn't happen in healthcare.

The market is opaque and complex. There is nothing free about it, except that drugmakers are free to charge whatever they want. The market is dependent on government-sanctioned rebates and monopolies by the FDA exclusivities and patent abuse. It is time to fix this. PBM may not mean much to the public, but it stands for pharmacy benefit managers. This is a structure of middleman that is not present in other industries. Normally, with transparency, prices cascade down through the system in a way that everybody can see it, and the successful survivors in that industry have performed because they give good value to their customers; they keep their overhead low; and they earn the business.

PBMs use techniques like spread pricing. Normally, there is a spread—you buy it for this and sell it for that—but not where people can't see it. It is time that we get away from this complexity and the opaqueness of it because the day of reckoning will come, and the day of reckoning is not too far away.

I recently came from the business world. No one likes the healthcare industry other than the CEOs and owners of these businesses. All of us who have to deal with them are just asking for that one simple thing: Show us what things cost. Quit hiding it. Insurance companies have these secret deals with hospitals, with pharma, and it is starting to cost too much. It shows up in the fact that it is nearly 20 percent of our GDP in the United States, and it costs almost half of that in most other developed countries. The sad thing is, the results aren't any better. In many cases, the results are better at a price that is half the cost.

Both Chairman GRASSLEY and I have talked with President Trump. President Trump has been the most vocal individual in DC about trying to get the industry to work like the rest of us entrepreneurs do. Every time he has an Executive order, they take him to court. That is ending because just recently the hospitals tried that, and the district court overturned it. They will probably appeal it, and, hopefully, the appellate court will overturn it.

I have a transparency bill which is as simple as: Show us what you are charging us before we engage your service.

Mr. GRASSLEY has the same thing basically on drug pricing. Let me tell you how that works.

This is a real live experiment that I put into place 12 years ago. I was so sick and tired of the insurance agents coming in and telling me how lucky I was that it was only going up 5 to 10 percent this year. I didn't think I was very lucky. My company wasn't large enough to spend a lot of time on it. When we got to be 300 employees, that starts to add up. Now we have 1,000 employees. Thank goodness my kids have to deal with that with a good, young executive team, but I put something in place 12 years ago that I am proud of.

I said enough was enough. What do we have that is really going to change the dynamic? You have to remember, this is 12 years ago—talk about trying to find transparency then. We were lucky that we were large enough to self-insure. By doing that, we probably saved close to 25 percent, and by engaging our employees in their own well-being and incentivizing them to shop around to enable their ability to find better prices, it was even there if you looked for it hard back then. Long story short, we have not had a premium increase at my company in 12 years. I am proud of that. We covered preexisting conditions with no caps on coverage because we took a radical change to how healthcare should be bought by the consumer, the employer, and forced the transparency out of a system that wasn't giving much of it then.

Now there is more transparency, but it is just on the fringes. If you get that to happen, prices will cascade down through the system. President Trump had another Executive order for pharma—all these expensive drugs you see advertised—to put the price along with the advertisement. A lot of times it is deceptive—you can get it for as little as \$5 a month. Well, somebody is paying for that \$60,000 or \$70,000 drug. Generally, it is the employer, and the employee some of it, but it is, again, due to the fact that we can't see anything.

Americans are blindfolded from prices, only to receive medical bills, often, that arrive 2 months later. They have no idea, and they open up the envelope with trepidation. Oh my goodness. It wasn't what I thought it would be. More often than not, it is: Oh, my gosh. This is terrible. It has got to end.

It would be different if we were asking for something that is radical. What we are asking for is tell us what you are charging us before we have to engage your services.

That is why it is so important. The White House is behind it. Hopefully, the other side of the aisle will get behind it. Support Chairman GRASSLEY's bill, the Prescription Drug Pricing Reduction Act, and support my bill, the Healthcare Price Transparency Act. The story I told you about my own company would happen across the country, and we wouldn't be com-

plaining about these surprise billings. We wouldn't be holding our breath. We would simply be doing what all educated consumers do when they go to buy from a truly free enterprise.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRAMER). The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, COVID-19 is a continuing threat to Americans' physical and financial health, and it is at this intersection that Congress can make a meaningful impact on the family budgets of all Americans by passing sensible legislation to lower the cost of prescription drugs through measures such as the Prescription Drug Pricing Reduction Act or, as I like to call it, the "Making Coronavirus Medications Affordable Act."

There is an urgent need to lower the cost of prescription drugs. The high price of drugs is not a new problem, but it is a problem that is going to be made worse by the coronavirus pandemic. Millions of households have seen their incomes suffer due to economic lockdowns aimed at containing the virus.

It is encouraging that job numbers continue to outpace expectations, but still, millions of fellow Americans are out of work, which affects their pocketbook and potentially their insurance coverage. Americans do not need the added burden of expensive drugs, particularly right now.

Congress is providing relief for American families and businesses through the COVID-19 crisis, and we are considering another round of support. I think we should include how do we make drugs more affordable. That way, if folks become ill, they know that they will be able to afford the cure. I believe the best path forward is the "Making Coronavirus Drugs Affordable Act," as I call it, or, as Chairman GRASSLEY calls it, the Prescription Drug Pricing Reduction Act. I like mine better.

Now, the difficulty in addressing the issue of the price of medications is that a balance must be struck between making sure the medication is affordable but also making sure there is still a profit motive that will incentivize the researchers and pharmaceutical companies to find these cures that we know we need. Just think about it. Without innovation, we would not be able to find a vaccine for coronavirus—a vaccine that will save millions of lives worldwide and allow us to go back to a normal life.

Let me just praise the pharmaceutical industry. We have seen them respond to this crisis in many helpful ways. Additionally, they recently committed a billion dollars to antimicrobial resistance, which is to say, to find an antibiotic that will work when other antibiotics no longer do. They have invested in large-scale and rapid treatment options, and, again, it is only through innovation that we will beat this virus and end the pandemic.

But we must remember this: If a patient cannot afford the innovation, the

new medicine, it is as if the innovation never occurred. The "Making Coronavirus Drugs Affordable Act" strikes the balance between lowering costs for families and incentivizing companies to find those cures.

Let me show you what this bill does. It caps the patient's out-of-pocket expenses. It lets patients pay over time. It protects patients from price gouging, and it preserves the incentive for companies to find cures. Let me explain each of these.

First, the bill caps the out-of-pocket expense for those in the Medicare Part D Program, our senior citizens, and particularly for the most vulnerable seniors with chronic conditions. Research has shown that seniors are at the most risk for severe complications and death from COVID-19. When a treatment or cure is widely available, cost should never be a barrier for a senior to access the drug that she or he needs to survive.

Under the current system, this is what a senior citizen pays for their medicinal benefit under Medicare Part D. They have a deductible for which the senior pays 100 percent; the initial coverage phase and the coverage gap phase, for which they pay one-fourth of the expense; and then in the catastrophic phase, the patient pays 5 percent of the cost no matter how high that expense goes.

So let's imagine a medication which costs over \$1 million. They are paying 5 percent of that medication cost, and if I could stand up any higher—but I keep losing my microphone—they will pay 5 percent of that. Think about a theoretical drug that costs \$3 million a year. The senior would be required to pay 5 percent of whatever that drug costs. That is under current law. What we are trying to do is fix this. If this occurs, the senior will not be able to afford lifesaving medications.

Under the legislation that we are attempting to pass, it would change the Medicare Part D standard benefit so that there is still the initial deductible in which the senior pays 100 percent, but after paying 20 percent of the initial coverage phase, there is no longer that 5 percent toward infinity. We make medications affordable for the senior. If that is all the bill did, we would do something quite remarkable for the ability of a patient to be able to afford a potentially lifesaving drug.

By the way, as a physician, I know this is a barrier for patients to be able to have their drugs. So we address that in this bill.

The second thing we do—you might say: Wait a second. The senior citizen if he or she has to pay for all this for a very expensive drug in the month of January, they can't afford that. Under the current situation, the senior has to pay her deductible and her initial coverage phase whenever it is due, which might be in the first week of the year. What we also do in this bill is we give the senior citizen the opportunity to pay all this lump sum as a series of

payments over 12 months. So let's imagine that this was \$10,000. Instead of having to pay all of it in January, she could pay \$800 every month over the course of the year. That allows her to budget and to factor it in with the other sources of income that she has. Not only do we cap the senior citizen's out-of-pocket expense, but we also allow her to pay that expense over a set of months so she can factor it into her budget. That is the second great thing that this bill does.

What is another thing that we do? Senator BRAUN also referred to this, but we also have cost transparency. If there is a medication which has the price being elevated unnecessarily, and if the customer knew that, she would know: Wait a second. I can get my medications far less expensively here versus there or, if I accept a substitute, again, the medication will be more affordable. We mandate that kind of price transparency that allows the customer to make an informed decision.

Now, I know there are competing ideas on how to lower drug costs. House Democrats, for example, have introduced legislation that they claim would lower costs. But, remember, I told you that there is this tension. How do we preserve the incentive to innovate while still making sure the innovation is affordable?

House Democrats have put up a bill. Yes, it makes medicine more affordable, but it kills the desire to innovate. The Congressional Budget Office has estimated that if the bill the House Democrats have proposed is passed, there will be 38 fewer cures invented by pharmaceutical manufacturers—38 fewer cures.

Let me tell you a story. I mentioned that I am a physician. I came of age in my residency, if you will, when the AIDS epidemic hit. I was 25 years old or 27 years old, and I would see men my age dying of HIV. We didn't have an antibody then. If you were diagnosed with HIV—again, we called it AIDS then—you basically were dead because we had no cures. Since then, we now have medications that—if you are infected with HIV, you can live until you are 75 years old or 80 years old. We have found something that doesn't quite cure, but it allows it to be treated as a chronic condition. What if we didn't have that cure? What if that were one of the 38 cures we never had?

What if one of the cures we lose out on is a cure for Alzheimer's? My parents died of Alzheimer's. All of us know somebody affected by Alzheimer's or dementia. What if the cure we lose is the cure for Alzheimer's?

You may think you are making medications less expensive, but in terms of human life, you are making it that much more expensive because instead of finding that cure for Alzheimer's, you instead have consigned those people with Alzheimer's to a slow, awful death—awful for them and awful for their loved ones as they see their parents decline. I would argue that it is

fool's gold to say that the House Democratic bill saves money. It just shifts it, and it shifts it to the misery of the family who will never enjoy one of these cures that are not otherwise developed.

To fix the problem of the high cost of drugs, it will take a bipartisan coalition. We have that with this bill. It ends government handouts to pharmaceutical companies, but it doesn't price-fix. It saves \$80 billion for the taxpayer and for the patient, and it maintains incentives for lifesaving innovations.

Some in this Chamber will be tempted to stop this bill until after this year's election. To them, I would say: Don't let politics keep us from delivering drug-pricing relief for American families. Too much is on the line, especially during this pandemic. To do nothing while families try to pay medical bills is wrong. Let's work together to pass this bill to lower the cost of drugs, to protect innovation, and to save lives.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, first, let me recognize and thank Senator GRASSLEY for his extraordinary leadership on an issue that matters so greatly to the American people, and that is the high cost of prescription drugs. His persistence has produced the Prescription Drug Pricing Reduction Act, a far-reaching set of bold proposals that I strongly endorse and that build on the work I have done as the chairman of the Senate Aging Committee.

More than half of all Americans and 90 percent of our seniors take at least one prescription drug each month. We should be able to work together to help the American people—particularly our seniors—on an issue that affects their health and their finances. No senior should be faced with the choice of buying food they need, paying a bill for the oil to heat their home, or buying their prescription drug.

I remember very well being in line at the pharmacy in Bangor, ME, and the couple in front of me found out that their copay was \$113. The husband looked at his wife and he said: Honey, we just can't afford that. They left the prescription that one of them needed that was prescribed by their doctor there on the pharmacy counter. When I asked the pharmacist how often this happens, he said: Each and every day. Every day.

That is why we should be working together to pass Senator GRASSLEY's bill, as well as many of the other bipartisan bills that you have heard described today, including legislation that I have advocated to improve the lives of millions of Americans. This goal surely should be beyond partisan politics.

In just the last year, three Senate committees advanced legislation to reform our flawed drug-pricing system. I can't think of anything else that we buy where the price is less transparent

and is more opaque than prescription drugs.

The Finance Committee's bill, the Prescription Drug Pricing Reduction Act, which I am proud to cosponsor, would make crucial improvements. As Senator CASSIDY just ably explained, one of the most important improvements is to Medicare Part D. It would protect our seniors with an out-of-pocket spending limit. It would also include cost-control measures, such as an inflationary cap to limit price hikes. We have made some progress in this area.

I have authored legislation that is making a difference for patients. One of the laws I authored bans gag clauses that had prohibited pharmacists from informing their customers if there were a less expensive way to purchase their prescription drug. Amazingly enough, sometimes it is cheaper to pay out-of-pocket than to use your insurance card—not something that most consumers would ever realize unless the pharmacist informed him or her.

My bill also updates a 2003 law requiring drug manufacturers to notify the Federal Trade Commission of patent settlement agreements, giving the agency greater visibility into whether they include tactics such as anti-competitive reverse payments that slow or defeat the introduction of lower cost drugs. Another law I authored is helping to bring lower cost generics to the marketplace more quickly by expediting their approval by the FDA.

But clearly there is more that we must do. At a time when economic and health security are more linked than ever, Congress has an opportunity to deliver a decisive victory in lowering costs for patients.

In addition to the Finance Committee package, the HELP Committee bill—I serve on the HELP Committee, which is chaired by Senator ALEXANDER—incorporated more than 14 bipartisan measures to increase price competition, including portions of a bill that I introduced with Senator TIM KAINE, the Biologic Patent Transparency Act, which is intended to prevent drug manufacturers from gaming the patent system.

Patents are important to encourage the development of earth-breaking, groundbreaking new pharmaceuticals, but the system should not be gamed so that when the patent is about to expire, a host of new patents are filed on the medication in order to block a lower cost generic from coming to market.

In October, the Institute for Clinical and Economic Review published its first annual report on unjustified price increases of prescription drugs in our country. It should surprise no one that HUMIRA, the poster child for patent gaming, led the list. HUMIRA's price increased by nearly 16 percent from 2017 to 2018, costing American patients and insureds an extra \$1.86 billion. Why do we want to wait any longer, and how did HUMIRA do it? It once again put up

this patent thicket—its manufacturer did—in order to block the lower price biosimilar.

The Judiciary Committee has advanced bills that empower the Federal Trade Commission to take more aggressive action on drug pricing. This year, the FTC charged the infamous Martin Shkreli with a scheme to increase the price of the lifesaving drug Daraprim by more than 4,000 percent overnight, which was the focus of an Aging Committee investigation that I led with former Senator Claire McCaskill in 2016.

Floor consideration should also allow for action on other important prescription drug bills, such as legislation that Senator JEANNE SHAHEEN and I have authored to eliminate incentives that create price hikes, distorting the insulin market. Insulin has been around for 100 years. I realize there is fast-acting and slow-acting insulin, but there is no excuse for the skyrocketing price of insulin.

There is another bill that I cosponsored, introduced by Senators KLOBUCHAR and GRASSLEY, that would end pay-for-delay schemes.

We must come together on prescription drug legislation without further delay. Three committees have produced strong bipartisan bills, and we should proceed to act and pass this legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mrs. HYDE-SMITH. Mr. President, I join my colleagues today in calling on this body to include the Prescription Drug Pricing Reduction Act of 2020 in the next coronavirus relief bill so that we can finally address the high cost of prescription drugs.

The troubles caused by skyrocketing drug prices are a never-ending source of worry and hardship for Mississippians and people across this entire country. I hear about this issue from constituents more than just about any other issue when I go home. I hear this all the time. I go to church with people who have to decide whether they are going to buy their drugs or buy food. That is a reality we live with.

Let me highlight a few stories shared with me by some of my constituents.

Emily Quinn lives in Fulton, MS. Her husband, Brian, was diagnosed with type 1 diabetes at the age of 2 and continues to rely on insulin daily. Her son Dylan, who is now 16, was diagnosed with type 1 diabetes at the age of 6. The Quinn family pays more than \$2,700 each month for just Brian's and Dylan's insulin, not including other diabetic equipment and supplies that they have to have.

It is shocking that more than a century—a century, not a decade; a century, 100 years—after insulin was discovered, insulin prices continue to rise by staggering amounts, nearly 300 percent over the last 10 years.

Scott Crawford of Jackson, MS, is a volunteer advocate for multiple sclerosis. Scott was diagnosed with pri-

mary progressive MS in 2002. Only one drug, named OCREVUS, can help slow the advancement of this disabling disease. That drug costs a staggering \$65,000 a year—more than most Mississippians make. Even with good insurance coverage, Scott cannot afford the \$15,000 copay for OCREVUS, so he just goes without.

MS drugs have seen some of the most shocking price increases of all, with list prices rising nearly 450 percent over the last 10 years.

Two young neurologists in Mississippi told me about their Medicare patients who quickly move into the catastrophic phase of Medicare Part D early each year. Even though these patients face only a 5-percent out-of-pocket cost for their drugs in this phase, that small percentage can amount to thousands of dollars for the expensive neurology drugs these patients depend on. Because there is currently no Medicare Part D out-of-pocket cap, these patients will get no relief from high drug prices later in the year when they still have to have them.

These are just a few of the many stories that I have received from Mississippians. I have one of my own as well.

My mother, a Medicare beneficiary living in Monticello, MS—Hyde, Lorraine—faced \$454.50—right there—in out-of-pocket costs for her prescription eye drops earlier this year. A tiny bottle of eye drops cost \$454.50. The drug, RESTASIS, has been on the market well over a decade—more than enough time for Allergan, the pharmaceutical company that developed the drug, to recoup its investment. Yet the average wholesale price of this drug has increased almost 250 percent in 10 years. It was almost unbelievable when my mom called me and told me what she paid for eye drops.

This case went all the way to the U.S. Supreme Court because Allergan had undertaken what I consider one of the most blatantly anti-competitive schemes in the history of the pharmaceutical industry. Fearing competition after its RESTASIS patent expired in 2014, Allergan transferred the patents to a Native American Tribe in an attempt to use the Tribe's sovereign immunity to shield Allergan against competition from lower priced generic alternatives. As I said, this case went all the way to the Supreme Court in 2018.

Even though the Supreme Court ultimately ruled this scheme was illegal, the company's underhanded ploy successfully delayed competition while it continued to reap outrageous benefits from RESTASIS, costing the U.S. healthcare system over \$2 billion per year because of their monopoly pricing.

We want pharmaceutical companies to succeed. The great cures and treatments they discover improve the lives of many, many Americans. We recognize that fact. But these cures and therapeutics can only save lives if the patients can afford them. Too many Mississippians and individuals across

this country cannot afford their prescription drugs due to the anti-competitive prices of companies—like Allergan—that continue to increase their prices year after year.

Today, the threat of the coronavirus pandemic has only increased concerns about drug pricing. As new vaccines and treatments for COVID-19 are being tested and developed, the affordability of prescription drugs is more important than ever. Just as much as we need a vaccine or treatment to be discovered, we also need it to be affordable for Americans if we are going to get on the other side of this pandemic.

I am proud to be an original cosponsor of the Finance Committee chairman's comprehensive Prescription Drug Pricing Reduction Act to bring affordability and fairness to the prescription drug market. This bill must be an immediate priority for us as leaders if we are serious—if we are serious—about helping patients afford the drugs they need.

This important legislation would create a true out-of-pocket cap for Medicare beneficiaries, reinforce the market forces that have supported the research and development of so many miracle cures, keep pharmaceutical companies from price gouging, prevent taxpayers from being on the hook for unlimited price hacks that have no basis in the free market, stop the hurtful tactics of pharmacy benefit managers that hurt patients and community pharmacies while enriching the middlemen.

These reforms could reduce out-of-pocket spending on prescription drugs by \$72 billion, reduce premiums by \$1 billion, and save taxpayers \$95 billion. The Congressional Budget Office anticipates those savings will spill over into even more savings in the commercial health market.

This is a priority that should transcend party politics. Yet Democrats who had previously supported Chairman GRASSLEY's reform legislation have walked away from the drug pricing negotiation table altogether. They would rather deny President Trump a victory on this issue than help the millions of Americans struggling to make ends meet due to high drug costs. There is no doubt about it: They are putting election-year politics ahead of making prescription drugs affordable for the American people.

The American people can't wait. Every month they continue to block this vital legislation is another month of thousands of dollars in insulin expenses for the Quinn family in Fulton, MS. Every month delayed is another month that Scott Crawford's MS advances because he cannot afford his medications. Every month is another month that those neurologists in Jackson will continue to worry about their patients on Medicare who face unlimited expenses due to no out-of-pocket cap.

These patients, and millions more like them, cannot wait until next year

or until the coronavirus pandemic passes or until Democrats decide to put the American people over politics.

Mississippians and Americans need a solution now. My friend the Senator from Iowa has done the hard work of writing a bill over the past 18 months that can address the heart of the issue and garner bipartisan consensus. I call on my colleagues to include the Prescription Drug Pricing Reduction Act in the next coronavirus relief package.

I have been very excited to work on this. This is one of the very reasons that I came to Washington, DC—to help Mississippians.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Ms. MCSALLY. Mr. President, I want to thank Chairman GRASSLEY for his tireless leadership on lowering the cost of prescription drugs for Americans. I am proud to join with him on the floor today and join him in his legislation that we must pass to help Americans and to help Arizonans.

Everywhere I go—and when I am hearing from Arizonans—I am constantly hearing about the rising costs of prescription drugs. It is among one of their top and most pressing concerns. From seniors who can't afford their medications to parents struggling to care for a child who suffers from chronic conditions, out-of-pocket drug costs are too high. Far too many seniors and hard-working individuals in our State either can't afford both their groceries and their medications or they have been forced to ration their prescriptions because of skyrocketing drug costs.

In 2017, AARP Arizona reported that a whopping 26 percent of our residents stopped taking their medications as prescribed due to cost.

Last fall, I heard from a constituent in her midsixties from Green Valley, AZ, who was diagnosed with rheumatoid arthritis and taking several medications to treat her condition. When she transitioned to Medicare Part D from her employer's health plan, her out-of-pocket costs for one of the drugs she was taking—Enbrel—went from \$10 per month to nearly \$6,000 per month. This is a 600-percent increase in her monthly out-of-pocket costs just for this drug alone. I don't know anybody who can afford \$6,000 a month for one drug as a senior—as anyone. This is insane. She had to switch to another medication twice, but because they were infusions, she now has to travel 84 miles round trip to get treated. The significant jump in drug costs have affected both her pocketbook even her quality of life.

This is unacceptable, and I have worked with my Senate colleagues on both sides of the aisle, with Chairman GRASSLEY's leadership, over the past year and a half since I have been in the Senate to bring down the costs of drugs and help Americans save more of their money.

Senator GRASSLEY's bill, of which I am proud to be an original cosponsor,

does just that by holding Big Pharma companies accountable for exploiting loopholes and keeping pricing high for seniors, families, and taxpayers. Our bill pulls back the curtain on drug pricing and negotiations. It ends the sticker shock at the pharmacy counter, and it caps out-of-pocket costs for seniors so that Arizonans can afford the medicines they need.

According to the Congressional Budget Office, our Prescription Drug Pricing Reduction Act would save taxpayers close to \$95 billion, reduce out-of-pocket spending by \$72 billion, and reduce premiums by \$1 billion.

This bill is even more important now that we are navigating a global pandemic and its subsequent economic challenges that are squeezing family and fixed-income senior budgets even more than in normal times. With over 17 million Americans unemployed—including many Arizonans—along with the ever-looming threat of the coronavirus, affording prescription medicine should be the least of their concerns. Our bill would give Americans and Arizonans one less thing to worry about during these extraordinarily difficult and unprecedented times.

Unfortunately, despite this bill receiving strong bipartisan support until just a few months ago, Democrats recently chose to walk away at the direction of their party's leadership, and they refused to join in on the reintroduction of this legislation that they co-authored. This happens only in DC.

Just to be clear: They were for it before they were against it. This is maddening. This is why people all over my State are so frustrated with the dysfunction in this place, where people are willing to put looking for power and electoral politics ahead of what people need right now. Right now they need relief. They need relief to lower their out-of-pocket costs for all of the issues that they are facing as seniors, as families—any of the diagnoses, any of the conditions. These lifesaving and quality-of-life-improving medicines—we have to lower the costs, and now is the time to do it. Arizona patients and taxpayers and families and seniors need Washington to act now.

I want to urge our Democratic colleagues to put politics aside. I know it is hard to do in an election year, but put it aside. Service before self—that is one of the core values I learned in the Air Force. I bring it here with me today.

Serving others first—that is why you are here. Put those politics aside. Let's act to lower the out-of-pocket costs of prescription drugs in our upcoming coronavirus relief bill.

This is a pivotal moment for action. We have to come together as a Congress to ensure hard-working Americans, their families, and seniors can access the treatments they need at an affordable cost.

Let's pass this bill now.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

S. 4049

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I rise, together with the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, to talk about the chairman's plan to conclude the deliberations of the legislation before us today.

As you well know from being in the committee, this was a process that was bipartisan, thoughtful, extremely well-orchestrated by the chairman, and we accomplished a great deal. As you know, the members of the committee—we considered literally hundreds of different amendments by the members as we marked up the legislation. Then we passed the bill out of committee, we brought it to the floor, and at that point, a total of 880 amendments were filed on the legislation—446 Republican amendments, 422 Democratic amendments, and 12 joint amendments. So we had a rich field to pick from in terms of trying to improve the legislation.

The first substitute that was introduced on the floor to begin formal deliberation included a total of 79 amendments—34 Republican amendments, 34 Democratic amendments, and 11 joint amendments. Then we proceeded forward. Last week we came up with another unanimous consent to allow the votes that took place this week on several very important amendments, but in addition to that, we incorporated another legislative proposal including 62 amendments.

So from the introduction of the bill to the floor and to this moment, we have adopted 141 amendments. They are bipartisan, both Democrats and Republicans. Now we are at the point—and the chairman, I believe, has a very thoughtful way to conclude the legislation—to consider another round of amendments and then be able to move to final passage very quickly.

Again, let me conclude by saying that the chairman has done a remarkable job. I commend him for his bipartisanship, his thoughtfulness, and his consideration, and I am completely supportive of his proposal to bring this bill to a conclusion.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, first of all, can I say Senator REED has been incredibly great in this whole process. We have been working on this for a whole year now, and we are now to the point where tomorrow we should be able to pass it out of—it will not be passed at that time. We also have a conference we are going to have to be faced with and all that, but today and tomorrow morning are very important to us.

The point that is made by Senator REED—if you add up all the amendments, really, it is you guys in the Senate who have drafted this bill. Not only are there 141 amendments since we came out of the committee, but in

the committee, we had over 800 amendments that were part of the bill to start with.

One of the reasons—and I think I speak for Senator REED and myself at the same time. We have had some experiences in the past where, since the Senate operates with unanimous consent, we were unable to have any amendments at all on the floor. So in order to do that, to make sure—if that should happen again, we wanted to make sure we had all these amendments already in the bill. So that was our starting point.

Now, here is where we are today. We had a great vote on the NDAA, receiving an 87-to-13 vote in favor of ending debate on the substitute. That was great. That was today. That means we are at kind of the end of this process now. We have continued to work on another managers' package.

Last night we hotlined—a lot of the people who may be watching are not familiar with the terminology. We hotlined—we sent out to all the Democrats and all the Republicans for any objections they might have—another group of amendments. It was a large group, an equal number of amendments for Democrats and Republicans. It came back, and there were a lot of objections to it, so we have now taken that and started on one last managers' package that we are going to be—a modified version that we are going to hotline tonight.

It is very important that people are listening right now. A lot of times people aren't listening. Certainly, the staffs should let their Members know that they are going to get a hotline on actually 40 amendments—20 Democratic amendments, 20 Republican amendments—tonight. That is going to be the hotline they are going to look at. Some of your staff and some of the Members may not have read these amendments yet. It is likely that is the case. If you have objections to amendments in this package—that is what we are hotlining—we encourage you to lodge those objections with the Cloakroom. That is when you get these things. That is going to be tonight. We will note those objections and see what remains.

Tomorrow morning—let's say all the objections have come in. Tomorrow morning, at a time—we were hoping that time was going to be around 10:30 tomorrow, but we know a lot of people want to talk; a lot of people want to be heard. We can't control that, but we will ask for unanimous consent to pass the package with a balanced number of amendments from both Democrats and Republicans. This is tomorrow, hopefully at 10:30, but maybe that will not work.

We will require Members who want to object to this final package to come down to the floor in person and object. If you already have an objection to a specific amendment in this package registered with the Cloakroom, the amendment should have been pulled

from the package. It will not even appear at that time. Otherwise, you need to be here to object in person.

We use the term "balanced." This is how this works. We have 40 amendments that are going to be hotlined tonight. If the Republicans have eight of them that they object to and the Democrats have seven they object to, they have to find one more to object to so it ends up being eight and eight or so that the number will be equal. It sounds a little complicated and it sounds like something that might not work, but it will work. We have been doing this now for over a year. Actually, we started this process 2 years ago. So it is going to be the responsibility of the Democrats and the Republicans to make that even so that no one can say that it is biased to one side.

So all of that is what is going to happen, and it is very important that staff and Members be aware of that because what we don't want to happen is to have someone come along and say they were not aware of this process that is in place. So that is the process we are going to use, and that is one that is fair.

Again, I don't think—and this will be the 60th consecutive year. There has never been a year, in my memory, that has had more amendments considered than we have considered this year.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

REINFORCING AMERICAN-MADE PRODUCTS ACT OF 2020

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, when Americans see a "Made in the U.S.A." label on a product, it is a source of great pride, and justifiably so. It represents the American virtues of entrepreneurialism and industriousness. It also alludes to the fact that, as Americans, we have a common sense of destiny and a common appreciation for the inherent dignity and eternal worth of the human soul. It is a symbol of support for American manufacturing jobs, for local communities, and for high-quality products. So it often spurs American consumers as well as foreign consumers to buy a particular product—a product lucky enough to have that label.

The Federal Trade Commission currently enforces a difficult standard for all products that want to claim the "Made in the U.S.A." label. It requires that "all or virtually all" of a product be made in the United States, and it has issued a lengthy legal guidance document—or a series thereof—establishing rules for who may and may not claim that title.

However, one State holds a different standard—one that is nearly impossible for businesses to meet. Under California's law, if more than 5 percent of the components of a particular product are manufactured outside the United States—even if that means just a few

bolts or a few screws—that product cannot lawfully be labeled "Made in the U.S.A."

Because of the flow of interstate and international commerce, in which most manufacturers sell wholesale to national and international distributors who then disperse products all throughout the country, the other 49 States are forced to comply with this one—the most rigid definition—in order to avoid costly litigation.

For many practical purposes, this just means they can't use the label. It makes it impracticable as a business matter and not feasible as a legal matter for them to claim that label. Even though they could legally boast the "Made in the U.S.A." claim in every other State in the country, California makes it more or less impossible for them to do so. In other words, a single State is effectively dictating a country-of-origin label. Think about that for a minute.

If California or any other State in the Union, for that matter, would like to create a State-of-origin label, I have no issue with such a State doing that and wouldn't suggest that the Federal Government ought to undo those parameters. But as it currently stands, the California law undermines Congress's rightful authority to regulate interstate commerce and needlessly hurts American manufacturers.

This is one of the reasons we are our own country. This is one of the reasons we fly the Stars and Stripes. It is one of the reasons the Constitution came into existence to begin with—to give Congress the power to regulate commerce between the several States with foreign nations and with Indians Tribes. Our previous form of government, under the Articles of Confederation, didn't create a Congress that had that power. As a result, in the early days following the American Revolution, States were engaging in activities amounting to economic Balkanization. We saw economic Balkanization among and between the States. That is why our Founding Fathers gathered in that hot, fateful, and sweltering summer of 1787 in Philadelphia—for this very reason.

The Reinforcing American-Made Products Act would solve this very problem. It would simply ensure that the FTC has the exclusive authority to set the national standard for "Made in the U.S.A." labeling. The legislation would provide clarity and consistency, helping American companies to avoid unnecessary hardships and frivolous lawsuits that would otherwise deter them from using this coveted and justifiably enviable label of "Made in the U.S.A."

Now more than ever, in the midst of the economic turmoil associated with the global pandemic, we ought to be doing all we can to support American jobs and to strengthen our local communities. This legislation would help us accomplish just that. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be discharged from further consideration of S. 4065 and that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 4065) to make exclusive the authority of the Federal Government to regulate the labeling of products made in the United States and introduced in interstate or foreign commerce, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the committee was discharged, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

Mr. LEE. I know of no further debate on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

Hearing none, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (S. 4065) was passed, as follows:

S. 4065

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Reinforcing American-Made Products Act of 2020”.

SEC. 2. EXCLUSIVITY OF FEDERAL AUTHORITY TO REGULATE LABELING OF PRODUCTS MADE IN THE UNITED STATES AND INTRODUCED IN INTERSTATE OR FOREIGN COMMERCE.

Section 320933 of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (15 U.S.C. 45a) is amended—

(1) in the first sentence, by striking “To the extent” and inserting the following:

“(a) IN GENERAL.—To the extent”;

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(b) EFFECT ON STATE LAW.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the provisions of this section shall supersede any provisions of the law of any State expressly relating to the extent to which a product is introduced, delivered for introduction, sold, advertised, or offered for sale in interstate or foreign commerce with a ‘Made in the U.S.A.’ or ‘Made in America’ label, or the equivalent thereof, in order to represent that such product was in whole or substantial part of domestic origin.

“(2) ENFORCEMENT.—Nothing in this section shall preclude the application of the law of any State to the use of a label not in compliance with subsection (a).”; and

(3) in the third sentence of subsection (a), as so designated by paragraph (1), by striking “Nothing in this section” and inserting “Except as provided in subsection (b), nothing in this section”.

Mr. LEE. I ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

DRIFTNET MODERNIZATION AND BYCATCH REDUCTION ACT

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 316, S. 906.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 906) to improve the management of driftnet fishing.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, with an amendment as follows: (The part of the bill to be inserted is shown in *italic*.)

S. 906

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Driftnet Modernization and Bycatch Reduction Act”.

SEC. 2. DEFINITION.

Section 3(25) of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1802(25)) is amended by inserting “, or with a mesh size of 14 inches or greater,” after “more”.

SEC. 3. FINDINGS AND POLICY.

(a) FINDINGS.—Section 206(b) of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1826(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (6), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in paragraph (7), by striking the period and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(8) within the exclusive economic zone, large-scale driftnet fishing that deploys nets with large mesh sizes causes significant entanglement and mortality of living marine resources, including myriad protected species, despite limitations on the lengths of such nets.”.

(b) POLICY.—Section 206(c) of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1826(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in paragraph (3), by striking the period and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following—

“(4) prioritize the phase out of large-scale driftnet fishing in the exclusive economic zone and promote the development and adoption of alternative fishing methods and gear types that minimize the incidental catch of living marine resources.”.

SEC. 4. TRANSITION PROGRAM.

Section 206 of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1826) is amended by adding at the end the following—

“(1) FISHING GEAR TRANSITION PROGRAM.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—During the 5-year period beginning on the date of enactment of the Driftnet Modernization and Bycatch Reduction Act, the Secretary shall conduct a transition program to facilitate the phase-out of large-scale driftnet fishing and adoption of alternative fishing practices that minimize the incidental catch of living marine resources, and shall award grants to eligible permit holders who participate in the program.

“(2) PERMISSIBLE USES.—Any permit holder receiving a grant under paragraph (1) may use such funds only for the purpose of covering—

“(A) any fee originally associated with a permit authorizing participation in a large-

scale driftnet fishery, if such permit is surrendered for permanent revocation, and such permit holder relinquishes any claim associated with the permit;

“(B) a forfeiture of fishing gear associated with a permit described in subparagraph (A); or

“(C) the purchase of alternative gear with minimal incidental catch of living marine resources, if the fishery participant is authorized to continue fishing using such alternative gears.

“(3) CERTIFICATION.—The Secretary shall certify that, with respect to each participant in the program under this subsection, any permit authorizing participation in a large-scale driftnet fishery has been permanently revoked and that no new permits will be issued to authorize such fishing.”.

SEC. 5. EXCEPTION.

Section 307(1)(M) of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1857(1)(M)) is amended by inserting before the semicolon the following: “, unless such large-scale driftnet fishing—

“(i) deploys, within the exclusive economic zone, a net with a total length of less than two and one-half kilometers and a mesh size of 14 inches or greater; and

“(ii) is conducted within 5 years of the date of enactment of the Driftnet Modernization and Bycatch Reduction Act”.

SEC. 6. FEES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The North Pacific Fishery Management Council may recommend, and the Secretary of Commerce may approve, regulations necessary for the collection of fees from charter vessel operators who guide recreational anglers who harvest Pacific halibut in International Pacific Halibut Commission regulatory areas 2C and 3A as those terms are defined in part 300 of title 50, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulations).

(b) USE OF FEES.—Any fees collected under this section shall be available, without appropriation or fiscal year limitation, for the purposes of—

(1) financing administrative costs of the Recreational Quota Entity program;

(2) the purchase of halibut quota shares in International Pacific Halibut Commission regulatory areas 2C and 3A by the recreational quota entity authorized in part 679 of title 50, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulations);

(3) halibut conservation and research; and

(4) promotion of the halibut resource by the recreational quota entity authorized in part 679 of title 50, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulations).

Mr. KAINE. I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported amendment be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The committee-reported amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

Mr. KAINE. I know of no further debate on the bill, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

Hearing none, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (S. 906), as amended, was passed, as follows:

S. 906

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Driftnet Modernization and Bycatch Reduction Act”.

SEC. 2. DEFINITION.

Section 3(25) of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1802(25)) is amended by inserting “, or with a mesh size of 14 inches or greater,” after “more”.

SEC. 3. FINDINGS AND POLICY.

(a) FINDINGS.—Section 206(b) of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1826(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (6), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in paragraph (7), by striking the period and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(8) within the exclusive economic zone, large-scale driftnet fishing that deploys nets with large mesh sizes causes significant entanglement and mortality of living marine resources, including myriad protected species, despite limitations on the lengths of such nets.”.

(b) POLICY.—Section 206(c) of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1826(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in paragraph (3), by striking the period and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following—

“(4) prioritize the phase out of large-scale driftnet fishing in the exclusive economic zone and promote the development and adoption of alternative fishing methods and gear types that minimize the incidental catch of living marine resources.”.

SEC. 4. TRANSITION PROGRAM.

Section 206 of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1826) is amended by adding at the end the following—

“(i) FISHING GEAR TRANSITION PROGRAM.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—During the 5-year period beginning on the date of enactment of the Driftnet Modernization and Bycatch Reduction Act, the Secretary shall conduct a transition program to facilitate the phase-out of large-scale driftnet fishing and adoption of alternative fishing practices that minimize the incidental catch of living marine resources, and shall award grants to eligible permit holders who participate in the program.

“(2) PERMISSIBLE USES.—Any permit holder receiving a grant under paragraph (1) may use such funds only for the purpose of covering—

“(A) any fee originally associated with a permit authorizing participation in a large-scale driftnet fishery, if such permit is surrendered for permanent revocation, and such permit holder relinquishes any claim associated with the permit;

“(B) a forfeiture of fishing gear associated with a permit described in subparagraph (A); or

“(C) the purchase of alternative gear with minimal incidental catch of living marine resources, if the fishery participant is authorized to continue fishing using such alternative gears.

“(3) CERTIFICATION.—The Secretary shall certify that, with respect to each participant in the program under this subsection, any permit authorizing participation in a large-scale driftnet fishery has been permanently revoked and that no new permits will be issued to authorize such fishing.”.

SEC. 5. EXCEPTION.

Section 307(1)(M) of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1857(1)(M)) is amended by inserting before the semicolon the following: “, unless such large-scale driftnet fishing—

“(i) deploys, within the exclusive economic zone, a net with a total length of less than two and one-half kilometers and a mesh size of 14 inches or greater; and

“(ii) is conducted within 5 years of the date of enactment of the Driftnet Modernization and Bycatch Reduction Act”.

SEC. 6. FEES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The North Pacific Fishery Management Council may recommend, and the Secretary of Commerce may approve, regulations necessary for the collection of fees from charter vessel operators who guide recreational anglers who harvest Pacific halibut in International Pacific Halibut Commission regulatory areas 2C and 3A as those terms are defined in part 300 of title 50, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulations).

(b) USE OF FEES.—Any fees collected under this section shall be available, without appropriation or fiscal year limitation, for the purposes of—

(1) financing administrative costs of the Recreational Quota Entity program;

(2) the purchase of halibut quota shares in International Pacific Halibut Commission regulatory areas 2C and 3A by the recreational quota entity authorized in part 679 of title 50, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulations);

(3) halibut conservation and research; and

(4) promotion of the halibut resource by the recreational quota entity authorized in part 679 of title 50, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulations).

Mr. Kaine. I ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2021—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

S. 4049

Mr. Kaine. Mr. President, I rise tonight to speak about a provision of the National Defense Authorization Act that would direct the renaming of military bases and facilities that are currently named for those who voluntarily fought for the Confederacy during the Civil War.

I thank Senator Warren for offering the amendment, and I particularly thank her for making adjustments to the amendment to accommodate concerns of colleagues on both sides of the aisle. I was proud to cosponsor the revised amendment in committee and speak in favor of it today.

It is important to state clearly what this amendment will do. If it passes and survives a threatened Presidential veto, it will require the Department of Defense to initiate a 3-year process to change the name of any military base, barracks, or other facility named after a Confederate military leader. Why 3 years? The timing is designed to allow a full public process in each location so that the desires of the community leaders can be taken into account in choosing new names.

I state with clarity the substance of the amendment because one of my colleagues took the floor earlier this

month to oppose the amendment, and he obscured its purpose in describing it, only saying that it required that “some of the names of our Nation’s military bases must be removed.” He neglected to mention that the amendment specifically sought change only to facilities named for Confederates. In fact, he did not mention the Confederacy or the Civil War at all.

If you are unwilling to be plain about what is at stake, it portrays a weakness in your position. So let me be plain. I speak today because I am a Senator from the State with the most at stake in this discussion. Three of the ten bases whose names must be changed under this amendment are in Virginia. Virginia was the State whose people were most affected by the Civil War, and I served as its 70th Governor. My hometown of Richmond was the capital of the Confederacy, and I served as its 76th mayor. I have dealt with issues of Civil War names, statues, memorials, battlefields, and buildings throughout my 26 years in public life. Based on decades of grappling with this question, I want to describe a principle, explain an epiphany, and finally pose a question.

First, a principle: If you declare war on the United States, take up arms against it, and kill U.S. troops, you should not have a U.S. military base named after you.

If you declare war on the United States, take up arms against it, and kill U.S. troops, you should not have a U.S. military base named after you.

This principle is nowhere stated in law because it need not be. It is a basic commonsense principle. The principle explains why we have no Fort Cornwallis, Fort Benedict Arnold, Fort Santa Ana, Fort Von Hindenburg, Fort Tojo, Fort Ho Chi Minh.

If you declare war on the United States, take up arms against it, and kill U.S. troops, you should not have a U.S. military base named after you, but we make an exception. Ten bases and many other military facilities are named after Confederate leaders who declared war on the United States, took up arms against it, and killed U.S. troops. Even further, they took these actions to destroy the United States, to tear our country in half so that the seceding Southern States could continue to own those of African descent as slaves—a species of property—rather than treating them as equal human beings. Is this worthy of honor? Does it justify an exception to the sound principle that I describe?

Why were these 10 bases so named when they were constructed in the years before and during the First and Second World Wars? The names were not chosen due to the military skill of the Confederate leaders. Some are revered for their prowess, but some are reviled. The names were not chosen to honor the character of the 10 leaders. Some are respected—excepting the blight on character that support for slavery confers—but others were not

distinguished in their behavior or their integrity. The record makes clear that the 10 bases were named for Confederate leaders upon their construction during the First and Second World Wars because of a lingering belief in their cause—dividing the Nation to uphold slavery and White supremacy.

In the days of mandated segregation, a vibrant Ku Klux Klan, popular culture painting a false picture of the war and its aftermath with films like “The Birth of a Nation” and “Gone with the Wind,” there was a powerful desire to hold up the Confederate cause, to sanitize the Confederate cause and deny the reality of African-American suffering. That desire even affected this very body during those years, as the Senate repeatedly used the filibuster to block Federal anti-lynching legislation.

It is clear now, as it has been clear for a very long time, that the cause of the Confederacy was not just but monstrous. Destroying the Nation to preserve slavery would have been a catastrophe.

History can't be rewritten, and it is important to tell it, but choosing who to honor is another matter entirely. I repeat a principle that I believe brooks no exception: If you declare war on the United States, take up arms against it, and kill U.S. troops, you should not have a U.S. military base named after you.

This wisdom was understood immediately in the aftermath of the Civil War by Robert E. Lee. He was asked about memorials to the Confederacy and stated: “I think it wiser not to keep open the sores of war but to follow the examples of those nations who endeavored to obliterate the marks of civil strife, to commit to oblivion the feelings engendered.” This amendment is consistent with Lee's wise observation.

Second, let me explain an epiphany that I have had just in the last few months. When I moved to Virginia to get married in 1984, I saw the Confederate statues in Richmond, and I was puzzled. As a Kansas-raised civil rights lawyer and then later as a local elected official in a city that was majority African American, I was struck by their continued prominence. But together with the leadership of my diverse city, we viewed these statues and other symbols of the Confederacy as painful symbols of an incomplete past—painful because of the reality of slavery and discrimination, which have warped our Commonwealth and country since 1619, and incomplete as well. Where were the statues to Richmond heroes from the revolution or the civil rights movement? Why did our city highlight 4 years out of a 250-year history and downplay everything else?

My generation of Richmond leaders endeavored to solve this problem by painting a more complete picture—statues of Arthur Ashe, Abraham Lincoln, Maggie Walker, a civil rights memorial on our capitol grounds, new mu-

nicipal buildings, courts, schools, many named after prominent African Americans, women leaders. Aging bridges that had been named for Confederate generals were eventually replaced and named for civil rights heroes.

In short, we viewed this problem as one that could be solved with a path of addition—not replacing the painful symbols of the past but instead adding to our built environment the recognition of people and eras that had not previously been honored. This was necessary and important work. I was proud to play my part in it during my 16 years in local and State service.

But in recent months, as I spent our extended April quarantine in Richmond and I talked to people about whether Confederate statues on our Monument Avenue should be removed, I learned something. When I refer to these statues as symbols of a painful past, again and again, I was told: Tim, you might see these statues as signifying a painful past, but we see them as signs of a painful present and even predictors of a difficult future.

This sort of stopped me in my tracks. I asked my friends to explain. Here is a composite of what they told me: If honoring these Confederates were just about the past, that would be one thing. But these statues are honored in the present by a city and State that maintain them, spotlight them, emphasize their beauty, and market their appeal to tourists. In the present, these statues become a rallying point for neo-Confederates and others who would take us back, just as occurred in Charlottesville in 2017.

The present is pretty frightening. African Americans are dying of COVID at disproportionate rates. The job losses in this economic collapse are falling so hard on African-American communities. We see scenes of police violence against African Americans playing endlessly on our televisions, and we don't see an immediate end to these disparities.

Do you really expect us to believe that a society that continues to honor those who tried to destroy our country to save slavery will be serious about ending the racial disparities that exist today? You either support the equality of all or you don't. If you honor those who opposed our equality—indeed, opposed the very notion of our humanity—what hope can we have about overcoming the real-time injustices that are manifest all around us?

I thank God I can still learn some new things at age 62. In my view, the statues and base names and the other Confederate honorifics that dot the American landscape have been about the past. But I now see that, for so many, they raise deep and troubling questions about the present and the future. Are we committed to the equality of all—the moral North Star announced by Jefferson in the Declaration of Independence and reconfirmed by Lincoln at Gettysburg? If we continue to honor men who fought to de-

prive those of African descent of their equality, we signal that we are not committed to our most fundamental American value.

Finally, there are questions for those, including the President, who attack those who want to remove Confederate names from military bases or take down Confederate statues.

When you saw young Germans in 1989 spray graffiti on the Berlin Wall and knock it down, how did you feel? I know how you felt. You felt good to see people standing up to leaders and saying: You will no longer divide us.

When you saw people throughout the Soviet bloc pulling down statues of Stalin and Lenin after the collapse of the Soviet Union or Iraqis pulling down statues of Saddam Hussein, how did you feel? I know how you felt. You felt good to see people standing and saying with their actions: We will no longer glorify tyrants who oppressed us.

When you see hundreds of thousands of Hongkongers in the streets protesting against the Chinese Government, how do you feel? I know how you feel because I heard you, even in this Chamber. You feel good seeing everyday people standing up against a government that would deprive them of their basic freedom.

Well, if you feel that way—and I believe virtually all Americans do—how can we feel otherwise about patriotic Americans who believe in a nation committed to the equality of all when they stand up and say: We will not be divided. We will not glorify those who oppressed us. We will not honor those who stood against our freedom. That is what our people, especially our young people, are saying to us now. Supporting this amendment will show them that we are listening.

In conclusion, we Americans have grown as a nation and as a people since the Civil War. And we have grown as a nation and as a people since the first half of the 20th century when, in very different circumstances, it was still seen as a good idea to honor the Confederacy.

One of the key areas of our growth—admittedly a progress of fits and starts—has been a greater acceptance of others, regardless of race or religion or sexual orientation or gender or nationality or physical ability. Thank God for that growth. Of course, the evidence all around shows that we still have a long way to go to reach full equality. It might be like the North Star. We can steer by it, but it is not in the capacity of mortal mankind to reach it.

But when we do steer by it and step in its direction, we become better. That is what this amendment will accomplish, and it is why I so strongly support it.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

PRESCRIPTION DRUG COSTS

Ms. ERNST. Mr. President, Americans are facing extremely challenging

times, and, right now, folks are working hard just to make ends meet to put food on their table and to care for their families and their loved ones.

As our communities continue to grapple with the devastating impacts of the coronavirus pandemic, the crisis of rising drug costs in the United States has only worsened. Now, more than ever, folks are operating on very thin margins and simply don't have room in their budgets for expensive prescriptions.

No individual should have to make the decision between filling a life-saving prescription and feeding their family. The skyrocketing costs of prescription drugs have become a matter of life and death for so many. We have heard the heartbreaking stories of individuals who could not afford their insulin, who were forced to ration and skip doses, and, as a result, they lost their lives.

I remember quite vividly a conversation I had with an Iowa mother explaining how she lost her son who, as a young man, was rationing his insulin because he could not afford to do more. It was a heartbreaking discussion, and having that discussion with that mother, I could not help but think then of my own brother and sister who have been reliant on insulin as juvenile diabetics for nearly all of their lives. When we talk about the cost of prescription drugs, lives are literally on the line.

Iowans have been very clear with me where they stand on this issue. They want to see us come together to advance solutions that drive down those drug prices. Seniors, families, and children all need to be assured that when they go to the pharmacy, they will be able to afford their medications and not have to skip a meal—or more—to do so.

This is why I was proud to join my friend and my colleague, Senator GRASSLEY, in introducing a piece of legislation that I know he has worked tirelessly on—the Prescription Drug Pricing Reduction Act of 2020. This vital piece of legislation would root out unfair pricing shenanigans and perverse payment incentives that allow pharmaceutical companies to take advantage of the system at the expense of taxpayers and patients.

According to the Congressional Budget Office, this bill would save taxpayers \$95 billion with a “b,” reduce out-of-pocket expenses by \$72 billion with a “b,” and reduce premiums by \$1 billion with a “b.”

It needs to be said that Chairman GRASSLEY worked for months on end to craft this bill in a bipartisan manner with his Democratic counterparts. In fact, two-thirds of the Senate Finance Committee approved our bipartisan Prescription Drug Pricing Reduction Act a year ago this very month—two-thirds of the Senate Finance Committee. Yet, at a time when Americans are struggling to afford rent and groceries, my colleagues across the aisle

suddenly chose to drop their support for this bipartisan drug pricing reform bill that they helped write.

Let me make that clear. The Democrats helped write the bill with Senator GRASSLEY. Those who sat on the Finance Committee approved this bill last year.

This year, they are refusing to assist my senior Senator, CHUCK GRASSLEY, in moving forward a bill they helped write. That begs the question: What changed over the course of one year? Do you know what, folks? That is exactly what happened. It was the year: 2020 is an election year, and that means Washington is not focused on solutions; it is all about the political scoreboard.

We have seen it already this year with our friends across the aisle blocking us from even debating the JUSTICE Act, the police reform bill that contained about 70 percent of what our Democratic colleagues were asking for in police reform.

Iowans put their partisanship aside and came together and got a police reform package passed; that is, Iowans in our State legislature. I wish we could say the same for Washington, not only on the JUSTICE Act but also this prescription drug pricing bill. Lowering prescription drug costs shouldn't be about who gets the credit. It should be about working across the aisle to save lives, which is the very reason that Senator GRASSLEY worked hand in hand with Democrats on this bill.

Iowans should expect more from Washington. They want more, and they should get it.

Chairman GRASSLEY, President Trump, and I will not back down from this fight. We will press on and do everything in our power to provide relief to Americans who desperately need it. I will continue to call on my Democratic colleagues to come to the table to work on improving our Nation's healthcare system and drive down the costs for Americans. Whether it is lowering drug costs, expanding childcare options for families, ensuring protections for individuals with preexisting conditions, like my sister and my brother, or simply making sure that children have access to clean diapers—simple things. These are all issues that Americans want to see Congress take action on.

Just recently, I joined with my colleague Senator BRAUN of Indiana in introducing a bill that helps address yet another critical issue for Americans—increasing transparency and lowering healthcare costs.

Our Healthcare PRICE Transparency Act would implement the administration's rules requiring hospitals and insurers to reveal their low, discounted prices and negotiated rates to patients before they receive medical care. Iowans should be able to know the costs associated with their healthcare in advance so they can make the best decisions for themselves and for their families.

Folks, let's not forget that, outside the Halls of Congress, Americans are

facing hard times. They are mourning the loss of loved ones who have been taken by this virus. They are worried about how they will take care of their children at home while they work to provide. They are concerned for their health and the well-being of their loved ones. Many of them are considering skipping a dose of their medication or cutting a pill in half to try to make those prescriptions stretch just a little bit further until their next paychecks.

Let's put aside political interests. Let's work together on this. I will be standing at the ready, and it is my sincere hope that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will join me in this effort.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE GREAT AMERICAN OUTDOORS ACT

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, 6 weeks ago, I stood here as the Senate prepared to begin deliberating historic conservation legislation—the Great American Outdoors Act. I introduced this legislation with Senator MANCHIN, of West Virginia, along with so many other bipartisan champions for the outdoors and our public lands. Senators DAINES, PORTMAN, WARNER, ALEXANDER, KING, CANTWELL, BURR, and HEINRICH are just a few of the champions who helped to shepherd this historic legislation through this Chamber. I remarked on that day that it was not often the Senate had a chance to make history, but, indeed, history we made.

The Senate came together in an overwhelmingly bipartisan fashion and passed the Great American Outdoors Act 73 to 25, and just moments ago, the U.S. House of Representatives joined us in making history by passing the Great American Outdoors Act with a vote of 310 to 107.

This legislation is headed today to the desk of the President of the United States for his signature. The President has already supported the bill, noting the nature of this historic bill and the huge conservation victory that it is.

In the weeks since Senate passage, I have traveled all over the great State of Colorado and have visited with land management officials, professionals, stakeholders, and constituents to discuss what the Great American Outdoors Act will really mean on the ground on a personal, local level for Colorado and Colorado's public lands. I would like to share some of those stories with you today.

Here we have a picture of an amphitheater that is outside of the Black Canyon of the Gunnison National Park. If you would just go a little bit further to the right, you would actually be in the canyon.

This is an amphitheater that was built, basically, in the 1960s. The park itself is now about 20 years old. It had over 430,000 people visit it last year. It has a deferred maintenance backlog of \$7.7 million, and this South Rim Amphitheater facility is part of that backlog. It is currently being used, but it needs significant upgrades. If you actually sat on one of those benches, you probably wouldn't be able to sit anywhere else for quite a long time because of the splinters and the gouges that you would receive from the shards of wood that are on those benches, and there are electrical outlets that are popping up from an old projection system.

This is supposed to be used for education and educational opportunities. With the right improvements, they will be able to restore this and get it back to its original purpose. New park benches and electrical work are among just a bit of this amphitheater's needs—a \$200,000 deferred maintenance project alone, this site for education for experiential learning. Within the rest of the park, there are millions more in maintenance projects like this one that need to be performed and carried out.

Our lands are busy. People are loving them. This is one example, and it is one example of a project that will be completed thanks to the Great American Outdoors Act. Yet it is not just national parks that have maintenance needs.

Secretary of Agriculture Sonny Perdue joined me in Colorado in mid-June, and we toured the Mizpah Campground, which is in the Arapahoe and Roosevelt National Forests, that has been closed for a decade. This is a beautiful river, and the campground is back here. There is only one problem: There is no bridge. This river wiped out the culvert and the bridge a decade ago. This is a campground without access because, 10 years ago—a decade ago—a flood came through—high water came through—and wiped out the access. You can't even use this public facility because of a decades-long maintenance backlog at this facility alone.

The Great American Outdoors Act will provide line-of-sight funding for projects like these, which will no longer have to compete for a small pool of funding with every other national forest in the country.

When I talk to these professionals—when I talk to the forest rangers and the park superintendents—they talk about how they are able to accomplish building structures in their parks, how they are able to build campgrounds in their parks, and how they are able to keep up with restroom facilities, but they have had no line-of-sight funding for additional help down the road. This means that, as the facilities age, they may just have to be closed or, in this case, as access gets wiped out, you will just never regain that access. What a loss to the American people that is, but what a benefit to the American people

the Great American Outdoors Act will become.

It is not just the national parks or the national forests or the Bureau of Land Management that will benefit from the Great American Outdoors Act. This is a picture of the Runyon Sports Complex in Pueblo, CO. This area has a number of ballparks from little leagues to adult leagues. In fact, they just had their first pitch of the season last week—a day that I was actually at the Runyon Sports Complex in Pueblo, CO, to kick off a tournament to celebrate the beginning of a season that had been much delayed thanks to COVID-19.

This area saw people like Pee Wee Reese play baseball and Babe Ruth visit this same area to play baseball. Now Coloradans of every generation are able to go to the Runyon Sports Complex and enjoy it. It has become a regional draw to help benefit the city economically and to teach kids about sports and teamwork. That is what this means.

The Land and Water Conservation Fund, yes, helps forests and parks, but 40 percent of the Land and Water Conservation Fund's funding is dedicated to projects at the State and local levels. If you grew up on the Front Range of Colorado and played baseball, the odds are good that you will have spent some time on the field at Runyon or at any other number of places that have been funded by a Land and Water Conservation Fund project. Runyon has received over \$100,000 in LWCF funding over the years, and the complex continues to be a vital part of the community today.

The LWCF is not just about our public lands; it is about your local ballpark, about your local swimming pool, about playground facilities, and urban parks that otherwise wouldn't give minority communities access to recreation. That is what it is about.

Just up the road from Runyon Field, in El Paso County, CO, and the communities within them, they have benefited greatly from the LWCF. We visited a project in El Paso County that received hundreds of thousands of dollars. It is a county that has received \$5 million in funding over the years and has provided benefits for everything from building parks to tennis courts and trails. The State has received over \$2 million in funding to improve the Cheyenne Mountain State Park facilities within El Paso County, CO.

Local, regional, and State outdoor recreation projects will only further benefit when the Great American Outdoors Act is signed into law. With the Great American Outdoors Act, Congress is finally fulfilling its commitment to fully and permanently fund the LWCF, which will benefit every State in the Nation.

The passage of this historic legislation could not come at a more critical time. Our economy has suffered during the coronavirus pandemic, and stay-at-home orders have kept Americans

cooped up indoors for the last several months. Millions of people and families are facing uncertain futures. Will school return in the fall? Will my business survive this challenging time? Will I receive my next paycheck?

When the first waves of the virus hit and shutdown orders went into place, some of Colorado's mountain towns and rural areas were the hardest and first hit. Community restaurants closed; hotels emptied; and their stores' doors were closed to visitors. These are challenging times, no doubt, but one glimmer of hope will always be our public lands and the great outdoors.

This Nation does not have Republican or Democratic public lands. This is not a partisan issue. Preserving and taking care of our public lands provides a benefit to the entire country, and it will provide a benefit for generations to come.

Yet, not only is this legislation about preserving and protecting our lands, it is also about job creation and economic recovery—more hope for the people of this country. Passing the Great American Outdoors Act will create over 100,000 jobs by addressing the park maintenance backlog alone. In my home State of Colorado, it will create thousands of jobs across the State as the mission of the Great American Outdoors Act is fulfilled. There will be more jobs created as the work begins to address maintenance projects on other Federal lands. The Forest Service, the Bureau of Land Management, our National Wildlife Refuges, and the Bureau of Indian Education's schools all have needs that will be addressed by this legislation. These will be important opportunities to create jobs when the projects are finally and fully funded.

I mentioned this statistic quite a bit during the consideration of the Great American Outdoors Act here in the Senate. For every \$1 million we spend on the Land and Water Conservation Fund, it supports between 16 and 30 jobs. That is a figure above and beyond the 100,000 jobs that we created by the parks' provisions of the legislation alone. This is a bill that will put people to work. It is a bill that will put people to work by building playgrounds, fixing trails, cleaning up ballparks, and protecting our iconic landscapes for generations to come.

This is a bill that reminds us that our communities and our shared, public outdoor spaces are worth investing in. It is a bill that reminds people that we have hope for America. It is a bill that reminds people that your public lands are waiting for you and that Congress was able to come together, during these trying times, in a bipartisan fashion that was so strong and so great that you will be able to enjoy the great American outdoors the way they were meant to be enjoyed.

I am pleased that the House of Representatives affirmed all of this by passing the Great American Outdoors

Act today with such a strong, bipartisan vote. I thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle and in both Chambers for their hard work and dedication to passing this historic conservation legislation.

I look forward to the President's signing this bill in the days ahead. I look forward to getting out into the great outdoors, and I look forward to these lands as they continue to inspire the hopes and dreams of kids and adults alike for generations to come.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, before the Senator from Colorado leaves the floor, I offer to him my congratulations for his inspired leadership of the Great American Outdoors Act.

This is something that good people on both sides of the aisle have worked on, literally, for as much as a half a century. Now, people are used to politicians who exaggerate, but that is no exaggeration, because I have been around long enough to know and to understand that—first, with the Land and Water Conservation Fund, which was first enacted by Congress in 1964. I was the chairman of President Reagan's Commission on American Outdoors and reiterated support for that in 1986. Senator GARDNER, Senator DAINES, Senator PORTMAN, Senator WARNER, Senator HEINRICH, Senator MANCHIN, Senator CANTWELL, and a whole parade of Senators on both sides of the aisle have worked very hard to make this happen.

And it would not have happened without President Trump's leadership, either. We would not have been able to spend the money the way that it is spent—energy exploration money for conservation purposes—unless the President's Office of Management and Budget had approved that.

So it is usually never true that an important piece of legislation is passed by a single Senator. It is usually a parade of Senators. But Senator GARDNER has been leading the parade, and I congratulate him for that and salute him on behalf of all of us who want to see our national parks—the 419 different places we have, from the Great Smokies to the Rocky Mountains, to Yellowstone, to Pearl Harbor, to the National Mall—protected, as well as our national forests, our national wildlife refuges, as well as the permanent funding for the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

So I wanted to have an opportunity to say that before he left the floor.

And I see my friend Senator PORTMAN from Ohio here, who really, along with Senator WARNER of Virginia, began the work on the other part of the bill—the bill that would take money from energy exploration and reduce the national park backlog by half over 5 years. That had the support, combined with the Land and Water Conservation Fund, of more than 800 different outdoor recreation, conservation, and en-

vironmental groups, as well as the President.

People will say: Well, that was easy to do with all that support.

It wasn't easy to do. If it had been easy to do, it would have happened 20 or 30 years ago. So it took support from the Senator from North Dakota and leadership from the Senator from Ohio and Senator WARNER from Virginia, especially.

I came to the floor also to talk about something else, but I see the Senator from Ohio so I think I will yield the floor and then speak on the other subject after he has a chance to speak, if he would like to.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Tennessee for focusing on the American Great Outdoors Act. I had come to the floor to talk about the COVID-19 legislation we are considering, but I am very pleased to be here with my colleagues who helped to get this legislation across the finish line. It is incredibly important and truly historic for our national parks.

I have spent more than a dozen years on this. It is kind of embarrassing because I wasn't very successful for the first 11, but from my days as the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, I have been focused on what really is a tragic situation—about a \$12 billion now maintenance backlog in our national parks, far more than the parks could ever afford to take care of based on our annual budgets that we provide them from this place and yet something that had to be done.

So it is not very exciting for some people to think about, gosh, fixing a visitor's center or making sure a trail isn't eroding into a river, making sure that our roads and bridges in our national parks are kept up to speed, so that when you go to a national park you can actually use the restroom facilities and the lodges. But we have had a huge problem with finding funding for that, and in this legislation, as was noted by my colleague from Tennessee, who has been at this for many years, as well, we are finally doing something to help our parks that is badly needed.

The priority projects—\$6.5 billion worth—will now be handled by legislation that passed the House today by a 310-to-107 vote and passed the Senate a few weeks ago. The President has agreed to sign it, and it will keep our promise, and it is a debt unpaid to our parks. Without it, future generations wouldn't have the opportunity to visit and enjoy these incredible treasures.

I spent the last few weeks at a couple of our national parks—one, the Charles Young home in Ohio, which is a beautiful historic home that is actually a station on the Underground Railroad and, therefore, has particular and very important historic significance for our State. Charles Young was the first Black colonel in the U.S. Army, the first Black superintendent of a national park, and his home needs to be preserved for future generations. And

yet the maintenance backlog is huge there, as you can imagine, and without this legislation, they would not be able to make progress.

I got to see specifically what the money is going for, which is making sure that house still stands years from now so that people, particularly young people in our community, can understand the history of our country—the good and the bad, the cooperation and the seeking for freedom that came from the Underground Railroad and the incredible leadership that Charles Young showed as an early African-American pioneer, both in the military and in our national park system.

And then I was at the Cuyahoga Valley National Park, where I had the opportunity to see the 13th most visited park in America and a number of different needs that they have, adding up to about \$50 million. Their annual budget, by the way, is about \$11 million, and yet they have \$50 million worth of things that have to be fixed.

I saw trails literally falling into the river. I saw railroad tracks for the beautiful scenic railroad that runs through there where the tracks have to be replaced. I saw a bridge that is truly becoming dangerous and has to be fixed—an historic bridge. These are things that can't be done with their normal budget that funds the rangers and some programs. These are capital expenses, things that have to have a separate funding source, the way we budget around here, and we are doing that now.

So after many years of trying different efforts at this and finding some success over the years—the Centennial Act has helped a little bit and some other things to get private-public partnership money—we now have the ability to really say that the parks are going to be in good shape for our kids, our grandkids, and the future generations that can enjoy what LAMAR ALEXANDER has referred to—I think, paraphrasing Ken Burns—as America's best idea.

With that, I yield back. I would like some time in a moment to talk about the COVID-19 legislation, but I would like to yield now to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Ohio for his courtesy, as well as his leadership. I will not be long.

(The remarks of Mr. ALEXANDER pertaining to the introduction of S. 4284 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. ALEXANDER. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

CORONAVIRUS

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, the legislation that Senator ALEXANDER is talking about probably is something we ought to look at in connection with this legislation that we are likely to pass here in the Congress in the next week or so regarding the COVID-19 crisis that we face. I am here on the floor

today to talk about that—to talk about what the next steps ought to be and how we should be responding as Congress to this unprecedented challenge we have of the pandemic.

We are now about 5 months into it, and for much of April and certainly in the month of May we were seeing pretty good progress on the coronavirus pandemic. The situation was improving, and many of us thought we were turning the corner. Unfortunately, as we have moved into June and July, we are now trending in the wrong direction in much of the country. Over the past week, the number of hospitalizations, for instance, has risen in many of our States, and there is concern that the situation could worsen when the weather begins to cool.

Today, in Ohio, our Governor announced a statewide mask mandate, as an example. We have not had that yet. He did so because he is concerned about some of the numbers. Ohio is not in as bad a shape as some of the States, but we are not seeing the progress we hoped for.

The past few months have been a somewhat better story for the economy. After the initial shocks of the self-imposed economic shutdown this past spring, a couple months ago, we have seen a steady rebound taking place in most parts of the country. New unemployment claims, put out just last week, while still far too high compared to where we were before this pandemic, are the lowest we have seen since the crisis began. Recent retail sales numbers are about where they were a year ago when there was no pandemic. So we are seeing better improvement in the economy as compared to the disappointing progress we were making recently on the pandemic.

Thanks to unprecedented Federal action, such as the Paycheck Protection Program which has allowed small businesses to keep their doors open and to retain employees, thanks to some of the targeted tax relief to help our families and also our businesses, we have been able to prevent an even more serious economic collapse that in my view would have had a devastating impact on all of us. However, we are not out of the woods yet. There are still, roughly, 17 million Americans out of work. That is a lot of Americans who have been furloughed through no fault of their own because businesses are not operating. This corresponds to about an 11-percent unemployment rate, more than three times higher than it was just 5 months ago.

You will recall that in February we had historically low unemployment. Now we are up to 11 percent. Of course, there are parts of the economy that have not seen the progress that other parts have.

So there is a lot for us to consider now that Congress is back in session and now that we are in the middle of negotiating this new what they call the phase 5 coronavirus rescue package. The new legislation will have a signifi-

cant impact on how we address these dual healthcare and economic crises. That is why it is important, and more important than ever, that we figure out how to work together, Republicans and Democrats alike, and make some smart bipartisan policy decisions.

Unfortunately, that is not the way the House of Representatives has proceeded to date. The House Democrats chose to construct their own proposal. It is called the Heroes Act. Rather than working constructively across the aisle to try to find some common ground to help Americans deal with this healthcare and economic crisis, Democrats chose and made and released an 1,800-page, \$3.5 trillion package that included some provisions that have nothing to do with COVID-19.

How big is \$3.5 trillion? Well, that makes it the biggest piece of legislation ever passed by either the House or Senate in the history of our country. Never have we had legislation that expensive. Also, \$3.5 trillion is just a lot of money. The budget last year was \$4.5 trillion—the entire budget for the entire year for our country. This one bill is \$3.5 trillion. So it is not only the most costly legislation ever to pass, but, again, it is not just about COVID-19. In fact, one Democratic leader called it “a tremendous opportunity to fix things to fit our vision,” which is why it passed by a nearly party-line vote.

If true, by the way, that vision entails raising taxes on some small businesses; it includes giving out tax breaks, largely to benefit very wealthy individuals on both coasts; it has direct payouts to illegal immigrants; it has immigration reforms related to ICE and other things; it has unprecedented mandates on the States to require mail-in voting and telling States, by the way, that they are required to have certain kinds of ID. This has always been within the province of the States to run their own election systems. That is in this legislation.

At the same time, out of \$3.5 trillion and 1,800 pages, there is nothing in it to provide liability protection to our schools, hospitals, and small businesses; no funding for the Paycheck Protection Program; no assistance for Americans trying to get back to work. It is \$3.5 trillion in taxpayer money being appropriated on a party-line vote. I don't think that is what people are looking for. I think they want us to get together, as we have already with four previous COVID-19 legislative packages, and work together to try to get it done. We have to find that common ground.

We have to be sure we pass something that is bipartisan, that supports our healthcare system, our schools, our local governments, our employers, our families, and that we do it in as targeted a way as possible given the fact that we have already the largest deficit in the history of our country this year, and, of course, all this adding to our national debt.

We need to do it based on good data on what has been spent and what remains to be done. We need to keep in mind what is the most important policy proposals to include in this legislation and not make it a catchall.

First, and most importantly in my view, we need to increase funding for the healthcare response and the safety efforts. This is the underlying problem: Until we focus on this pandemic and what the virus is doing, we can spend all the money we want around here, and it is not going to make much of a difference. So we have to be sure that we are focused on the actual problem. I think that means getting our healthcare professionals the resources they need to effectively respond to this crisis. They need more funding. We need more funding for testing, contact tracing, PPE—the personal protective gear that, unfortunately, we still don't have the stockpiles here that we need. We need to be sure we are doing everything we can do to get this antiviral medication up and going. We have one, Remdesivir, that is showing positive results. We need to make sure that we are doing everything we can to get this vaccine as fast as possible because with a vaccine, as we have with the common flu, we will be making tremendous progress in pushing back against the virus. Stopping the spread of the virus has to be our top priority in this next bill, as it has been in some of the other legislation.

It is clear from the recent resurgence in cases that we are still not where we need to be in testing. I know there has been a lot of discussion recently about testing and whether it is needed or not. I will tell you it is critical because we need to know where the disease is and how it may be spreading. It also gives us much greater context in taking steps toward reopening in a safe way, whether it is our schools or whether it is our businesses, going to restaurants, going to bowling allies, movie theaters. Testing is very important.

Last week, I was in Columbus, OH, at the Columbus Health Department, where officials told me what a huge difference the CARES grant that they received has made in being able to expand testing. They are building a track to monitor and maintain the virus in Franklin County that is needed right now, and they are doing a great job. They are providing testing that is driveby testing. It is easy to access. If you don't have insurance to pay for it, it is covered through CARES funding that passed in the Congress. We are being sure that the funding is providing the best information available as we fight this invisible enemy. We have to continue to do that to prioritize bolstering the ability of our healthcare officials at home and to be able to coordinate the response—State level, local and national levels, and testing, obviously, is key to that.

In addition, as more parts of our country are putting in place safe plans to reopen our economy, we want to

make sure that the individuals who went on the COVID-19 unemployment lines in the early days of this pandemic have the opportunity and the incentive to reenter the workforce. We have to be sure our workplaces are safe.

This week, I introduced legislation called the healthy workplace tax credit, a credit on payroll taxes to ensure employers can afford additional safety measures, from the Plexiglas you have probably seen in some places, the shields to be able to protect people, to the PPE that is needed, the gowns in some cases, the masks, the gloves, hand sanitizer, to be able to afford that, and to be sure that there is testing in place so employees and consumers feel safe reentering the economy. This tax credit will support our efforts to make our workplaces healthy and safe and to build consumer confidence that all appropriate measures are being taken.

It doesn't really matter what we say as elected officials. It doesn't matter what our Governors are saying or local health officials. If people don't feel safe or feel comfortable, they are not going to reengage in the economy and step forward. I think this kind of a tax credit should be something that both sides of the aisle can strongly support, and we can ensure that we are doing everything we can to get people back to a more normal life.

As we tackle this healthcare challenge head-on, we also can't afford to step back on our efforts to combat the drug epidemic. Remember the opioid crisis that we were facing over the last couple of years. It has devastated communities all around our country, including my home State of Ohio. Unfortunately, we are seeing, during the coronavirus pandemic, the number of additions, overdoses, and overdose deaths is growing. This is very concerning, particularly because, thanks to a lot of efforts, including efforts in this body, to provide more treatment and recovery and prevention services, we were finally making progress in 2018. In my State of Ohio we had a 22-percent decrease in opioid overdose deaths. Every single year for the previous dozen years we had seen increases, and, finally, we were making progress. Now, unfortunately, we seem to be backtracking because of the COVID-19 crisis.

People are isolated, and people are feeling anxiety. People are not being able to access the treatment they used to be able to access. So in this legislation, we should also be sure that we make permanent the progress we have made recently with coronavirus in providing more telehealth treatment, making that more accessible. I have introduced legislation called the TREAT Act that would do just that so we don't lose ground on this other deadly disease.

We also need to look forward to the fall and ensure that we have funding to support the schools so they are able to safely reopen their doors to students.

Keeping our children out of the classroom for a protracted period of time has already had a negative impact on many of them with regard to educational advancement.

We have heard this from the experts, the American Pediatric Society, and the pediatricians back home—the doctors who are looking at this situation are saying it is very helpful in terms of getting kids back to school for education but also for their mental health and for their social skills.

On top of that, many parents, of course, have been forced to make impossible decisions. Do they go to work to earn a paycheck or do they stay home to take care of their child. So reopening the schools will have the effect of having childcare, which is very important. We need to act fast to ensure children don't lose more progress.

Our phase 5 legislation should provide funding to help our schools safely reopen, whether it is providing additional masks, gloves or other protective gear or other resources we have talked about, I think that money is well spent.

Second, we have to get the economy moving again. To do that, I believe we need to remove the disincentive currently in place; whereby, interestingly, we tried to help on unemployment insurance, but we provided a flat \$600 payment that has actually disincentivized a lot of people from going back to work. Why? Because most individuals are making more on unemployment insurance than at their previous job. A University of Chicago study says that 60 to 70 percent of those who are on unemployment insurance are making more on UI than they did when working.

As part of this negotiation, I believe Congress should and will extend the additional Federal unemployment insurance benefit in some form, but you shouldn't get paid more not to work. I think that is a principle that we all agree with, I hope, on both sides of the aisle. We should fix this disincentive to work by making the benefit a percentage of your previous income.

By the way, a July 13 Yahoo Finance-Harris Poll found that 62 percent of Americans believed these enhanced UI benefits served as a disincentive to work. They are right. It doesn't have to be that way. We can help people to ensure they get the support they need but not have them being paid more than they would if they were going to work.

Depending on how high the Federal payment is, by the way, we ought to also consider a return-to-work bonus for individuals that they receive on top of their paycheck—in other words, take part of the Federal benefit with them back to work. I have been promoting this since May. We haven't been able to pass it yet around here, but I think this would help people—help those workers who do want to go back to work to be able to make that tough decision without having a financial disincentive. It would help our small busi-

nesses and others who need the workforce badly, and it would help our economy begin to be able to reopen properly.

This idea, by the way, has broad support across the country. That same poll I talked about found that 69 percent of respondents support a return-to-work bonus.

There are various ways we can accomplish this goal, but I believe it would be helpful if it is paired with an extension of the unemployment insurance.

So this is something we have to focus on and come up with a bipartisan consensus—a compromise—to ensure that we are not paying people more not to work but ensure we are taking care of people who are furloughed through no fault of their own.

I also think we should be considering provisions to help incentivize the hiring from the employer side, so it is also providing more of an incentive to bring people on board. A way to do this that makes a lot of sense to me because it is building on legislation we have already passed is to expand and repurpose the work opportunity tax credit to add a category for COVID-19 furloughed individuals. Also, the employee retention tax credit from the CARES Act we passed just a short while ago can be improved to make it more encompassing and a better hiring credit. Helping to subsidize the marginal cost of a new hire will allow businesses to ramp up operations more quickly as the economy reopens, while also bringing more individuals off of the unemployment rolls and into the workforce.

I hope these are part of whatever legislative package we end up with. Again, these two should be bipartisan. The work opportunity tax credit has always been bipartisan. The retention tax credit was bipartisan in the CARES Act. These are things we can do, and they should get done.

We should be sure to stick with what has worked to this point in our coronavirus response. One of the biggest successes, of course, has been the PPP loan program. However, one flaw in the original law creating the PPP program was that it put in place barriers to loans for those owners who had unrelated felony records.

This was brought to my attention by a constituent of mine. His name is Troy Parker. He is a person who has done everything you would expect and you would want someone to do who comes off of a felony conviction—a mistake that he made. He was given a second chance, and he took it. He started a small business. It is a cleaning business, and he hires a lot of other second-chance individuals—returning citizens. He gives them a chance, an opportunity, and he has been successful. But during the coronavirus pandemic, he lost a lot of his business, as you can imagine, so he applied for a PPP loan. He was told he couldn't get one. Why? Because he has a felony record. He has a conviction for a financial crime, and it was within the last 5

years. It was several years ago, but it was in the last 5 years, so he couldn't get a PPP loan. Well, he is just the kind of individual we would want to help.

Thanks to Troy, we engaged on this issue when we learned about it. We worked with the Treasury Department. We got some immediate relief in terms of a rule, but we now have to put that into law to provide the relief that is needed to provide certainty and to codify it. The Paycheck Protection Program Second Chance Act does that. It is bipartisan. Senator CARDIN and I introduced this legislation. It has to be part of the next bill because it makes so much sense.

We also need a plan to adapt our economy for a future where many individuals may be living more of their lives at home and online. This is easier in some urban areas where you have access to broadband, but it can be a huge hurdle in some other areas, particularly rural parts of our country, including parts of Ohio.

Think about it. We rely much more on telehealth, much more on telelearning, and much more on teleworking. Yet, in many parts of the country, there is no access to the kind of Wi-Fi, the kind of broadband that you need to do so effectively.

Earlier this month, I introduced bipartisan and bicameral legislation to accelerate broadband access across the country to help our economy. Rural America deserves the same level of access to broadband, and including this legislation in this phase 5 package would help them get it faster.

Third, we need to solve the growing problem of State and local governments running out of funding the longer this crisis continues. This has affected some critical public safety services like EMS, firefighters, and police departments, leaving more Americans vulnerable at the worst possible time.

Ohio is particularly vulnerable because many of our local governments are so reliant on income taxes. In fact, the Brookings Institute has determined that four of the top five cities of America that will feel the largest fiscal impact are probably cities in Ohio.

Back in April, Senator BROWN and I urged the Treasury to provide more flexibility so local governments can use the CARES funding that has been provided for critical services like police and fire. While the administration—thanks to Secretary Mnuchin understanding and acting on this—did so administratively, it now has to be codified to be sure we have the needed certainty.

When I was home the last few weeks, I heard a lot about this from our county commissioners, our municipalities, and our mayors saying: We don't know if we can use these funds this way or that way. We have to be sure we have some certainty here. We don't want to have to repay this money.

So this codification will also be very important.

The flexibility, I hope, is something that both sides of the aisle can agree to. Why shouldn't we have more flexibility with regard to the CARES funding?

By the way, some of it hasn't been spent yet. As an example, in Ohio we still have \$850 million that is slated to go to the local communities, to our commissioners, and to our mayors for our cities that are under 500,000. Yet we don't have the flexibility and certainty we need there. That is important to pass as part of this legislation.

These are just a few policy proposals, I believe, that can make an immediate and lasting impact in our response to the challenges we face with this coronavirus pandemic. I am sure that in the coming days, we will be discussing the next steps forward in-depth because I believe we all recognize how important it is to get this right and to move quickly on it.

Unemployment, by the way, expires—that \$600—on July 31, at the end of next week. That is a deadline we can't let pass.

We are facing a momentous test of our ability to come together once again to address a disease that has changed almost every aspect of our lives, seemingly overnight. It is our responsibility to do that. Now is the time to put aside partisanship, get away from our partisan corners, and work together on some of these constructive solutions.

I look forward to working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle—my colleague from Washington State, my colleagues from North Dakota, and my colleagues who I know share my concern that we can't allow this opportunity to pass. We have to once again come together.

As we said tonight, there are many of these things that are bipartisan, where there can be a lot of consensus. We have to move forward to support our healthcare system, our schools, our employers, and our families as we work to overcome this crisis.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

THE GREAT AMERICAN OUTDOORS ACT

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I come to the floor to talk about the NDAA, but before I do, I want to join my colleagues and share their great enthusiasm tonight out here on the Senate floor in talking about the Senate-crafted bill, the Great American Outdoors Act, that took a step closer to getting to the President's desk today. That is the investment that we believe we should be making in open space and public lands passed the House of Representatives and we hope will be signed by the President very shortly.

This investment, as my colleagues were talking about tonight, has been a long time in coming on two fronts—obviously, coming from a State that represents a lot of National Parks and areas that need the investment in deferred maintenance projects—every-

thing from Olympic National Park that will get an upgrade for some aging water systems to new trails at Mt. Rainier, to other projects at Lake Roosevelt and even Fort Vancouver.

I want to thank all my colleagues, Senators GARDNER, MANCHIN, PORTMAN, KING, BURR, WARNER, ALEXANDER, DAINES, and HEINRICH, who made up the coalition who have been working on this issue in the more recent days to make sure that we got it out of the Senate and got it over to the House of Representatives. The important thing is that it has been a bipartisan coalition of people who believe in public lands and open space that has brought us to this point.

The Land and Water Conservation Fund was something that Scoop Jackson led the charge on in the 1960s, based on the fact that he thought America was urbanizing and, with our highway system, he thought we would need open space and, boy, was he right. So everything from Gas Works Park in downtown Seattle that gives families a great view of Lake Union to the impressive things that have been done all over the State, being able to say now that the Land and Water Conservation Fund will receive \$900 million permanently means two to three times more money than we previously had to make investments in open space.

And we know that investments in open space are not only restorative to all of us who enjoy the outdoors, whether it is hunting or fishing or hiking, but it also is a big juggernaut for our economy. That over \$800 billion in revenue is generated from this industry, and it is an industry that is well worth putting more investment in.

So I thank all my colleagues that were here tonight and for their hard work. Particularly, I want to thank Senator MANCHIN. Senator MANCHIN has done an incredible job taking this issue as the ranking member of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee and understanding how important it was to get it over the goal line.

So I tell the Senator that I am going to give him a picture of myself hiking in the Dolly Sods in West Virginia as a great thank you for his perseverance of moving this effort to the final goal line. So I just want to thank Senator MANCHIN and, obviously, all my colleagues.

S. 4049

But, Mr. President, I wanted to come as we were wrapping up the final debate on the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2021 to talk to my colleagues about this bill as it moves to conference.

I want to make sure we continue to pay particular attention to one provision, and that is that the NDAA bill, as reported out of the Armed Services Committee, I believe included some egregious provisions that would effectively wrestle away civilian control of spending on our nuclear arsenal and give it to the military, a provision that would allow the Department of Defense

to raid dollars out of the Department of Energy that are literally there specifically for us to meet our nuclear cleanup obligations and also to fund R&D at our national laboratories, places like the National Renewable Energy Laboratory in Colorado or other facilities in my State, like the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory.

Specifically, the committee-reported bill would have stripped the Energy Secretary's power over his own budget and would have allowed subcabinet officials on the Nuclear Weapons Council to approve the budget for the National Nuclear Security Administration.

So I know the Presiding Officer knows this well. But it would have allowed the Pentagon to prioritize making nuclear weapons over the critical missions of the U.S. Department of Energy. And I believe it also would have reduced civilian control over spending on our country's nuclear weapons complex.

I am so glad that Energy Secretary Brouillette wrote to Senator INHOFE and talked about this and said: "These provisions eliminate a President's Cabinet Secretary from managing some of the most sensitive national security programs in the Department, most notably, assuring the viability of the Nation's nuclear deterrent."

I do want to thank Senators INHOFE and REED for hearing the concerns expressed by many Senators on both sides of the aisle and for hearing the concerns of the Secretary of Energy and accepting the Manchin-Cantwell amendment that stripped these troubling provisions out of the bill because I believe it was a radical change that did not have enough debate.

But I certainly appreciate the Presiding Officer's interest and determination as well. In particular, I want to thank Senator ALEXANDER and Senators HEINRICH, CASSIDY, WYDEN, BARRASSO, HIRONO, RISCH, and SANDERS who jointly sent a letter to the Senate leadership expressing opposition to these provisions.

In a letter that stated, if these provisions would have remained in the bill, they would have "impeded accountability and Congressional oversight, as well as imperil future funding for other critical DOE responsibilities such as promoting scientific and technological innovation, managing our National Laboratories, sponsoring basic research in the physical sciences, and ensuring cleanup of the nation's nuclear weapons complex."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that that letter, the Cantwell-Alexander letter, be printed into the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JULY 1, 2020.

DEAR MAJORITY LEADER MCCONNELL, MINORITY LEADER SCHUMER, CHAIRMAN INHOFE, AND RANKING MEMBER REED: As the Senate considers the Fiscal Year 2021 National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA), we write to

express our opposition to the inclusion of controversial and far reaching provisions that would fundamentally alter the Department of Energy's (DOE) responsibilities for the nuclear weapons budget.

As members of the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, we write in support of Secretary Brouillette's June 29, 2020 letter to Chairman Inhofe and share his concerns that provisions in the Senate NDAA bill undermine DOE's ability to meet its mission goals and responsibility for maintaining the viability of the nation's nuclear deterrent.

As currently written, the Senate NDAA bill would strip the Secretary of Energy of the ability to manage some of the most sensitive national security programs that account for almost half of the Department's budget. Such changes could impede accountability and Congressional oversight, as well as imperil future funding for other critical DOE responsibilities such as promoting scientific and technological innovation, managing our National Laboratories, sponsoring basic research in the physical sciences, and ensuring cleanup of the nation's nuclear weapons complex.

Sweeping changes impacting civilian control of our nation's nuclear weapons programs should only be made in consultation and coordination with the committee of jurisdiction in an open and transparent manner. The changes included in the Senate NDAA bill have been met with opposition from the Trump Administration, former Secretaries of Energy, recent NNSA Administrators, and the Congressional Advisory Panel on the Governance of the Nuclear Security Enterprise.

We therefore request that the provisions be removed from the pending bill or that the Senate be allowed to vote on the relevant amendments filed by Ranking Member Manchin.

Sincerely,

Senator Maria Cantwell, Senator Lamar Alexander, Senator Martin Heinrich, Senator Bill Cassidy, Senator Ron Wyden, Senator John Barrasso, Senator Mazie Hirono, Senator Jim Risch, Senator Bernie Sanders.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I respectfully ask that the members of this year's NDAA conference committee—I am assuming there will be one—that they consider all these issues as they go to conference.

This is not just a bureaucratic budget dispute or some interagency accounting measure. This is, I believe, a very important issue, as it relates to civilian oversight of our nuclear weapons complex and, as written in the original bill, would have required the Nuclear Weapons Council to set the priorities for the NNSA budget and would have required the Department of Energy to get the Nuclear Weapons Council's approval before it could submit its Energy budget to OMB.

So, yes, there was a big takeover of the Department of Energy budget snuck into the NDAA. Well, let's just say some of us knew about it; some of us didn't know about it. But we objected, and now, we have taken this language out.

But I am sure this will continue, and I think it still continues. I think people who have a desire to have a larger National Nuclear Security Administration budget definitely are going to continue this effort. But people should

know that the National Nuclear Security Administration makes up about 45 percent of the Department of Energy's budget.

So, in other words, the Secretary of Energy would have lost control over almost half of his budget. And it would also mean that the Nuclear Weapons Council, which is comprised of five DOD subcabinet officials and one representative of the Department of Energy, that they would have effectively been dictating to members of the President's Cabinet what the budget should look like. So imagine that the Secretary of Energy has to come before Congress, and he says, 45 percent of my budget has already been determined by somebody else, and you really can't go talk to them.

This isn't just an issue of transparency. This is also an issue about the Department of Energy's obligations to clean up, specifically in Washington at Hanford. So I want to make sure people understand that nuclear waste cleanup is a Federal obligation. It is an obligation that we have as a nation, not just in Washington, but other States, and unfortunately, we haven't met all the milestones for nuclear waste cleanup. In fact, Idaho experienced this between 2012 and 2018 when DOE failed to meet cleanup milestones at the Idaho National Laboratory.

Taking away DOE's ability to control its own budget would make it harder to meet milestones, and now, some want more of their budget taken away by the NNSA. How are they going to meet these milestones? This is probably nowhere more important than in the State of Washington. And so the Department of Energy is legally obligated to meet these cleanup obligations at the Hanford site and to meet the obligations of what is called the Tri-Party Agreement, which is a legal contract with the State of Washington.

It is the duty of our Nation to clean up what was a national effort in World War II and the Cold War.

So I hope our colleagues won't forget history here, won't forget the obligation to clean up those nuclear waste sites, and certainly won't forget this effort we had here on the Senate floor. Last year, the Department of Energy completed a Lifecycle Scope, Schedule, and Cost Report for the completion of the Hanford cleanup site. It found remaining cleanup costs to be \$323 billion at a best-case scenario and \$677 billion at a worst-case scenario.

So that makes cleaning up legacy military nuclear waste sites in central Washington the second largest long-term obligation the Federal Government has after Social Security and Medicare. So it is no wonder people come and try to raid it.

Trust me, I could be going on all night over all the efforts that have been going on for decades, where people try to come up with a new way of either taking that money out of the budget or saying that they are going to find a quicker way to do cleanup. I am

all for speed, but I am also for meeting the obligations. But there is no magic here. It is a responsibility, and it is science, and it is an investment, and it belongs to the whole Nation. And we certainly don't deserve to have people coming to the Senate floor with a bill trying to take away 45 percent of the administration's budget and then say we don't have to meet that cleanup obligation because we are investing in nuclear weapons instead.

So, believe me, as this bill moves off the Senate floor, I am going to be watching the conference. I am not just going to watch this issue now or in conference. I am going to be keeping watch on this issue in a constant fashion, just like I always have on Hanford cleanup dollars. But I resent that people believe that Congress would fall for such a tactic to believe that the efforts of nuclear weapons development should be controlled by a small subcabinet council and that they shouldn't report to the Secretary of Energy on that budget, but make up their own budget and demand that it be met at the Presidential level.

Now, I just hope we don't reach this same dilemma again. I hope we have learned from it. I hope that people understand that these priorities of cleanup of our nuclear waste sites and what these parts of the country did for us in meeting our obligations in World War II and the Cold War.

We laud those efforts from a scientific perspective. We laud those efforts from the manpower that it took. We should now laud a budget that keeps the focus on cleanup and gets the job done and not lose track or sight because, from time to time, somebody else wants to make a larger investment in nuclear weapons.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—AMENDMENT
NO. 2457

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I rise tonight to ask: What does democracy look like in America? I have here a picture of what democracy looks like—people showing up presenting their opinions with their feet and their voices and their signs saying: We want change. And the change they want is to pursue the important value that public safety in America be a value that is applied equally to all citizens; that every single person in the community is viewed as a client for the public safety team; that the distribution of protection is equal and the treatment of citizens is equal, so that when public safety officers respond, they respond equally no matter what section of the city the call comes from; that they respond

the same no matter the color of a person's skin; that profiling is a thing of the past; that viewing two young Black men on the street is not viewed differently than viewing two young White men on the street. It is that goal of having everyone treated fairly that has led so many to come out and say: We need major reform in our country. We need to set behind us the time period when departments of public safety tend to look at the White community and say, "Those are our clients," and look at the Black community or the dark-skinned community and say, "Those are the threats." That is what people are trying to change by turning out in America in this fashion.

It is an important moment in which we need substantive change, real change—real change like the bill CORY BOOKER put together and led the battle on, and KAMALA HARRIS put together with him in partnership and led the battle on. That is the type of change we need in America. That is why people have been turning out in the streets.

But there is an unexpected twist on something we didn't anticipate, in which the President of the United States hasn't listened to this message about coming together so that everyone is treated equally. Instead, he is doubling down on a strategy of racism, a strategy of bigotry, a strategy of creating conflict in America with a determined new effort.

This is a picture of protesting in Oregon. I was at a demonstration much like this, where people chanted: "This is what democracy looks like. This is what democracy looks like."

This is what democracy looks like, colleagues—people coming together with their signs and their feet and their time, saying: We need change. It is as fundamental as free expression under the First Amendment. It is as fundamental to our Constitution as the right to assemble. This is as fundamental to the vision of "We the People" as anyone can imagine—that vision that Lincoln summarized as "government of the people, by the people, for the people," not of, by, and for some dictatorial force, not someone who wants to consolidate power in an imperial Presidency.

In fact, our Founders were really worried about authoritarianism. They were really worried about an imperial Presidency.

Once they launched that Constitution, what would happen with that first President? Would that first President say: I am now going to consolidate power in this young Republic, hold on to the Executive, ignore the balance of powers between the branches of government, and consolidate power in the Executive. I am going to take the forces that were the Revolutionary War forces, and I am going to turn them into a force to keep in power regardless of the constitutional requirement for elections.

They were very worried about this. One of the reasons they particularly

liked the idea of George Washington being the first President is that George Washington was very worried about that, and the example he set would mean a whole lot.

It is one thing to have a Constitution on paper. It is a whole other thing to hold onto it, to keep it. Coming out of the Constitutional Convention, the story goes that someone asked one of the convention policymakers: What do we have? And he replied: A republic, if we can keep it—if we can keep it.

This is what democracy looks like right here. There is another picture of what democracy looks like. This is the "wall of moms" in Portland, OR, coming out, standing side by side, creating a barrier between the police and the Federal forces that had been allocated to the city by President Trump and the people, creating that barrier, that "wall of moms," to say: Do not use flashbang on us or all the people behind us; do not use tear gas on us or all the people behind us; do not use impact munitions, a polite name for, essentially, rubber bullets—they say "non-lethal bullets"—we hope, right, because sometimes they do enormous damage—do not use your batons to knock us down and break our bones; do not pepper spray us in the face. We are the "wall of moms."

This is what democracy looks like, but this is a message lost on President Trump. We have something entirely different from the President. The President said: I am going to send some forces out to Portland to basically pour gasoline on the fire and turn it into, basically, a much more intense conflict.

So you already have the basics of a challenge in which you have had folks from the White extremists coming in camouflage to Portland to create trouble and looking for a fight, and you have antifa coming to Portland to look for a fight with the White extremists, the White nationalists.

Well, that had calmed down enormously to where there was only a small group left, coming in late at night and causing trouble. But Trump said: If I can recreate conflict in Portland, well, I can run a campaign on fear. Because what we have seen, in Presidential campaign after Presidential campaign, is a Republican candidate saying: If we run on fear, we will win because people think of us as stronger on national security.

Well, we have seen the different strategies. There was the Ebola run-on-fear strategy. There was the "immigrants, rapists, and murderers are going to run across the border and swarm America" run-on-fear strategy. There was the "ISIS is going to row across the Atlantic and invade America" run-on-fear strategy. There was the Willie Horton "you are going to be attacked by a dark-skinned person in an alley" run-on-fear strategy.

And all too often it has worked, this effort to gear up division in America, to play on racism in America.

But to that strategy of division and racism I say: No way. That is too low, too wrong for America. We should be coming together as a country. We should have a message of coming together as a people. We should be taking on the challenges of healthcare and housing and education.

Those are the bills we should have here on the floor of the Senate. We should be taking on the issue of fair labor, good-paying jobs. We should be working on rebuilding America's infrastructure.

We should be addressing the fact that, even today in States all across this country, you can be discriminated against for being a member of the LGBTQ community. You can get married in the morning, and you can proceed to be thrown out of your apartment. You can be told you cannot eat in this restaurant, you cannot sit in this movie theater, you cannot receive this government benefit.

The Supreme Court just took one step forward on the employment question, strengthening the ability to not be discriminated against in employment.

We passed a bill here in the Senate back in 2013 to do exactly that, to strengthen protections in employment, but the Republican-controlled House wouldn't take it up and treat LGBTQ Americans fairly.

If we were doing our job, we would have a debate on the Equality Act that would end discrimination in all of these areas because it is the right thing to do that no door should be slammed in the face of an American because of who they are or whom they love. Isn't that something we should be doing here?

Shouldn't we be taking on this challenge of carbon pollution and climate chaos? All the fossil fuel companies have worked hard to turn this into a partisan issue. It didn't used to be a partisan issue. Back when President Bush—not yet President but candidate Bush ran against candidate Dukakis, it was the Republican candidate who ran on climate change. It was the Democrat who ran on fossil fuels.

It is not so long ago, before Citizens United, that we had so many climate champions on both sides, but then dark money was introduced, and the fossil fuel community said: This is our chance to control the U.S. Senate. They put hundreds of millions—not thousands, millions—of dollars into the Senate campaigns 6 years ago, 2014.

I remember it well because I was one of the folks they were targeting, and I saw their strategy of taking that money and putting it into third-party campaigns and running tremendous numbers of assault ads, negative ads, attack ads—doing it on social media all across the board.

Since then, what happened? Well, all the voices that were on the Republican side of the aisle saying “We need to take on climate” disappeared. That is the corrupting power of Citizens United and dark money.

Then we had a bill here on the floor. We needed 60 votes, under our policy rules, to be able to pass it to close debate. It was disclosure—to say at least we should disclose where money comes from. But what happened? The fossil fuel lobby said no Republican can dare to vote for this bill if you want us to keep you in power, and every single Member across the aisle followed their lead and voted against disclosure.

They voted for darkness. They voted for hiding these massive contributions coming in from who knows where because they are hidden.

My point is that this is democracy here, people expressing their views, and here in this Chamber we should have democracy as well.

We had it almost over our entire history, of people being able to put virtually any issue on the floor and have it debated on and then to have it voted on and then to have voters know how their Senator voted so there was accountability.

But no more. We are in this incredible period in which there are a record number—low—of amendments, and the amendments we do have are basically not very significant to begin with or they are preprogrammed by leadership, not by each Senator having power. The idea of 100 Senators having that power—that sounds like something out of just another world, yet that was the Senate throughout its history until recently.

Why do I keep emphasizing this? Because this concentration of power where bills and amendments only go through the majority leader is an absolute fit with government by and for the powerful—the opposite of government by and for the people.

So if someone has a bill that says you can't gouge Americans on drug prices, they can't get that bill to the floor because it is blocked by the majority leader, and the drug companies don't want that bill on the floor, so they give a lot of money to that team.

If someone says we should have reasonable gun safety laws—not violating the Second Amendment—and we will make the world a little safer for our children, well, that bill can't get on the floor because it is blocked by the majority leader, and it is backed by massive spending of dark money and the NRA.

Or if we have a bill that says we should do a lot more about housing, I can't put that bill on the floor. How about we have a banking system that serves the cannabis industry so that we don't have huge bags of money opened up to the possibility of organized crime moving it around the country and doing bad things? We should extend that coverage, but we can't get that vote on this floor—which brings me to something more important than just basically anything I have just talked about, which is what President Trump is doing right now: deploying secret police across America, secret police here in America.

Now, we know that President Trump admires authoritarian leaders. He has spoken with admiration about Duterte in the Philippines. He seems to be in love with Erdogan in Turkey. He loves the Crown Prince in Saudi Arabia, who assassinated an American-based journalist.

He can't find anything wrong with how Putin runs Russia, as basically an authoritarian-style dictator. But now he is doing something beyond just this affection: He is bringing the tactics of authoritarian governments to the streets of the United States of America.

This is what democracy looks like, but I am going to show you some pictures of what democracy doesn't look like—instead, what authoritarianism looks like, what paramilitary forces look like.

So let's take an exploration of the President's strategy. Well, first, authoritarians don't want identity about the organization on their police uniforms, and they want the police, in functioning, to look more like warriors in some other fight across the sea.

So you dress them in camouflage. Here are folks deployed by President Trump in the streets of Portland. What agency do these belong to? No shoulder patch, no identity on this front, no identity on the other shoulder, no identity on the helmet—no identity. Who are these people?

How about these people? Are these the same group here? These are White extremists, nationalists, who come to Portland to get in fights. So President Trump dresses up his Federal forces to look like White extremists on the streets of Portland.

How is there accountability if you don't know where they are from?

Who can tell me if these folks are from Customs and Border Protection? Are they from the Federal Protective Service? Are they U.S. Marshals? How do we know? We don't because they are deliberately not marked.

We are told that these are actually Customs and Border Protection. I called up the head of Customs and Border Protection, and I said: What is the story with this tactic of secret police on the streets? He said: Oh, no, no, no; we insist they have “CBP” on them. We insist they have a unique identifier.

In fact, he put this in a tweet. He told all of America: We don't do that. But America has pictures, and those pictures tell us there is no ID. They are being deployed as secret operators on the streets of Portland.

That is going to be terrifying because you don't know who they are. Is it just someone who wants to create trouble who puts “police” on their shirt? Is it one of these folks? These folks have badges on them that look a little more official. We see an American flag here. We see an American flag here.

Are these White extremists coming to the streets to beat people up, or are they Federal agents? And if so, who are they, and what is their mission? We found out their mission in short order.

Here we have a picture of a Navy vet. That Navy vet said he came down to say: What does it mean to honor your oath—your oath of office, your oath to the Constitution? He wants to know. He was a veteran who served in our forces to defend the Constitution.

How did President Trump's secret police respond? Here is a CBP agent with a baton right here, striking him. Here is another one with a baton coming around to strike him again. Here is another one spraying pepper spray into his face. This man, just standing here—his hands are basically hooked in his pocket, like this—he is just standing here saying: I came down here to see what people thought about honoring their oath to the Constitution. And he is attacked. He is attacked by multiple members of this secret force Trump puts on the streets of our Nation.

They had not just pepper spray and not just batons; they had other weapons, impact munitions—in this case, U.S. marshals.

Here is a young man who is holding a boom box over his head—that is what it looked like—and he is on one side of the street. On the other side of the street are the marshals. As he stands there in the video, you see him crumble and fall to the ground because from across the street, he was shot right between the eyes. Critical condition. Fractured skull.

Who in the world would expect a Federal officer to shoot a protester, who is either holding up a sign or a radio, between the eyes from across the street? Do you think that is accidental? They accidentally shot him in the head? It wasn't accidental; it was deliberate. They are sending a message. A lot of other people got shot with these munitions. I am told that he is no longer in critical condition. Thank goodness for that, but it could have been very, very different. We still don't know the ultimate outcome of this assault on a peaceful protester.

Pepper spray, using batons on veterans, shooting a peaceful protester in the head from a few yards away—that is not all that Trump's secret police were up to. They decided to go through the streets and grab people and throw them into unmarked vans.

Here is one of those vans on the streets of Portland. Here are President Trump's secret police, unmarked, throwing another protester into a van.

One of the individuals who was treated in this fashion said he was terrified because he thought these camouflaged folks were the White extremists who come to make trouble, and was he being kidnapped? They would not answer the question when they were asked "Who are you?" They didn't answer the question.

Secret police, unmarked, using pepper spray, batons, impact munitions, and tear gas on peaceful protesters, and then throwing people—grabbing them and throwing them into unmarked vans. What does that make you think of? What country are we talking

about here? Are we talking about Syria? Are we talking about Duterte in the Philippines? Are we talking about Erdogan in Turkey? Are we talking about the Crown Prince in Saudi Arabia? Are we talking about Putin running Russia? We could be talking about any of those folks, as they use these tactics, but this is unacceptable and outrageous and unconstitutional in a democratic republic.

President Trump coordinated this deployment of secret police and attacks on peaceful protesters to create a big conflagration, a big explosion of protests in Portland. The protests had died down to just less than 100 actors and some bystanders in the late evening, and then I am told that on the days that followed these outrageous attacks, the protests multiplied—not one- or twofold but fivefold or more. That is exactly what Trump wanted because he wanted to say: There is this dissent and trouble in the streets of Portland. I am your law-and-order President; I will take care of that trouble.

You create the trouble. You escalate the conflict so you can say "I am the one who can deescalate it" later. This is a horrific strategy that no Member of this Senate should have the slightest sympathy for—a strongman in the Oval Office adopting the secret police tactics of the worst dictators from around the globe.

Some of the headlines that followed were things like this:

"Federal Law Enforcement Use Unmarked Vehicles To Grab Protesters Off Portland Streets."

"A Navy vet asked federal officers in Portland to remember their [constitutional] oaths. Then they broke his hand." You saw the pictures of them striking him with the batons.

"Federal Officers Deployed in Portland Didn't Have Proper Training, D.H.S. memo said." It says: Untrained, undisciplined folks, but they knew what the President wanted and that was to create an escalation of violence on the streets of our city.

You are probably wondering, didn't the President call and talk to the Governor before he decided to deploy these secret police on the streets of Portland? No, he didn't. Didn't the DHS Secretary? No. How about the Department of Justice? The Attorney General? No. Surely they called the mayor and said: Before we deploy folks to patrol the streets with tear gas and batons and impact bullets, rubber bullets, pepper spray; before we beat up peaceful protesters and shoot them in the head, we want to talk to you, Mayor, about what is going on. Did the President call? Did the Secretary call, the Secretary of Homeland Security? Did the Secretary or the Attorney General call? Did the head of Customs and Border Protection, CBP, call before they sent in their special operating group? Did the Marshals' lead director, commissioner call? The answer is no, no, no, no, and no. None of them called be-

cause they weren't coming to coordinate, to help; they were coming to disrupt. They knew that if they asked to come, asked whether they were wanted, the answer would be no, you are not wanted because you are coming to inflame the violence and disruption.

The President was giving speeches, saying "Look at what a wonderful President I am because I am sending help to quell violence in Portland" while he was sending secret police to create violence. This has to be one of the bigger lies he has told in his time as President. By various accounts, he tells a number of them every single day. But this lie to the American people is not just a little white lie; this is not just a little misrepresentation; this is something of constitutional input about who we are as a country. We don't do secret police in our country. We don't grab people off the streets and terrify them and throw them in unmarked vans in our country—at least not until now.

You see, the President has looked at the polls that say we are not very happy. Americans are not very happy with the way you have executed the Presidency. We are certainly not very happy with the way you have managed this really big crisis, the COVID-19 pandemic. When there is a crisis, you start to see someone—can they rise to the occasion? Can they bring forth the best in people? Can they facilitate cooperation? Can they mobilize resources? Can they make the case in an effective and persuasive fashion?

The American people have seen that President Trump could not rise to the occasion. He could not bring himself to bring people together. He could not make the case for a national strategy on how to tackle the coronavirus. He could not mobilize resources to address it in a timely fashion. Millions more are going to get sick as a result of his incompetence, and tens of thousands more will die because of the incompetence of President Trump.

What is a President running for reelection to do when his incompetence is revealed in its complete and total clarity to the Nation? You create a war. That is what you do. You create a war because a war might rally people to your side when we are being attacked. But in this case, the President couldn't come up with an overseas war. ISIS? Too weak. The scary Ebola? Too long ago. North Korea? A completely failed strategy by the President of expressing his love for yet another dictator and that love not being returned in any effective policy changes. So what is left? Immigration. Oh, wait—he already played the rapist and murderers at the border card. He already offended people throughout our Nation by snuffing out the lamp of Lady Liberty. What is left? You have to create a war inside the United States.

First came Washington, DC. He tried out the secret police strategy by deploying forces onto the steps of the Lincoln Memorial, unmarked, and nobody knew who the hell they were. Who

are these people who are on the Lincoln Memorial? Are they far-right extremists carrying guns? Are they Customs and Border Protection? Are they U.S. Marshals? Who are these people? Nobody knew. They were secret police at the Lincoln Monument.

And then he decided to test the strategy of using weapons against peaceful protesters across from the White House. There they are gathered together. There is this great tradition in America. If you want to protest where the President can see you, you go to L'Enfant Plaza and you look up at the second story and you hold up your protest sign and you scream your position on something that you consider very important for America—the change you want to see or the man you object to. The President and his family look out those windows and say: I sure hate seeing those protesters.

But that is symbolic of the right to assemble and the freedom of speech in our beautiful Nation under our extraordinary Constitution. What did President Trump do? Well, he walked off L'Enfant Plaza across from the White House so people couldn't protest there. That is what this President thinks of protesters. He sees them as a threat to him. He doesn't like freedom of assembly, and he doesn't like freedom of speech, but what he does like is a good photo opportunity.

So the President decides to get the team together and we will go over and I will stand on the steps of the church and hold up a Bible. I still am a little confounded about what his message was to do that. The thing is, to get to the steps of the church, he would have to come near these protesters he hates because he hates protesters. He doesn't like Americans calling for change or criticizing his policies.

I am thinking back about this “wall of moms” that I showed you earlier—these moms coming down, forming a line, and saying: Don't tear gas us. Don't do shock grenades. Don't shoot us with rubber bullets. Don't pepper spray us.

And yet his forces did all those things.

Where did he try this out first? He tried it in that area behind L'Enfant Plaza where the church steps were. His forces went out and attacked those protesters. Nobody saw violence of any kind. This had nothing to do with quelling a riot. This had to do with one simple thing: The President hates protests and wanted to show what a strong man he is, like those dictators he admires all across the planet—like the Crown Prince in Saudi Arabia, like Duterte with his extrajudicial executions in the Philippines, like Putin, whom he just can't say enough good things about who suppresses the civil rights of the Russian people. He wanted to show how strong he was so he sent his team out to tear gas, use impact munitions, rubber bullets on the protesters so he could stand at the church with a Bible.

I am still wondering what passage in the Bible he was there to talk about. You can think for yourselves. You can imagine. You can ask yourselves: What did the President want to say with the Good Book in his hand? Did he want to say this book talks about turning the other cheek, and I will show how much I admire that principle of turning the other cheek by coming out and telling my team to tear gas and shoot peaceful protesters? Is that what the President wanted to do, kind of somehow demonstrate support for turning the other cheek by having his team gas and shoot people in that area close to L'Enfant Plaza, close to the steps of the church, or did the President want to come out and say: This Good Book talks about beating swords into plowshares, and I want to come out and show just how I believe in the principle of beating swords into plowshares by having my team gas people and baton people and do these explosive flashbang grenades. Is that what the President was trying to do?

What message in the Bible was he trying to convey? Was he trying to convey the message that Jesus Christ talked about time and time and time again of helping the poor and the destitute, and he thought it was such an important message to carry to the United States that he would use force, tear gas, rubber bullets to clear the path so he could talk about how important it was to help the destitute and the poor in America and how his policies might help them? No. We don't know. I don't think the President knew. He has never indicated that he is actually familiar with the contents of that book he was holding up, which makes it a particularly bizarre photo op.

But this was his first trial run of this strategy of using weapons against peaceful protesters, of using unmarked uniforms on the steps of the Lincoln Memorial. He loved it so much. He loved that sense that he was so strong because he could clear the path with his Presidential team so he could get to those steps. He was such an awesome man, such an incredible President showing strength by attacking peaceful protesters so he could have his photo on. It filled him with such energy, he thought: Let's try this out elsewhere in the country—so he comes to Portland.

He comes to Portland, and he proceeds to say: Let's use that secret police strategy again, unmarked. Let's use those batons and pepper spray again against a peaceful protester. Let's use those impact munitions again against someone holding up a sign, shooting them from across the street, giving them a fractured skull and putting them in critical condition and into the hospital. Let's take it and even amplify it a little bit and put them into unmarked vans and sweep them away. This is what we have with the Trump secret police strategy.

As he did these things, he went out on the campaign stump and said: Look

what a mighty leader I am attacking these peaceful people with these weapons. I did it to the protesters in Washington, DC, and I did it to the protesters in Portland, OR, and now I am going to take my strategy of attacking protesters and spread it all across America.

What does he talk about? He says: I want to take this strategy to Baltimore. He says: I want to take this strategy to Philadelphia. He says: I want to take this strategy to New York. And then he said: I want to take it to Chicago and I want to take it to Detroit and I want to take it to Oakland, CA. What do those things have in common? And then he says: They are led by Democrats. I will take my strategy of inciting violence with secret police, unmarked van abductions, use of pepper spray, batons, and flashbangs—the whole arsenal—and I will take it to all these cities where there are Democratic mayors. Then I will say: Look at me. I am a law-and-order President, and I can quell all that trouble I created across this country.

You are probably thinking I made up this list of cities that the President talked about. Surely, the President wouldn't take this incredibly horrendous secret police strategy and express that he wanted to take it on a trial run all across America so he could create violence in Democratic cities, but in his own words:

Who's next? New York and Chicago and Philadelphia and Detroit and Baltimore and all of these—Oakland is a mess.

And he framed it as going to quell violence, but, instead, the strategy produces violence. It enflames. It accentuates. It outrages. It creates conflict.

I have here an article, and it is from FOX 32 News in Chicago: “Lightfoot confirms federal agents will help manage Chicago violence.” Chicago has a Democratic mayor. Let's go create trouble there.

Mayor Lori Lightfoot had a different tone Tuesday regarding President Donald Trump's decision to send agents to Chicago. “I'm hopeful that they will not be foolish enough to bring that kind of nonsense to Chicago,” the mayor said.

Well, what did she mean by “nonsense”? It is the polite word for attacking peaceful protesters with batons and flashbangs and tear gas.

I am certainly not saying that Portland didn't have some tensions. The extremist groups on the right have made a favorite trip out of coming to Portland to cause trouble and the anti-fascists have responded in kind, and that is what the local team has to manage and deescalate. They have succeeded in deescalating it to where it was a small group late at night. And then Trump came in and blew it all into a big crisis once again.

When I said that this is coordinated with his campaign, campaign ads went up. His strategy of creating chaos in America, then campaigning on it couldn't be more transparent.

As President Trump deploys Federal agents to Portland, Ore., and threatens to

dispatch to other cities, his re-election campaign is spending millions of dollars on ominous television ads that promote fear. . . . The influx of agents in Portland has led to scenes of confrontations and chaos that Mr. Trump and his aides have pointed to as they try to burnish a false narrative about Democratic elected officials allowing dangerous protesters to create widespread bedlam.

The Trump campaign is driving home that message with a new ad that tries to tie its dark portrayal of Democratic-led cities.

There it is—campaign ads to fit his dark portrayal of Democratic-led cities.

The idea that not only would the President bring those secret police tactics to America—to our streets—he would deploy them in his effort to create conflict so he can win reelection, so he can have something that scares the American people. Don't we have enough to be worried about already? Don't we have a pandemic to manage?

A number of us worked to say: Mr. President, you need to have a national strategy on producing protective equipment to help stop the spread of this contagion. Mr. President, that should probably include taking available factories and putting them to work making protective equipment and distributing it quickly. The President said, no, he's not doing it. He is not activating the Defense Production Act to have a national strategy to stop the spread of this disease.

I have two healthcare workers in my family. My son works in a doctor's office recording the computer code on the symptoms and so forth. He is a medical scribe. My wife goes house to house visiting folks who are in hospice. They are in the final chapter of their life, and she coaches them and their family on care and support during this final chapter of our journey here on this planet. A number of the people she sees are very high risk because they are fragile and sick in that final chapter, so they would be very affected if this disease were introduced. Some of them have the disease.

She has to be very careful that she doesn't pick it up and bring it home to my elderly mother who lives in our house. My elderly mother is in her nineties. She probably wouldn't want me to call her elderly in her nineties, but she is fragile, and she would be affected. My son doesn't want to bring it home or spread it. Both of them had trouble getting the protective equipment they needed early in this pandemic because we didn't have a national strategy. Trump failed the leadership test.

How about another critical piece of this, which is testing?

We needed to crank up all of the biological manufacturing capacity of America to produce the reagents so that people could be tested and get the results within hours or a day so that, if they were infected, even if they were asymptomatic—they didn't have the disease symptoms, but they had the disease, and they could spread it—that they would be quarantined, but the President said no.

So we put into the bill a requirement for the President to produce a national test strategy and produce a report with his test strategy. What did it read? It read our test strategy—our national strategy—was to leave it to the States. What kind of leadership is that to have no strategy on producing the reagents or the tests and getting them around the country?

One thing we have done here is we have funded a lot of money to help communities buy tests because they are expensive. We said they should be free to the victims—to the people who are getting tested, that is. Every health expert has said you have to crank up this testing so that there is no wait time. It doesn't help to get the results 7 or 10 days later.

I have been holding townhalls. I hold one in every county every year in Oregon, 36 counties. This year, I only got 21 in before the coronavirus made it impossible to hold them in person, but I have been holding them digitally, electronically. I keep hearing the report from the county health agents that now testing has increased to its taking 7 days to get a response, 9 days to get a response, 11 days to get a response. Why is that? It is because we didn't have any national strategy for producing tests. As the disease flares up and grows in magnitude in the Southern States, more and more resources are getting diverted to those Southern States. So there are not the testing supplies because there is no national strategy.

Then the experts said: Well, you should have a contact tracing strategy, so, when people test positive, you can immediately find out who they have been in touch with so those people get immediately quarantined before they can pass it on to other people.

Yet that doesn't work if you can't get test results quickly, and it doesn't work if you don't have contact tracers. A number of us have worked to provide funding for contact tracers. ELIZABETH WARREN and I have introduced a bill that calls for 100,000 contact tracers across this country. There is \$75 billion in the House's bill for testing and tracing across the country.

How did President Trump respond this last week? President Trump said: I don't want any money for testing in this bill—no money for testing. He wants this stripped out; yet it is an essential element for controlling the coronavirus.

I don't think he will win on that one. I think the Members of this Chamber, on both sides of the aisle, care enough about their constituents that they want to help with testing and contact tracing, but the President wants the testing stripped out.

Why does he want it stripped out? It is because, if you test more people, then you get more positives, and if you get more positives, it doesn't look good. So he is choosing to have things look good rather than to contain the coronavirus.

If you proceed to offend people across the country by failing in leadership on protective equipment and failing in leadership on testing and failing in leadership on contact tracing, you need another plan, and we have the plan.

The President has made it clear he will test out his secret police and attacks on peaceful protesters in DC, magnify that experiment in Portland, and see if it creates more chaos. If it does, he will deploy that effort across the Nation. That is President Trump's plan, and it is as wrong as anything could be. Secret policing has no place in the United States of America.

I introduced a simple amendment to the Defense Authorization Act, which deals with security powers and things like Customs and Border Protection and deals with things like U.S. Marshals, and I said we are on that right now on the floor of the Senate. Let's have this debate about secret policing, and let's just ask a few simple things.

First, when the President sends agents anywhere in the country, they have to carry identification about who they work for. It is not that big of a request, and it is not expensive. Instead of putting a generic "police" or no marking at all, you put "CBP," or you put "U.S. Marshals," or you put "Federal Protective Service" or one of a dozen other Federal police units that play different roles. That way, the American people will know who they are. Then you put unique identifiers on them so that, if they do something terrible, like walk up and shoot a protester in the head, you would know who had done it. You could find out.

Now, some of my friends have said: Well, we are not sure we want to require names to be on the uniforms because there have been some cases in which people have been so outraged that they have harassed the families of the police officers or of these Federal agents. We don't want that. OK. A number would work that could be used to identify someone after an egregious act but would protect the families of our Federal agents who are doing a good job. That is pretty simple. Have an ID as to what agency you belong to and a unique identifier. You are no longer secret.

Then you can't be deployed on some expanded mission of sweeping the streets. Your legitimate mission should be to protect a Federal monument or a Federal building, and you have to be at that Federal building or in the near vicinity of it or of the monument. That is pretty simple. If you want a broader mission, you have to coordinate with the mayor and the Governor and get their permission.

It is pretty straightforward. Have a patch with the agency, a unique identifier, and pursue your mission in the near vicinity of the Federal property.

What else?

The President would have to tell the people of America how many people he is sending, from what agencies, and to what city for a little bit of transparency. That is it.

This amendment that I am proposing to stop secret policing is simple; yet my colleagues are blocking it from being considered in this bill.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GARDNER). The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, in a moment, I will again ask for this important issue of deployment of secret police to be debated and voted on, on this floor. That is what the U.S. Senate is for, to address the issues facing Americans, but I didn't want to ask until my colleague was here to respond from the Republican Caucus. When he is ready, I will make that motion.

I make this motion to send a couple of different messages. One, most importantly, is that secret policing has no place in America, and all Americans must stand arm in arm and say no. The second is, when there is an important issue like this, this is the Chamber in which it should be debated and voted on so we can hear the conflicting views.

There may be clauses in the amendment that I will propose that people won't like, insight that they can provide, or modifications that they would like to propose to my amendment, but it can't happen unless this amendment is considered on the floor.

That is why, notwithstanding rule XXII, I ask unanimous consent to call up my amendment to stop secret policing in America, amendment No. 2457, an amendment to limit Federal law enforcement officers for crowd control; that there be 2 hours for debate, equally divided between opponents and proponents; and that upon the use or yielding back of time, the Senate vote in relation to the amendment with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. President, in reserving the right to object, I, like the entire staff in the Chamber today and like the Presiding Officer for most of this time, has endured this for the last hour, an hour that has been very similar to the hour we had yesterday on the very same topic and with the very same motion to have the very same amendment passed in the Defense Authorization Act.

I am a member of the Committee on Armed Services. Prior to the Presiding Officer, I was presiding. I was honored to sit in that chair and watch the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services and the ranking Democrat of the Committee on Armed Services talk in glowing terms about each other and the bipartisan effort that has led to a National Defense Authorization Act that has considered 807 amendments to this point. As we sit here, 40 more amendments—20 by Republicans and 20 by Democrats—are being hotlined for further consideration for, hopefully, tomorrow's final passage.

The National Defense Authorization Act has been greatly debated. In fact,

it has been the most debated bill that I have been part of since I got here. Not only that, the amendments that are represented in this 807 are almost, nearly, equally divided among the two parties represented in this great Chamber.

What we have been witnessing tonight is a diatribe—in some cases, fantasy but, in every case, an exaggeration and, in many cases, a fabrication. The good Senator from Oregon has shown us pictures of what democracy looks like. I don't disagree. We are self-governed. The exceptionalism of America is that we are self-governed.

Democracy also demands protocol in this Chamber, the most deliberative body in this world. Yet, without any warning—without any heads-up—here we are, dealing with a unanimous consent motion on an amendment that has already failed to get unanimous consent just in the last 24 hours on a bill that has already been debated for weeks and months. It included bipartisan amendments across the board. Then we are confronted with this breach of not only protocol but of—well, let's just say—common decency and respect for each other.

I do agree with the Senator from Oregon on this point: He is right in that we should have the debate, and that is why it is too bad that his amendment wasn't allowed to be debated in Senator TIM SCOTT's JUSTICE Act.

And the reason it couldn't be debated there was because he and most every one of his colleagues on the Democrat side other than three filibustered against TIM SCOTT's police reform bill.

I don't think they want a solution. They want to have this crazy rhetoric, demagogue all day and all night, wherever they can have a demagogue, and they want to blame President Donald Trump for the actions of criminals.

Now, I have heard it all when I have heard, from the Senate floor, antifa referred to as the anti—what did he call them? The antifascists. The antifascists. That is the way to sugar-coat thugs.

So for these reasons—and I could think of dozens of others, but I will spare you all and the staff this late night, getting later—I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Oregon's postcloture time has expired.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MERKLEY. And I would invite my colleague to stay if he would like to and yield to him if he wants to jump into the conversation.

Mr. CRAMER. I think we have had enough debate. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. President, I don't object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, my colleague has said that the facts I have presented tonight are a fabrication, to use his exact word. He has called it a breach of protocol. He has called it a violation of common decency.

I think we are here as a Chamber to address difficult, important issues in America. This is a difficult and important mission.

This is a new use of force in a manner that doesn't belong in the streets of America. It is important that we debate it.

I would be happy to have it be a standalone bill, come up right after this National Defense Authorization Act, and have it debated for 2 hours and voted on, because then we actually have a conversation and we have to take a position, and our constituents can see where we stand, and folks could propose an amendment to it if they didn't like the way I have written it. It is so simple. It says: Do what we have always done. Put ID about where you come from. Have a unique identifier. And don't go sweeping through the streets if your mission is to protect a Federal property. Stay at that Federal property or work with the Governor or the mayor if you have a broader effort. Those are reasonable things.

I don't think that it was a breach of protocol to ask this Chamber to consider that on this bill because there is a connection. We are talking about a bill that involves the use of force and how we govern in America.

I don't think it is a violation of common decency. My colleague does, and I would prefer that we actually have that conversation about the facts and about the arguments, about the simple solution I proposed when we can actually take a vote or other people can offer amendments to it and modify it. That is this Chamber doing what it should be doing.

So I am disappointed that my colleague is blocking this from being considered before this body.

I do love this body, and I first came here when amendments were freely—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. MERKLEY. Thank you, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. President, I am just going to reiterate my final point one final time, and I promise not to take more time than the Senator from Oregon.

He had his opportunity to have this amendment considered, debated, and voted on in the JUSTICE Act, introduced by Senator TIM SCOTT, a bill that dealt specifically with police reform.

It would have been the perfect place to have the debate, except that my colleague voted against cloture so we couldn't even proceed to the bill.

I don't know how we could have made it any easier or better. In fact, when we took up the JUSTICE Act, he and his side were provided at least 20 amendment opportunities. We could have had the debate he seeks tonight at the appropriate time on the appropriate bill, and I am sorry that we didn't do that.

Perhaps after tonight's episode, he and his colleagues will reconsider, and perhaps before we are done this year, Senator SCOTT's JUSTICE Act could be brought to the floor and we could have an adult discussion and debate on amendments and on the bill and on all kinds of great ideas right here in the most august body in the United States. I hope that can happen.

With that, I yield the floor and wish you a good night.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

Mr. GARDNER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CORONAVIRUS

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, the Congress, our States, and the administration talk about ways to handle the immediate consequences of COVID-19. We must also talk about the aftermath, and Steve Case has written a provocative op-ed about the future.

Those of us in Congress should read and discuss it. It has to be considered in future planning.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, July 19, 2020]

THERE'S NO GOING BACK TO THE PRE-PANDEMIC ECONOMY—CONGRESS SHOULD RESPOND ACCORDINGLY

(By Steve Case)

This week, Congress will likely take up the next steps in the economic response to the covid-19 pandemic. If the package is like previous efforts, it will focus on trying to turn back the clock to February 2020: treating the economy as if it were Sleeping Beauty, merely needing to be awakened to be fully restored. This strategy is a mistake: Congress needs to stop solely backing efforts to restore the old economic reality and focus on how to develop a new one.

Most of the \$1 trillion that Congress has put into business support so far during the pandemic has been directed to preserving existing firms through the Paycheck Protection Program and the Main Street Relief Fund. Helping those businesses and their workers is vital, but that alone won't fuel the economic recovery the country needs.

The problem is that many of the businesses backed by PPP or Main Street are going to wind up shutting down. Even when they aren't facing a global pandemic or economic crisis, about 100,000 small and medium-size businesses fail in the United States every year. New businesses will be needed to re-

place the ones that permanently close. Moreover, the failure rate is likely to be higher, as many firms were on the wrong side of trends—such as the move to online shopping, convenient food delivery or watching streaming content at home—that the pandemic lockdown has accelerated.

Another consideration: The protests stirred by the killing of George Floyd in Minneapolis police custody have made clear how many Americans were left behind in the pre-coronavirus economy; restoring the way things were before the virus hit won't address these needs.

Here are three ways Congress can help launch a new, more equitable era of entrepreneurship.

First: Make it easier for the earliest-stage start-ups to receive PPP dollars and for all start-ups to access the Main Street Relief Fund. PPP loans go to existing businesses to maintain jobs but not to new businesses that want to create them. Main Street loans go only to companies that are already profitable; most start-ups are not. That approach is backward: Studies show that nearly all net new job creation comes from start-ups, not established businesses.

A PPP revision should allow start-ups to obtain loans based on their plans to create jobs—with loan forgiveness granted only if those jobs materialize. If they don't, the start-ups should be required to repay the loans before any other obligations. And the barrier in the Main Street lending program that makes businesses ineligible for aid if they were not profitable in 2019 should be removed.

Second, the government needs to be a counterweight to private capital that exacerbates geographic disparities in opportunity as the country responds to the crisis. The pandemic is a devastating tragedy, but adversity tends to be met by the creation of new industries and new businesses. This crisis will stir innovations in medicine, goods and services delivered at home, remote work and learning, and more. Where will these new firms grow? If the decision is left to the private sector alone, almost all of them will be in three states: New York, California and Massachusetts, which attract 75 percent of all venture capital.

Great ideas to respond to this crisis are spread widely across the country—but capital is not. Business assistance programs created by Congress should have a special focus on getting startups off the ground in places that have lacked venture capital backing in the past. Sen. Amy Klobuchar (D-Minn.) and others have already proposed such legislation; members of Congress from these neglected areas should insist it is part of any Phase 4 bill.

Finally, lawmakers should step in to address unintended inequalities of opportunity for female and minority entrepreneurs caused by the earlier relief bills. Because these programs fund only existing businesses, they reinforce opportunity gaps. Communities with thriving businesses get more PPP and Main Street aid; those that have lacked capital to get businesses off the ground in the past see little help now.

The solution would be for Congress to direct unused PPP funds to start-ups led by female entrepreneurs and entrepreneurs of color, creating opportunities where they have not existed before. The Main Street Lending program could be modified to extend special debt options to community development groups and minority-focused accelerators to back a new wave of startups founded by historically underrepresented entrepreneurs.

There's no going back to the pre-pandemic U.S. economy. Too much has changed; too many new needs exist. This is a rare oppor-

tunity to break with the past and create a better future. Congress should grab it.

VOTE EXPLANATION

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, I voted in support of S. Amdt. 1788, which would reduce defense spending by 10 percent and invest that money into healthcare, education, and poverty reduction in communities with a poverty rate of 25 percent or more. To govern is to choose, and as we face unprecedented challenges at home, this defense budget is out of step with the values, priorities, and needs of the American people.

The unchecked growth in the defense budget is unsustainable, and the Trump administration has exacerbated these challenges. We have a duty to ensure the readiness of our forces, and I have supported efforts to rebuild our Armed Forces after years of costly overseas engagements. But massive spending increases without clear strategic direction do not make us safer. We need to be thoughtful about our spending choices, recognizing that every dollar spent on defense is a dollar not spent on healthcare, education, workforce training, and other critical areas of need.

The National Defense Authorization Act as it is currently written would spend \$740.5 billion on defense. This represents 53 percent of total Federal discretionary spending and exceeds the defense budgets of the next 11 nations combined, including our allies in Australia, South Korea, Germany, Japan, France, and the United Kingdom. It is more than twice the combined defense expenditures of China and Russia. Topline defense spending has risen by more than \$100 billion since President Trump took office; after the \$74 billion cut proposed in this amendment, defense spending would still be above the fiscal year 2017 level.

Some of my colleagues have expressed unease about the across-the-board nature of these cuts, and I agree that a targeted approach is preferable. But I have seen the consequences of delaying difficult decisions and believe we can no longer wait to have difficult conversations about our defense budget. In addition, the National Defense Authorization Act is not an appropriations bill, and this amendment simply reduces the total amount of money authorized to be spent on defense in the upcoming fiscal year. The Appropriations Committee, on which I serve, will still have the task of making thoughtful, targeted reductions in areas of lower priority, while preserving funding for high-priority items. I encourage my colleagues to confront these challenges for the good of our country and make adjustments as needed during conference negotiations with the House while remaining under the cap set by this amendment.

I am glad that this amendment protects salaries and healthcare from cuts, and would have preferred that it go further in making targeted cuts in order

to reduce the impact elsewhere in the defense budget. In particular, we should have taken this opportunity to scale back our country's trillion-dollar nuclear modernization efforts. Modernizing our nuclear weapons in a manner that makes them easier to use in more scenarios while abrogating our treaty responsibilities and doing nothing to bring Russia back to the nuclear negotiating table is a recipe for disaster.

However, my concerns with the particulars of this amendment do not change the plain fact that our national defense budget has grown out of control. In the midst of the worst economic downturn since the Great Depression, a pandemic that has taken the lives of more than 143,000 of our fellow Americans and shows no signs of slowing down, and the impending crises of homelessness and joblessness that we face if the Congress fails to provide relief, we simply cannot afford to continue this level of overinvestment in defense at the expense of other critical national priorities. For that reason, I supported this amendment.

REMEMBERING LORNE CRANER

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I would like to pay tribute to someone many of my colleagues knew and admired, Lorne Craner, who passed away on July 2 at the too young age of 61, a victim of cancer.

Lorne dedicated his professional life to advancing freedom and justice in the world. He served that cause faithfully as the longest tenured president of the International Republican Institute, IRI, as the Assistant Secretary of State for Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor in the George W. Bush administration, as Director of Asian Affairs on President George H.W. Bush's National Security Council, and as an advisor to Members of Congress, including his service as foreign affairs aide to a newly elected Senator from Arizona, our late colleague, John McCain. He continued to advance American values abroad as president of the American Councils for International Education, as a board member of several distinguished organizations, including the Millennium Challenge Corporation.

I got to know Lorne when Senator McCain, who was IRI's chairman, asked me to serve on its board. I saw the Institute thrive in size and reach under Lorne's leadership, becoming one of the world's most effective agencies for democratic development, respected by human rights advocates around the world and in both U.S. political parties.

Like John, Lorne was a tireless defender of the dignity of all human beings, the bedrock value that democracies are instituted to respect. Like John, Lorne fought the bad guys to defend the little guys. Toward that end, he usually exercised a little more skill at diplomacy than John sometimes possessed, but they shared an equal de-

votion to mankind's right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Secretary of State Colin Powell awarded Lorne the Distinguished Service Medal, the State Department's highest decoration.

Lorne and John shared, too, a dedication to the peaceful conduct of international relations. Both knew that our interests and values sometimes had to be defended by force of arms, but they were both so personally familiar with the costs of war that they worked hard to resolve international conflicts peacefully where possible and to make new friends of former enemies.

Lorne went to work for John in his last term as a Member of the House and his first term in the Senate, but their relationship began earlier than that. Lorne's father, Air Force Colonel Bob Craner, resided for more than 2 years in the cell next to John's in a Hanoi prison the POWs called, "the Plantation." John described Colonel Craner to me as one of the finest officers he had ever served with and "probably the person I was closest too in my life that I wasn't related to." John was held in solitary confinement at the time, the hardest period of his imprisonment, and he credited Bob Craner, whom he constantly communicated with by tap code, "with keeping me sane."

Despite the mistreatment of the POWs, John resolved early in his Senate career to help America reconcile with Vietnam, recognizing that the U.S. and Vietnam had shared interests in Southeast Asia, and that the cause of human dignity in the country where he had resided involuntarily for over 5 years could be served through friendly rather than hostile relations. The normalization of relations between the U.S. and Vietnam wouldn't have happened when it did if not for John's efforts to help bring it about. I think it is one of his greatest achievements. And Lorne Craner, the son who was deprived of his father for 5 years by the Vietnam war, provided invaluable help in that effort.

Lorne travelled to Vietnam with John in 1990, where he helped John build productive partnerships with Vietnamese officials who would help resolve issues that were in the way of better relations. And from his positions in government and at the IRI, he continued to advance American interests and ideals in Southeast Asia. Today, growing security and commercial ties between the two former enemies, symbolized by the port calls in Vietnam by U.S. Navy ships, including the USS *John S. McCain*, are a testament to both John and Lorne's vision and effectiveness. They imagined a better future out of the resentments and rubble of war, and, with others, made it a reality. They were both men who believed to do good in the world was why we were put on this earth.

Lorne was deeply committed to his cause, a cause he never strayed from, for a day in his life, and we are all bet-

ter for it. He was, too, as all who knew him will testify, a devoted father and husband, and his family's loss is the most profound. He was a hard man to lose at such a young age, for his family and friends, and for the country and the world.

Lorne Craner, son of Robert and Audrey Craner, husband of Anne Craner, father to three beloved children, Isabelle, Alexander, and Charles, brother of Charys, an American patriot, a man of justice, a peacemaker, and a friend to many, is gone. But his memory is a blessing to all who had the good fortune to have known him.

To his wife and children, the people who loved him most, as much as you hurt today, time will assuage your grief, and you will still feel his presence in your hearts. I lost my parents when I was a young man. I can say with confidence that the day will come when you will recall, without heartache, the good and honorable man who loved you so and with whom you will one day be reunited. God bless you.

Thank you.

65TH ANNIVERSARY OF MINOT AIR FORCE BASE

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. President, I want to congratulate the Minot Air Force Base on the 65th anniversary of its beginning.

On July 12, 1955, Minot, ND, community leaders and area residents gathered to break ground on land north of the city for what would become the Minot Air Force Base. One and a half years later, operations commenced at the base, and personnel and aircraft made their way to Minot, where they have enhanced our State and defended our Nation ever since. By the mid-1960s, it was recognized as one of the Nation's largest military installations, with a population of nearly 19,000 military and civilian men and women and their families. It was also recognized as having the largest housing village on a military base in the continental United States, with more than 2,450 homes.

The mission, aircraft, and staff have changed over these past seven decades. Today, the Minot Air Force Base supports two legs of the Nation's nuclear triad and provides vital defense to our security. It is the only dual-wing nuclear-capable installation in the Nation, with the 5th Bomb Wing and its B-52 bombers and the 91st Missile Wing, along with Minuteman III intercontinental ballistic missiles.

During these 65 years, the Minot community and State of North Dakota have remained constant in their support for the thousands of people who have been stationed at the Minot Air Force Base. We take pride in all they have done and continue to do to ensure peace throughout our world. We will continue to stand by them in the years ahead.

To the men and women of the Minot Air Force Base, you and all who came before you have faithfully served our

country and lived up to your motto, "Only The Best Come North." Every day, you go to work carrying the weight of the world on your shoulders, willing to pay the ultimate sacrifice to protect our freedoms and keep us safe. Thank you for all you do to make America great.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

REMEMBERING TECHNICAL SERGEANT RALPH H. RAY

• Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. President, I rise to recognize Technical Sergeant Ralph H. Ray, who was a dedicated West Virginia serviceman in our U.S. Army Air Corps during World War II. T SGT Ralph H. Ray is being honored by the renaming of a bridge on U.S. Route 60 that spans the Greenbrier River in his native Greenbrier County, WV.

T SGT Ralph H. Ray graduated from Frankford High School at the age of 17 in 1940. He left his home in West Virginia to complete his enlisted physical for the U.S. Army Corps on January 7, 1943, and subsequently earned the rank of technical sergeant. He earned his airplane mechanic diploma at the Ford Factory in Michigan the spring of 1943 and then completed gunnery school in Laredo, TX.

During his service, T SGT Ralph H. Ray was assigned to a top-notch flight crew with whom he trained for 3 months. He and his crew traveled to Trinidad, Brazil, Africa, Morocco, and Wales before reaching the Tibenham Base in East England. While serving as a flight engineer during World War II, he and his crew flew 30 successful missions before returning to the United States and spending the last 10 months of his enlistment at the Air Transport Corps in Miami, FL. This dedicated and diverse military service is certainly worthy of admiration.

After his release from the U.S. Army Air Corps, T SGT Ralph H. Ray worked as an airplane mechanic for Bollinger Airport in Davis Creek, WV, and while there, he earned his civilian pilot's license. T SGT Ralph H. Ray began working as a chemical technician for Westvaco in South Charleston, WV, in 1948. He married his wife Mary Madeline Hudson on April 16, 1948, and established a beautiful and loving family with four daughters: Valerie Ann Lyons, Angela Sue Ray, Verna Ray-Breaux, and Anita Ray-Kirk.

T SGT Ralph H. Ray retired in 1984 and passed away on August 8, 2019. It is fitting that an enduring monument will be established to commemorate Technical Sergeant Ray and his contributions to our State and our country. As resolved by legislature of West Virginia, the locally known Caldwell Bridge, will henceforth be named the "U.S. Army Air Corps T SGT Ralph H. Ray Memorial Bridge." I hope it provokes thought and appreciation for all of our military heroes and may the bridge be an enduring reminder of the

life of dedicated serviceman, husband, father, and lifelong West Virginian.●

TRIBUTE TO JEANNINE ABADIE

• Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Jeannine Abadie, the Walton County Teacher of the Year at Emerald Coast Middle School in Santa Rosa Beach, FL.

Jeannine is always working to help her students better understand mathematics and to improve her classroom to better suite their needs. She recently created a video app that provides tutorials for students. She specializes in curriculum design and assessment analysis for her math classes.

Jeannine also mentors her colleagues in lesson planning and student achievement. She provides support and professional development for her colleagues to ensure their students are well equipped for high school and their future educational careers.

Jeannine is a math instructor at Emerald Coast Middle School and has taught there for 7 years. Previously, Jeannine taught algebra at Northwest Florida State College. She received her master's degree from the University of West Florida in mathematics and statistics and will soon graduate with her second master's degree in instructional design and technology.

I convey my best wishes to Jeannine for her outstanding work as an educator. I look forward to hearing of her continued success in the years ahead.●

TRIBUTE TO FAITH BENCH

• Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I honor Faith Bench, the Manatee County Teacher of the Year at Braden River Middle School in Bradenton, FL.

Faith has a special bond with her students who struggle with math. That is because she struggled with the subject when she was in school. She understands those who hate the subject at the beginning of the year and finds it deeply fulfilling to help grow each student's problem-solving skills by the time they leave her class with greater confidence and appreciation for the subject.

Faith's colleagues note that she works hard to make learning fun and engaging for her students each year. She is committed to tailoring her lesson plans to suit the individual needs of every student. In turn, Faith is inspired by her colleagues and believes that their work together is the key to an educator's best work.

Faith teaches mathematics to seventh grade students at Braden River Middle School. Teaching is her passion, and she wants to help her students accomplish their dreams.

I thank Faith for the good work she has done for her students over the years. I look forward to learning of her continued good work in the coming years.●

TRIBUTE TO KATHY HAMILTON-BROWN

• Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Kathy Hamilton-Brown, the Brevard County Teacher of the Year at Endeavor Elementary School in Cocoa, FL.

Kathy credits her success to her fellow teachers in Brevard County. She notes that her school is like her family: a home away from home. To Kathy, teaching is more than just a job. She believes her students are our Nation's future leaders, and she is committed to making a difference in each of their lives.

Kathy's life experiences influenced her to become a teacher and care for her students. She feels indebted to the support system of family and friends who guided her at a young age. She hopes to inspire her students to do something great with their lives after they leave her classroom.

Colleagues note that Kathy is a fierce advocate for students, working to ensure they succeed both socially and academically. Due in large part to her innovative efforts, Kathy's school saw a 61-percent reduction in disciplinary referrals, as well as an increase in overall student attendance.

Kathy is a prekindergarten through sixth grade teacher at Endeavor Elementary School. She has been with Brevard Public Schools for 21 years. Outside of the classroom, she serves on the community partnership school operations team and works with Endeavor's business partners throughout the community.

I would like to extend my sincere thanks and gratitude to Kathy for her commitment to the education of her students. I look forward to hearing of her continued good work in the coming years.●

TRIBUTE TO WILLIAM FURIOSI

• Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I am pleased to honor William Furiosi, the Seminole County Teacher of the Year at Oviedo High School in Oviedo, FL.

William has taught AP biology, chemistry, and experimental research at Oviedo High School for the past 17 years. William aims to create a positive environment for students to think critically while studying science. He enjoys breaking down complex scientific theories to help them better understand the component ideas behind what they are learning.

At the Seminole County Science Fair this year, 12 of his student's science projects placed, with six first places, four second places, and two third places. His students say they benefit from his teaching style, finding it relatable and exciting during their classes.

I thank William for the good work he has done for his students over the years. I wish him all the best and look forward to learning of his continued success in the coming years.●

TRIBUTE TO JAE GLASS

• Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Jae Glass, the Gulf County Teacher of the Year at Port St. Joe High School in Port St. Joe, FL.

Jae teaches seventh grade English language arts and a ninth grade intensive reading class at her alma mater, Port St. Joe High School, where she has taught for 8 years.

Jae dedicates her time to being a positive role model for her students by engaging with them each day in her classroom. Throughout the school year, her students participate in more than traditional learning lectures. An example of an alternative activity includes her "book tasting day," which allows students to snack at picnic tables while sampling from an array of books.

Jae believes it is important to make English relatable and fun to her students. She encourages them to use reading and writing as a creative means of expression. She also works to help students that do not speak English as a first language by securing additional materials for her school.

I convey my sincere gratitude to Jae for her devotion to helping her students succeed in their future endeavors. I look forward to hearing of her continued success.●

TRIBUTE TO EVAN GOULD

• Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I honor Evan Gould, the Clay County Teacher of the Year from Lake Asbury Junior High School in Green Cove Springs, FL.

Evan felt honored and humbled to represent Clay County as he considers himself just one of the many high-quality educators teaching in the region. He relishes opportunities for his students to participate at district and State competitions as he takes great pride in their superior and award-winning performances. His music and drama programs are highly regarded in Florida and generate great interest throughout the county.

Evan has been a teacher for 30 years, with 22 years in Clay County. Outside of the classroom, Evan dedicates his time and talents to giving back to his community. He cofounded the Clay All-County Elementary Chorus, as well as The 5 & Dime Theatre Company. Evan also serves as the chair of District 1 Junior Thespians, which hosts an annual festival that brings in more than 500 drama students from across the region.

I extend my sincere thanks and gratitude to Evan for his many years working as a teacher and helping countless students fulfill their drama and musical ambitions. I look forward to learning of his continued success in the coming years.●

TRIBUTE TO JOLI HARTZOG

• Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I honor Joli Hartzog, the Washington

County Teacher of the Year at Florida Panhandle Technical College in Chipley, FL.

Joli has been a teacher for more than 26 years. She is the adult education director and instructor for the Florida Panhandle Technical College and offers instruction for several programs at the school. Joli teaches all levels of students, including those seeking high school equivalency, professional testing preparation, personal enrichment, or other specialized certification.

Enrollment at Florida Panhandle Technical College remains open throughout the year so the environment and format of Joli's class is ever-changing. She works with students ranging from 16 to 66 years old who are working towards their GED, and she is able to modify her teaching style to match the composition of the current class. She is willing to meet with her students anytime, whether when they arrive in her classroom, after class, or by appointment.

Joli finds the best part of teaching to be the family she has found at the school. She enjoys working with her fellow instructors and faculty and says they all work as a team. Joli considers this family to extend to her students and loves that she is able to help them achieve their life dreams.

I offer my sincere gratitude to Joli for her dedication to her students and extend my best wishes on her continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO KERI HEMRICK

• Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Keri Hemrick, the Collier County Teacher of the Year at Gulf Coast High School in Naples, FL.

Keri believes motivating her students to impact their community is one of the most important commitments she makes as a teacher. She aims to lead each student, whether they have a disability or a gift, towards increasing their achievements in school. She works to ensure their success upon leaving her classroom.

Keri's students were excited to learn that she had received this award. They were proud to see her recognized for representing the family-like environment she cultivated in their classroom. Many students have credited her for helping them to understand the new subjects throughout the school year.

Keri is an exceptional education co-teacher, case manager, and chair of the exceptional student education department at Gulf Coast High School. She dedicates her life to making a difference by engaging her students with special instruction and services.

I extend my best wishes to Keri for her dedication to her students and her community and congratulate her on this award.●

TRIBUTE TO EUAN HUNTER

• Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I honor Euan Hunter, the Marion County

Teacher of the Year at Vanguard High School in Ocala, FL.

Euan believes that learning is a lifelong endeavor not only for his students, but also for himself. He enjoys working with other teachers in the school district and works to utilize the teaching experience to make the learning of chemistry as real, enjoyable, and successful as he can for his students.

Euan believes he is fortunate to have taught chemistry to students of different age groups under a variety of curricula in England, Scotland, New York City, and now in Ocala. He looks forward to bringing chemistry to life so students can enjoy the learning process.

Euan currently teaches chemistry at Vanguard High School and has taught students around the world for 16 years. He received his degree in chemistry from the University of Edinburgh and studied to be a chemistry teacher at a university in England. Euan taught chemistry and general science in England and Scotland for 10 years and was an adviser to the Scottish Government on chemistry curriculum and assessment qualifications for students. After marrying his wife, they moved to New York City, where he taught at a middle school, before moving to Ocala.

I am grateful for Euan's hard work in educating students and enabling them to succeed. I wish all the best to him and look forward to learning of his continued good work in the coming years.●

TRIBUTE TO WHITNEY JONES

• Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I am pleased to recognize Whitney Jones, the Nassau County Teacher of the Year from Wildlight Elementary School in Yulee, FL.

Whitney became a teacher to make a difference in the lives of students by helping them to develop a passion for learning. Her teaching philosophy is that students will work hard when they are shown love and respect. She finds it humbling to watch her students grow and successfully learn new class subjects throughout the school year.

Whitney considers her role in her students' lives to be one that offers encouragement, guidance, and compassion. She works with her colleagues to implement new teaching strategies and plans standards-based lessons to ensure students are prepared for the third grade when they leave her classroom.

Whitney began her teaching career at Yulee Primary School, teaching there for 5 years before becoming a second grade teacher at Wildlight Elementary School, where she has taught for the past 2 years as a team leader and grade level chair. She is also on her school's action plan team, which works to create plans to help the lowest quartile students improve in school.

I extend my best wishes to Whitney for her good work as a teacher and look forward to hearing of her continued good work in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO DEVON LAMONICA

• Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I honor Devon LaMonica, the Okaloosa County Teacher of the Year at Fort Walton Beach High School in Fort Walton Beach, FL.

Teaching was not the career Devon imagined for herself when studying forensic science biochemistry at the University of Central Florida, but now she cannot imagine any other career for herself. Devon loves the opportunity to ignite a passion for science in her students and views teaching as a joy. She launched the biomedical science program at Fort Walton Beach High School and continues to teach the entire program.

Devon earned her master's degree in education at the University of West Florida and returned to work as an educator at Fort Walton Beach High School, her own alma mater. She is nationally recognized as a Biomedical Science Master Teacher and trains new teachers in this field across our Nation. She has been a teacher for 13 years.

I extend my sincere thanks and gratitude to Devon for her work to teach her students. I look forward to learning of her continued success in the years ahead.●

TRIBUTE TO ELIZABETH MANN

• Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Elizabeth Mann, the Santa Rosa County Teacher of the Year at Oriole Beach Elementary School in Oriole Beach, FL.

Elizabeth believes children learn best when they are working together. She provides opportunities throughout the school year for her students to team up with one another to accomplish a goal. She accepts each student for who they are and holds high expectations, viewing their small victories as the most rewarding part of her work. Whether it is their first time counting to 20 or helping a friend, she believes these moments make her job fulfilling.

Elizabeth comes from a family of educators. Both her parents were teachers and instilled in her the drive to help others. Her colleagues consider her to be every parent's dream teacher for their child because of her dedication to the children's success.

Elizabeth is a student education inclusion teacher for first grade at Oriole Beach Elementary School. She works with special needs students throughout the school year and offers group and one-on-one instruction across all subject areas.

I am grateful for Elizabeth's great work with her students. I extend my best wishes to her and look forward to learning of her continued good work in her future endeavors.●

TRIBUTE TO KELLI McGAHEY

• Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Kelli McGahey, the Putnam County Teacher of the Year at James

A. Long Elementary School in Palatka, FL.

Kelli's colleagues note that she has an innate ability to connect with students struggling academically or developmentally. She often spends extra time helping those students better understand assignments. Kelli seeks to impart her love for reading to her students and is passionate about inspiring the next generation of avid readers.

Kelli has taught first grade at James A. Long Elementary School for 6 years. While Kelli was surprised to learn that she received this prestigious recognition, her students and colleagues consider her an inspiration and know it was well deserved.

I would like to thank Kelli for the good work she has done for her students and extend my best wishes to her. I look forward to hearing of her continued success.●

TRIBUTE TO JONATHAN MOTTA

• Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Jonathan Motta, the Osceola County Teacher of the Year at NeoCity Academy in Kissimmee, FL.

Jonathan believes it is important that his students be prepared for life after high school and challenges them to apply the principles they learn after they leave his classroom. He works to incorporate upper level math into practical business models, technology, and other areas that are important to students. He considers this integration to be the most rewarding part of his work.

Jonathan also seeks to fill what he views as a gap in the traditional teaching format by teaching his students other life skills, such as organization and public speaking.

Jonathan finds the unique environment and approach to learning at NeoCity Academy to be a great place for his teaching style. He teaches mathematics and has incorporated a variety of concepts to students in Osceola County for the past 7 years. During his tenure, he developed a project-based learning curriculum that creates assignments involving real-world scenarios such as architecture, finance, design and manufacturing, and health.

I thank Jonathan for his passion and creative efforts to implement a lifelong approach to learning. I wish him all the best in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO KAREN NEADS

• Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I am pleased to recognize Karen Neads, the DeSoto County Teacher of the Year from Memorial Elementary School in Arcadia, FL.

At Memorial Elementary School, Karen strives to develop a positive environment in which she is able to motivate her students. As she prefers to teach in a way where she is more behind the scenes than upfront, Karen was shocked to receive this important recognition. She credits her colleagues and administrators on their work to

help teach the school's youngest students to her success.

Karen was named Teacher of the Year in her 25th year of teaching, all of which she has taught kindergarten and in DeSoto County. Her favorite aspect of teaching is watching her students grow throughout the year. She notes they enter her classroom with a blank slate and, by the end of the school year, are able to read and write.

I extend my sincere thanks and gratitude to Karen for her dedication to her students, and I look forward to hearing of her continued success in the years ahead.●

TRIBUTE TO JACOB POELMA

• Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I am pleased to honor Jacob Poelma, the Monroe County Teacher of the Year from Coral Shores High School in Tavernier, FL.

Jacob believes that, as a teacher, his impact is greater than the sum of his students' test scores and homework grades. He strives to honor a student's individuality while fostering a sense of community in the classroom. He knows that every student has a unique story and focuses on tailoring his teaching to engage each student in the best way they are able to learn. Jacob works to provide real-time language translations of his lectures so all of his students can master the material in their native language.

Jacob has taught biology in Monroe County for 4 years. He works with students in and out of the classroom by offering personalized teaching and mentorship opportunities, sponsors Coral Shores High School's Gaming Club, announces sporting events, and volunteers at extracurricular and other community activities.

I extend my deepest gratitude to Jacob for his dedication to his students and efforts to improve the learning experience. I look forward to hearing of his continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO KATHLEEN RULING

• Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Kathleen Ruling, the Union County Teacher of the Year from Lake Butler Elementary School in Lake Butler, FL.

Kathy believes that every child is worthy of respect, as they have a unique story to tell. She views her job not as a line of work, but a place where she is preparing each student for their future. Her colleagues describe her as having a natural gift for teaching and working with children.

Whether by creating hands-on classroom experiences or diligently tracking each child's progress, Kathy supports her student's educational careers and is always willing to help, even after they leave her classroom.

As an elementary special education teacher for 38 years, Kathy has left a lasting legacy in Union County. In 1985,

she implemented the staggered start program for kindergarteners. In 1990, she founded the Tiger Cubs, a club that recognizes students for their positive attitude and encouragement to peers. Both of these programs are still in effect in the county.

I express my sincere appreciation to Kathy for her many accomplishments and years of service to her students. I wish her continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO JOSIE STUMPF

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I am pleased to honor Josie Stumpf, the Volusia County Teacher of the Year at Holly Hill School in Holly Hill, FL.

Josie teaches fifth grade and has taught in Volusia County for nearly 20 years. She credits her success to Daytona Beach mayor Derrick Henry, who was her 11th grade teacher. She says Mayor Henry changed the course of her life, as it was not until she was in his class, where music and energy were incorporated into his lessons, that she realized learning could be fun. This motivated her to inspire others in the same way that he inspired her.

Josie strives to keep learning fun. An example of her creative teaching includes transforming her classroom to mimic a campground, a cafe, and many other different environments to better engage her students in the learning process.

Josie's colleagues admire her seemingly natural ability to relate to students, which has inspired them to follow her lead. Josie's enthusiasm for education extends beyond her own classroom, where she has been known to develop curriculum modules for language arts and regularly helps other teachers.

I extend my best wishes and gratitude to Josie for her dedication to students for nearly two decades, and I look forward to hearing of her continued success in the years to come.●

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Ms. Ridgway, one of his secretaries.

PRESIDENTIAL MESSAGE

REPORT RELATIVE TO THE CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO TRANSNATIONAL CRIMINAL ORGANIZATIONS THAT WAS ESTABLISHED IN EXECUTIVE ORDER 13581 ON JULY 24, 2011—PM 55

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days before the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency with respect to transnational criminal organizations declared in Executive Order 13581 of July 24, 2011, is to continue in effect beyond July 24, 2020.

The activities of significant transnational criminal organizations have reached such scope and gravity that they threaten the stability of international political and economic systems. Such organizations are becoming increasingly sophisticated and dangerous to the United States; they are increasingly entrenched in the operations of foreign governments and the international financial system, thereby weakening democratic institutions, degrading the rule of law, and undermining economic markets. These organizations facilitate and aggravate violent civil conflicts and increasingly facilitate the activities of other dangerous persons.

The activities of significant transnational criminal organizations continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States. For these reasons, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13581 with respect to transnational criminal organizations.

DONALD J. TRUMP.
THE WHITE HOUSE, July 22, 2020.

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

At 11:30 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bills:

S. 4148. An act to extend the Chemical Facility Anti-Terrorism Standards Program of the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes.

S. 4209. An act to amend title IX of the Social Security Act to improve emergency unemployment relief for governmental entities and nonprofit organizations.

The enrolled bills were subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. GRASSLEY).

At 5:58 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the text of the bill (H.R. 1957) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to mod-

ernize and improve the Internal Revenue Service, and for other purposes, and that the House has agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the title of the aforementioned bill.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, July 22, 2020, she had presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 4148. An act to extend the Chemical Facility Anti-Terrorism Standards Program of the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes.

S. 4209. An act to amend title IX of the Social Security Act to improve emergency unemployment relief for governmental entities and nonprofit organizations.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-5072. A communication from the Secretary of the Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Prohibitions and Restrictions on Proprietary Trading and Certain Interests in, and Relationships With, Hedge Funds and Private Equity Funds" (RIN3235-AM70) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 10, 2020; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-5073. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Relief for Taxpayers Affected by Ongoing Coronavirus Disease Pandemic, Related to Sport Fishing Equipment and Bows and Arrows Excise Tax Filing and Payment Deadlines" (Notice 2020-48) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 8, 2020; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-5074. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Notice: COVID-19 Relief and Other Guidance on Mid-Year Reductions or Suspensions of Contributions to Safe Harbor statute 401(k) and statute 401(m) Plans" (Notice 2020-52) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 8, 2020; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-5075. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Carryback of Consolidated Net Operating Losses" ((RIN1545-BP84) (TD 9900)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 15, 2020; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-5076. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Vice Admiral Richard A. Brown, United States Navy, and his advancement to the grade of vice admiral on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-5077. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Manpower), transmitting a report on the approved retirement of General Terrence J.

O'Shaughnessy, United States Air Force, and his advancement to the grade of general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-5078. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Manpower), transmitting a report on the approved retirement of General James L. Lengyel, Air National Guard of the United States, and his advancement to the grade of general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-5079. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Manpower), transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General James C. Vechery, United States Air Force, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-5080. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Manpower), transmitting a report on the approved retirement of General James M. Holmes, United States Air Force, and his advancement to the grade of general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-5081. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Manpower), transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Thomas C. Seamands, United States Army, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-5082. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Manpower), transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Bruce T. Crawford, United States Army, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-5083. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Manpower), transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Joseph L. Osterman, United States Marine Corps, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-5084. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Manpower), transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Michael A. Rocco, United States Marine Corps, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-5085. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Manpower), transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Vice Admiral Thomas J. Moore, United States Navy, and his advancement to the grade of vice admiral on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-5086. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Manpower), transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Todd T. Semonite, United States Army, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-5087. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Manpower), transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Thomas W. Bergeson, United States Air Force, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-5088. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Manpower), transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Vice Admiral David H.

Lewis, United States Navy, and his advancement to the grade of vice admiral on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-5089. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Manpower), transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Major General Timothy J. Kadavy, Army National Guard of the United States, and his advancement to the grade of major general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-5090. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Manpower), transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General John J. Broadmeadow, United States Marine Corps, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-5091. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of an officer authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of lieutenant general in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777a, this will not cause the Department to exceed the number of frocked officers authorized; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-5092. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of an officer authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of lieutenant general in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777a, this will not cause the Department to exceed the number of frocked officers authorized; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-5093. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of nine (9) officers authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of brigadier general in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777, this will not cause the Department to exceed the number of frocked officers authorized; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-5094. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of an officer authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of rear admiral in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777, this will not cause the Department to exceed the number of frocked officers authorized; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-5095. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of five (5) officers authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of rear admiral or rear admiral (lower half) in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777, this will not cause the Department to exceed the number of frocked officers authorized; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-5096. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of an officer authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of major general in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777, this will not cause the Department to exceed the number of frocked officers authorized; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-5097. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of twelve (12) officers authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of rear admiral (lower half) in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777, this will not cause the Department to exceed the number of frocked officers authorized; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-5098. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of fifteen (15)

officers authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of brigadier general in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777, this will not cause the Department to exceed the number of frocked officers authorized; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-5099. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of three (3) officers authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of brigadier general in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777, this will not cause the Department to exceed the number of frocked officers authorized; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-5100. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of three (3) officers authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of rear admiral (lower half) in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777, this will not cause the Department to exceed the number of frocked officers authorized; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-5101. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of an officer authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of brigadier general in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777a, this will not cause the Department to exceed the number of frocked officers authorized; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-5102. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of twenty (20) officers authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of brigadier general in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777, this will not cause the Department to exceed the number of frocked officers authorized; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-5103. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of two (2) officers authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of major general or brigadier general in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777, this will not cause the Department to exceed the number of frocked officers authorized; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-5104. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of six (6) officers authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of major general or brigadier general in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777, this will not cause the Department to exceed the number of frocked officers authorized; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-5105. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of an officer authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of brigadier general in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777a, this will not cause the Department to exceed the number of frocked officers authorized; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-5106. A communication from the Secretary of the Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendments to Procedures with Respect to Applications Under the Investment Company Act of 1940" (RIN3235-AM51) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 10, 2020; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-5107. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary of State, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Convention on Cultural Property Implementation Act, a report relative to extending and amending the agreement between the Government of the United

States of America and the Government of the Republic of Nicaragua; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-5108. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Convention on Cultural Property Implementation Act, a report relative to actions taken from 2012-2018 to conclude new cultural property agreements with Belize, Bulgaria, Egypt, and Libya, and to extend agreements with Bolivia, Cambodia, China, Colombia, Cyprus, El Salvador, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Italy, Mali, Nicaragua, and Peru; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-5109. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Convention on Cultural Property Implementation Act, a report relative to actions taken from 2012-2018 to conclude new cultural property agreements with Belize, Bulgaria, Egypt, and Libya, and to extend agreements with Bolivia, Cambodia, China, Colombia, Cyprus, El Salvador, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Italy, Mali, Nicaragua, and Peru; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-5110. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Federal Election Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from October 1, 2019 through March 31, 2020; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-5111. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 23-217, "Comprehensive Plan Framework Amendment Act of 2019"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-5112. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 23-323, "COVID-19 Response Supplemental Temporary Amendment Act of 2020"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-5113. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 23-333, "Medical Marijuana Program Patient Employment Protection Temporary Amendment Act of 2020"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-5114. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 23-334, "Coronavirus Support Temporary Amendment Act of 2020"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-5115. A communication from the Principal Deputy Assistant, Directorate of Standards and Guidance, Department of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revising the Beryllium Standard for General Industry" (RIN1218-ADZ0) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 14, 2020; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. WICKER, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 2525. A bill to require the Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology to conduct a study of personal protec-

tive equipment worn by firefighters to determine the prevalence and concentration of per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WICKER for the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

*Michael P. O'Rielly, of New York, to be a Member of the Federal Communications Commission for a term of five years from July 1, 2019.

*Joel Szabat, of Maryland, to be Under Secretary of Transportation for Policy.

*Mary A. Toman, of California, to be Under Secretary of Commerce for Economic Affairs.

*Michael J. Walsh, Jr., of Virginia, to be General Counsel of the Department of Commerce.

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, for the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation I report favorably the following nomination lists which were printed in the RECORDS on the dates indicated, and ask unanimous consent, to save the expense of reprinting on the Executive Calendar that these nominations lie at the Secretary's desk for the information of Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

*Coast Guard nomination of Peter H. Imbriale, to be Lieutenant.

*Coast Guard nominations beginning with Nicholas C. Custer and ending with Nicole L. Blanchard, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 17, 2020.

By Mr. JOHNSON for the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

*Elizabeth J. Shapiro, of the District of Columbia, to be an Associate Judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia for the term of fifteen years.

*Mark A. Robbins, of the District of Columbia, to be an Associate Judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia for the term of fifteen years.

*Carl Ezekiel Ross, of the District of Columbia, to be an Associate Judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia for the term of fifteen years.

*Derek Kan, of California, to be Deputy Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 4258. A bill to establish a grant program for small live venue operators and talent representatives; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina (for himself and Mr. WARNER):

S. 4259. A bill to codify a statutory definition for long-term care pharmacies; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MENENDEZ:

S. 4260. A bill to promote access to mortgage credit during the COVID-19 pandemic by preventing restrictions on providing Federal backing for single-family mortgage loans in forbearance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. PERDUE:

S. 4261. A bill to establish a grant program to assist elementary and secondary schools with reopening after closures related to COVID-19, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. SMITH, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. ROSEN, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. WARNER, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 4262. A bill to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to develop an action plan, make targeted grants, and develop public awareness campaigns with respect to COVID-19 and the disproportionate impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on racial and ethnic minorities and other vulnerable populations; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. JONES, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. COONS, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. CASEY, Mr. Kaine, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. REED, Mr. BROWN, Ms. SMITH, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. HASSAN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. KING, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. WARNER, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. UDALL, Mr. BENNET, Mr. SCHATZ, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. WARREN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. TESTER, Mr. PETERS, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. MURKOWSKI, and Mr. MANCHIN):

S. 4263. A bill to amend the Voting Rights Act of 1965 to revise the criteria for determining which States and political subdivisions are subject to section 4 of the Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAHAM (for himself, Mrs. CAPITO, and Mr. ROUNDS):

S. 4264. A bill to require personal protective equipment to be acquired from domestic producers for the Strategic National Stockpile; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. LEE:

S. 4265. A bill to amend the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 to require the submission of certain reports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. CRUZ:

S. 4266. A bill to provide civil liability for injuries in law enforcement free zones, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRUZ (for himself, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. RUBIO, and Mr. DURBIN):

S. 4267. A bill to designate the area between the intersections of 16th Street, Northwest and Fuller Street, Northwest and 16th Street, Northwest and Euclid Street, Northwest in Washington, District of Columbia, as "Oswaldo Paya Way"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Ms. HASSAN (for herself and Mr. BURR):

S. 4268. A bill to improve coordination between the paycheck protection program and employee retention tax credit; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. Kaine (for himself and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. 4269. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve maternal health and promote safe motherhood; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. TILLIS:

S. 4270. A bill to amend the CARES Act to ensure that the temporary relief from CECL standards does not terminate in the middle of a company's fiscal year; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. Kaine (for himself and Mr. WARNER):

S. 4271. A bill to reform Federal firearms laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RISCH (for himself, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. ROMNEY, and Mr. YOUNG):

S. 4272. A bill to advance a policy for managed strategic competition with the People's Republic of China; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Ms. HARRIS (for herself and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 4273. A bill to amend the Rosie the Riveter/World War II Home Front National Historical Park Establishment Act of 2000 to provide for additional areas to be added to the park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. PAUL:

S. 4274. A bill to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to exclude discounts for covered part D drugs from the anti-kickback prohibition, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. THUNE (for himself and Mr. ENZI):

S. 4275. A bill to require recipients of Pandemic Unemployment Assistance to provide employment documentation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WARNER (for himself and Mr. DAINES):

S. 4276. A bill to require the Secretary of Labor to establish a program for providing portable benefits to eligible workers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MARKEY:

S. 4277. A bill to amend the Toxic Substances Control Act to reauthorize healthy high-performance schools, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. MARKEY:

S. 4278. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to carry out a grant program to support efforts to provide fare-free transit service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself and Mr. BENNET):

S. 4279. A bill to require the disclosure to Congress of presidential emergency action documents; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. MARKEY:

S. 4280. A bill to reduce the health risks of heat by authorizing the National Integrated Heat Health Information System Interagency Committee to improve extreme heat preparedness and response, requiring a study, and establishing a grant program to address heat effects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. GRASSLEY:

S. 4281. A bill to require a report to Congress on certain efforts in connection with the financial management systems of the Department of Defense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MANCHIN (for himself and Mr. GARDNER):

S. 4282. A bill to amend the Community Mental Health Service Block Grant to authorize a set-aside for crisis care services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. CASEY, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, and Ms. ROSEN):

S. 4283. A bill to provide funding for States to improve their unemployment insurance technology systems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mr. CRUZ):

S. 4284. A bill to provide for emergency education freedom grants, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish tax credits to encourage individual and corporate taxpayers to contribute to scholarships for students through eligible scholarship-granting organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MANCHIN (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. CRAPO, and Mr. TESTER):

S. 4285. A bill to establish a pilot program through which the Institute of Museum and Library Services shall allocate funds to States for the provision of Internet-connected devices to libraries; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. PETERS, and Mr. GARDNER):

S. 4286. A bill to authorize appropriations for offsetting the costs related to reductions in research productivity resulting from the coronavirus pandemic; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. MORAN (for himself, Mr. TESTER, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Mr. ROUNDS):

S. 4287. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish presumptions of service-connection for members of the Armed Forces who contract Coronavirus Disease 2019 under certain circumstances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TESTER:

S. 4288. A bill to establish the Badger-Two Medicine Cultural Heritage Area in the State of Montana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. YOUNG (for himself, Mrs. CAPITO, and Mr. KING):

S. 4289. A bill to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to collect, analyze, and report qualitative and quantitative data on the use of telehealth during the COVID-19 public health emergency; to the Committee on Finance.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. CARPER, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. BENNET, Ms. SMITH, Mr. CARDIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. WARREN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. HIRONO, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. Kaine, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. CASEY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. REED, Ms. STABENOW, and Mr. KING):

S. Res. 655. A resolution declaring racism a public health crisis; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. STABENOW (for herself, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. KING, and Ms. COLLINS):

S. Res. 656. A resolution recognizing the importance of the blueberry industry to the United States and designating July 2020 as "National Blueberry Month"; to the Committee on the Judiciary

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 92

At the request of Mr. PAUL, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 92, a bill to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that major rules of the executive branch shall have no force or effect unless a joint resolution of approval is enacted into law.

S. 159

At the request of Mr. PAUL, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 159, a bill to implement equal protection under the 14th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States for the right to life of each born and preborn human person.

S. 350

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 350, a bill to restore the application of the Federal antitrust laws to the business of health insurance to protect competition and consumers.

S. 549

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 549, a bill to modernize voter registration, promote access to voting for individuals with disabilities, protect the ability of individuals to exercise the right to vote in elections for Federal office, and for other purposes.

S. 633

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 633, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the members of the Women's Army Corps who were assigned to the 6888th Central Postal Directory Battalion, known as the "Six Triple Eight".

S. 1067

At the request of Ms. HARRIS, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1067, a bill to provide for research to better understand the causes and consequences of sexual harassment affecting individuals in the scientific, technical, engineering, and mathematics workforce and to examine policies to reduce the prevalence and negative impact of such harassment, and for other purposes.

S. 1197

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1197, a bill to amend the

Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish a tax credit for construction of new all-electric homes.

S. 1210

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1210, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase and make permanent the exclusion for benefits provided to volunteer firefighters and emergency medical responders.

S. 1703

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1703, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reform the low-income housing credit, and for other purposes.

S. 1964

At the request of Ms. HIRONO, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1964, a bill to support educational entities in fully implementing title IX and reducing and preventing sex discrimination in all areas of education, and for other purposes.

S. 2579

At the request of Ms. HIRONO, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2579, a bill to direct the Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy to carry out programs and activities to ensure that Federal science agencies and institutions of higher education receiving Federal research and development funding are fully engaging their entire talent pool, and for other purposes.

S. 2815

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) and the Senator from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG) were added as cosponsors of S. 2815, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the National Purple Heart Honor Mission.

S. 2882

At the request of Ms. HARRIS, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2882, a bill to establish a community wildfire defense grant program, and for other purposes.

S. 2886

At the request of Ms. MCSALLY, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2886, a bill to prohibit the use of animal testing for cosmetics and the sale of cosmetics tested on animals.

S. 3176

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3176, a bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and the United States-Israel Strategic Partnership Act of 2014 to make improvements to certain defense and security assist-

ance provisions and to authorize the appropriations of funds to Israel, and for other purposes.

S. 3328

At the request of Ms. ROSEN, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 3328, a bill to award grants to States to establish or improve, and carry out, Seal of Biliteracy programs to recognize high-level student proficiency in speaking, reading, and writing in both English and a second language.

S. 3559

At the request of Mr. BENNET, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3559, a bill to provide emergency financial assistance to rural health care facilities and providers impacted by the COVID-19 emergency.

S. 3606

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3606, a bill to provide for the establishment of a Health Force and a Resilience Force to respond to public health emergencies and meet public health needs.

S. 3693

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3693, a bill to amend the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 to foster efficient markets and increase competition and transparency among packers that purchase livestock from producers.

S. 3745

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) were added as cosponsors of S. 3745, a bill to direct the Secretary of Education to provide relief to borrowers of student loans for whom the Department of Education found misrepresentation by the institution of higher education or a State attorney general has asserted a right to borrower defense discharge.

S. 3814

At the request of Mr. BENNET, the names of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN), the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) and the Senator from Utah (Mr. ROMNEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 3814, a bill to establish a loan program for businesses affected by COVID-19 and to extend the loan forgiveness period for paycheck protection program loans made to the hardest hit businesses, and for other purposes.

S. 3819

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a co-

sponsor of S. 3819, a bill to encourage the protection and promotion of internationally recognized human rights during the novel coronavirus pandemic, and for other purposes.

S. 3840

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3840, a bill to protect the continuity of the food supply chain of the United States in response to COVID-19, and for other purposes.

S. 3855

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3855, a bill to ensure ethical and accountable use of COVID-19 relief funds, to prevent corruption and bias in the disbursement and supervision of those funds, and for other purposes.

S. 3886

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 3886, a bill to prohibit the use of funds for an explosive nuclear weapons test.

S. 3995

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3995, a bill to limit the authority of States or other taxing jurisdictions to tax certain income of employees for employment duties performed in other States or taxing jurisdictions, and for other purposes.

S. 3997

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. ROMNEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3997, a bill to strengthen the security and integrity of the United States scientific and research enterprise.

S. 4014

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4014, a bill to provide for supplemental loans under the Paycheck Protection Program.

S. 4019

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4019, a bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to designate Juneteenth National Independence Day as a legal public holiday.

S. 4084

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the names of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) were added as cosponsors of S. 4084, a bill to prohibit biometric surveillance by the Federal Government without explicit statutory authorization and to withhold certain Federal public safety grants from State and local governments that engage in biometric surveillance.

S. 4089

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4089, a bill to amend title 11, United States Code, to improve protections for employees and retirees in business bankruptcies.

S. 4117

At the request of Mr. CRAMER, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4117, a bill to provide automatic forgiveness for paycheck protection program loans under \$150,000, and for other purposes.

S. 4150

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4150, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to provide assistance to certain providers of transportation services affected by the novel coronavirus.

S. 4158

At the request of Mr. HAWLEY, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4158, a bill to examine the extent of the reliance of the United States on foreign producers for personal protective equipment during the COVID-19 pandemic and produce recommendations to secure the supply chain of personal protective equipment.

S. 4162

At the request of Mrs. FISCHER, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4162, a bill to provide certainty for airport funding.

S. 4172

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4172, a bill to provide emergency funding for child welfare services provided under parts B and E of title IV of the Social Security Act, and for other purposes.

S. 4182

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Ms. ERNST) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4182, a bill to provide nursing homes with resources for responding to the COVID-19 public health emergency to protect the health and safety of residents and workers, to reauthorize funding for programs under the Elder Justice Act of 2009, and for other purposes.

S. 4190

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4190, a bill to authorize the Director of the United States Geological Survey to establish a regional program to assess, monitor, and benefit the hydrology of saline lakes in the Great Basin and the migratory birds and other wildlife dependent on those habitats, and for other purposes.

S. 4193

At the request of Mr. PETERS, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr.

MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4193, a bill to develop and nationally disseminate accurate, relevant, and accessible resources to promote understanding about African-American history.

S. 4204

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4204, a bill to establish an Interagency Task Force to analyze preparedness for national pandemics, and for other purposes.

S. 4220

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the names of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) were added as cosponsors of S. 4220, a bill to limit the use of Federal law enforcement officers for crowd control, and for other purposes.

S. 4230

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4230, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to expand access to mental health services and certain evaluation and management services furnished through telehealth under the Medicare program.

S. 4233

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4233, a bill to establish a payment program for unexpected loss of markets and revenues to timber harvesting and timber hauling businesses due to the COVID-19 pandemic, and for other purposes.

S. 4248

At the request of Ms. HARRIS, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4248, a bill to establish a grant program to provide funds for health care entities to establish or improve bias and anti-racism training to help reduce racial and ethnic disparities in COVID-19 testing, treatment, health outcomes, and vaccine access.

S. 4252

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 4252, a bill to provide funding for States to improve their unemployment compensation programs, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 509

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. HAWLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 509, a resolution calling upon the United Nations Security Council to adopt a resolution on Iran that extends the dates by which Annex B restrictions under Resolution 2231 are currently set to expire.

S. RES. 578

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN), the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) and the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 578, a resolution condemning the Government of Iran's state-sponsored persecution of its Baha'i minority and its continued violation of the International Covenants on Human Rights.

AMENDMENT NO. 1885

At the request of Mr. ROMNEY, the names of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. SASSE) and the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1885 intended to be proposed to S. 4049, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2051

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2051 intended to be proposed to S. 4049, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2328

At the request of Mr. YOUNG, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2328 intended to be proposed to S. 4049, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2352

At the request of Mr. HAWLEY, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mrs. LOEFFLER) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2352 intended to be proposed to S. 4049, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2433

At the request of Mr. MANCHIN, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2433 intended to be proposed to S. 4049, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of

the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2435

At the request of Mr. VAN HOLLEN, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2435 intended to be proposed to S. 4049, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2437

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 2437 intended to be proposed to S. 4049, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2441

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2441 intended to be proposed to S. 4049, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2451

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the names of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) and the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 2451 intended to be proposed to S. 4049, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2457

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the names of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 2457 intended to be proposed to S. 4049, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION

By Mr. KAINE (for himself and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. 4269. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve maternal health and promote safe motherhood; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President. There are significant racial and ethnic inequities in maternal and infant mortality rates in the U.S. According to the CDC, the maternal mortality rate for non-Hispanic Black women in 2018 is more than 2.5 times higher than the maternal mortality rate of non-Hispanic white women, and the infant mortality rate of non-Hispanic Black women is more than 2.3 times higher than the infant mortality rate of non-Hispanic white women. Any pregnant woman choosing to have a child should be able to do so safely without regard to income, race, ethnicity, employment status, or any other socio-economic factor.

This is why Senator MURKOWSKI and I are introducing the Mothers and Newborns Success Act, which aims to reduce maternal and infant mortality, ensure that all infants can grow up healthy and safe, and protect women's health before, during, and after pregnancy. Our legislation supports innovation in maternal health delivery and improves data collection on maternal mortality and maternal deaths. The bill will help ensure that women are matched with birthing facilities that are risk-appropriate for their particular needs to improve maternal and neonatal care and outcomes. The legislation strengthens support for women during the critical postpartum period, the year after birth, and will help ensure pregnant women get the vaccinations they need and are aware of maternal health warning signs. The bill promotes maternal health research and the use of telehealth to help high-risk expectant mothers in geographically isolated areas. The Mothers and Newborns Success Act is a significant step toward reducing racial, ethnic, and geographic inequities in maternal and infant health. I am glad that my colleague Rep. Terri Sewell will be introducing companion legislation in the House of Representatives.

Given COVID-19's disproportionate impact on communities of color and recent research from the CDC which finds that pregnant women with COVID-19 are more likely to be hospitalized and admitted to the ICU, this legislation is especially timely.

No woman should fear for her or her child's health because of her race. We need to ensure more women of color and their children, particularly Black women and children, receive equitable care. COVID-19 and its impact on pregnant women has only underscored the need for urgent action. By advancing evidence-based policies to improve maternal and infant health outcomes, this bill will work to reduce and eliminate

preventable maternal and infant mortality in the United States. I'm calling on my Senate colleagues to support this bill and include it in the next coronavirus relief package so we can enact positive systemic changes to make sure more women and newborns thrive and have the maximum chance for success.

By Mr. THUNE (for himself and Mr. ENZI):

S. 4275. A bill to require recipients of Pandemic Unemployment Assistance to provide employment documentation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 4275

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Pandemic Unemployment Assistance Integrity Act".

SEC. 2. PANDEMIC UNEMPLOYMENT ASSISTANCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2102(a) of the Relief for Workers Affected by Coronavirus Act (contained in subtitle A of title II of division A of the CARES Act (Public Law 116-136)) is amended—

- (1) in paragraph (3)—
- (A) in subparagraph (A)—
- (i) in clause (i), by striking "and" at the end; and
- (ii) by inserting after clause (ii) the following:

"(iii) provides documentation substantiating employment or self-employment or the planned commencement of employment or self-employment not later than 21 days after the date on which the individual submits an application for assistance under this section or is directed by the State Agency to submit such documentation or has shown good cause under the applicable State law for failing to submit such documentation by the deadline, in accordance with section 625.6(e) of title 20, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor thereto, except that such documentation shall not be required if the individual previously submitted such information to the State agency for the purpose of obtaining regular or other unemployment compensation; and"; and

- (B) in subparagraph (B)—
- (i) in clause (i), by striking "or" at the end;

- (ii) in clause (ii), by striking the period at the end and inserting "or"; and

- (iii) by adding at the end the following:

"(iii) in accordance with section 625.6(e)(2) of title 20, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor thereto, an individual who does not provide documentation substantiating employment or self-employment or the planned commencement of employment or self-employment under subparagraph (A)(iii).";

- (2) by redesignating paragraphs (4) and (5) as paragraphs (5) and (6), respectively; and

- (3) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following:

"(4) DOCUMENTATION SUBSTANTIATING EMPLOYMENT OR SELF-EMPLOYMENT OR THE PLANNED COMMENCEMENT OF EMPLOYMENT OR SELF-EMPLOYMENT.—The term 'documentation substantiating employment or self-employment or the planned commencement of

employment or self-employment' means documentation provided by the individual substantiating employment or self-employment and wages earned or paid for such employment or self-employment, or such information related to the planned commencement of employment or self-employment.'".

(b) APPLICABILITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Beginning not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, each State shall require that documentation substantiating employment or self-employment or the planned commencement of employment or self-employment (as defined in section 2102 of the Relief for Workers Affected by Coronavirus Act (contained in subtitle A of title II of division A of the CARES Act (Public Law 116-136)) be submitted by any individual who applies for pandemic unemployment assistance under section 2102 of the Relief for Workers Affected by Coronavirus Act (contained in subtitle A of title II of division A of the CARES Act (Public Law 116-136)) on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) PRIOR APPLICANTS.—Any individual who applied for pandemic unemployment assistance under section 2102 of the Relief for Workers Affected by Coronavirus Act (contained in subtitle A of title II of division A of the CARES Act (Public Law 116-136)) before the date of enactment of this Act and receives such assistance on or after the date of enactment of this Act shall submit documentation substantiating employment or self-employment or the planned commencement of employment or self-employment (as defined in such section 2102) not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act or the individual will be ineligible to receive pandemic unemployment assistance under such section 2102.

By Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina
(for himself, Mr. ALEXANDER,
and Mr. CRUZ):

S. 4284. A bill to provide for emergency education freedom grants, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish tax credits to encourage individual and corporate taxpayers to contribute to scholarships for students through eligible scholarship-granting organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, today, Senator TIM SCOTT of South Carolina and I have introduced the School Choice Now Act, which does two things: It protects students who have been attending private schools from the heartbreaking loss of scholarships, and it gives families more options for their children's education at a time that school is more important than ever.

I have been working to find ways to help parents pursue the education that best meets their child's needs for a long time, since 1979, when I began to be the Governor of Tennessee.

In 1986, we Governors got together in something called Time for Results. I was chairman of the National Governors Association. The vice chairman was the Arkansas Governor, Bill Clinton, and we devoted the Governors' attention for an entire year to one subject—education.

There were six points. One of those points way back then was to find ways to give parents more choices of schools for their children.

Then, later on, in 1992, when President George H.W. Bush was in office and I was Education Secretary, I helped the President develop something we called the GI Bill for Kids, which was Federal funds for a \$1,000 scholarship to work with cities and States, like Milwaukee in Wisconsin, that were trying to give low-income families more choices of good schools for their children.

Then, my last act as Education Secretary was to notice what they call start-from-scratch schools in Minnesota, created by the Democratic-Farmer-Labor Party. There were about a dozen of them, as I remember, and I wrote every school district in the country and asked them to start one of these start-from-scratch schools, which were the forerunners of today's public charter schools. Today, we have 7,500 public charter schools.

Then, in 2004, I tried something I called the Pell Grant for Kids, a \$500 scholarship that would follow every middle- and low-income child in America to an accredited program of their choosing.

Some people said: Wait a minute. You can't call the Pell grant a voucher.

I said: That is precisely what the Pell grant is. The Pell grant is a voucher that a college student can take to any accredited college—public, private, or religious. Why can't we do that for elementary and secondary schools?

In 2005, we had a hurricane named Katrina, creating devastation on the gulf coast, and Senator Ted Kennedy and I and Senator Landrieu and others worked together to provide 1.2 billion Federal dollars in one-time emergency assistance for the 2005-2006 school year so students enrolled in public or non-public schools—children who were displaced by the hurricane—could enroll in public or private schools while their families recovered. They got scholarships of up to \$6,000.

And, more recently, I suggested a Scholarship for Kids Act. I said: Why don't we give a State like Tennessee, Ohio, or North Dakota, the opportunity to take most of the Federal dollars and turn them into scholarships for the lowest income students in their State? That scholarship would amount to \$2,100 if we just took the existing money we had and spent it that way.

So that is the strategy that we followed in this country for many, many years, ever since 1944, with the GI bill for veterans.

We all remember what that was. The veterans came home and a grateful nation gave them a scholarship and said: Take it anywhere you want, to any college or accredited school. Take it to Notre Dame, take it to Yeshiva, take it to a historically Black college, take it to Ohio State, take it to Tennessee, take it to the Presbyterian school.

And they have done that, and the GI bill may be one of the most certainly successful pieces of legislation ever enacted.

Last year, there were over \$28 billion in Federal Pell grants and more than

\$91 billion in Federal loans that followed students to public and private colleges of their choice.

Now, the Federal Government also provides vouchers to help pay for childcare. The Child Care and Development Block Grant was negotiated by John Sununu when he was Chief of Staff for H.W. Bush in 1990, and what that does is basically give money to States, and States then give vouchers, just like Pell grants for college, but they give them to working moms, and they can go pick the childcare center that is best for their child.

The Federal Government, in 2019, provided \$8.7 billion and States another \$1.2 to provide vouchers to 1.3 million children.

So I think you can see where I am going with this. It is that the idea of giving parents choices of schools is not a new idea. We have done it in colleges since 1944. We do it with childcare. We do it in community colleges. Why not do it for elementary and secondary education? Why not give low-income families more of the same choices of good schools that wealthy families have?

Now, during COVID-19, children in all K-12 schools have been affected by the disease. There are 100,000 public schools across our country serving 50 million students. That are another 35,000 private schools serving 5 million students. Many of those schools, public and private, are choosing not to reopen in person this fall.

Many schools are failing to provide high-quality distance learning. The students who will suffer the most from this are the low-income children—the children from families where both parents work away from home every day or where the only parent works away from home every day, children with no internet, families who can't afford to put a child in a private school if the public school is not open.

These are the parents who have the greatest need and the children who have the greatest need. We should address that need as we think about how to deal with COVID-19.

Just as more families need more options, there are fewer scholarships available to help them choose private schools because there has been less charitable giving as a result of the pandemic.

So for low-income students attending private schools on a scholarship, that can mean a heartbreaking end to their time at school and a transfer to a new school that may not meet their needs at all.

That is why Senator SCOTT and I and others of us recommend that Congress first provide sufficient funding for all of our schools—100,000 public schools and 35,000 private—so they can safely open this fall with as many students physically present as possible.

I have suggested that the cost of this to the taxpayers could be as much as \$70 billion. The House of Representatives has appropriated \$58 billion.

If Congress were to agree on the higher number, \$70 billion, that would be about \$1,200 for every one of the 55 million public and private school students in the country.

The School Choice Now Act that Senator SCOTT and I are offering is about the 5.7 million of those 55 million children who attend the 35,000 nonpublic, private, or religious schools. It provides scholarships to students to have the opportunity to return to the private school they attended before the pandemic and gives other students a new opportunity to attend private school by doing two things: One, providing one-time emergency funding for scholarship-granting organizations. These are nonprofits that do the important work of helping students attend private schools in each State. These scholarship-granting organizations will use this one-time funding to provide families with direct educational assistance, including private school tuition as well as homeschooling expenses.

No. 2, this act would provide permanent dollar-for-dollar Federal tax credits for contributions to those scholarship-granting organizations. What this means is that any American taxpayer who makes a charitable donation to one of these nonprofits that provide scholarships to students will receive a credit on their Federal taxes equal to the amount the taxpayer donated. The same goes for private companies that make donations to these organizations.

The School Choice Now Act is not a Federal mandate. States are free to create their own tax credit scholarship programs that work for the unique needs of students in their States. States that don't want to support scholarships to private schools are not required to accept these funds. They can be returned to the Secretary, and the funds will be redistributed to States that want the funds.

This bill is about one of the great principles of what it means to be an American: the principle of equal opportunity. For me, equal opportunity means creating an environment in which the largest number of people can begin at the starting line. When everyone is at the starting line in America, anything is possible. Giving children more opportunity to attend a better school is the real answer to inequality in America.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 655—DECLARING RACISM A PUBLIC HEALTH CRISIS

Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. CARPER, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. BENNET, Ms. SMITH, Mr. CARDIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. WARREN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. HIRONO, Mrs.

MURRAY, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. KAINE, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. CASEY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. REED, Ms. STABENOW, and Mr. KING) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. RES. 655

Whereas the United States ratified over 350 treaties with sovereign indigenous communities, has broken the promises made in such treaties, and has historically failed to carry out its trust responsibilities to Native Americans, including American Indians, Alaska Natives, and Native Hawaiians, as made evident by the chronic and pervasive underfunding of the Indian Health Service and Tribal, Urban Indian, and Native Hawaiian health care, the vast health and socioeconomic disparities faced by Native American people, and the inaccessibility of many Federal public health and social programs in Native American communities;

Whereas people of Mexican and Puerto Rican descent, who became Americans through conquest, were subject to, but never full members of the polity of the United States and experienced widespread discrimination in employment, housing, education, and health care;

Whereas the immoral paradox of slavery and freedom is an indelible wrong traced throughout the Nation's history, as African Americans lived under the oppressive institution of slavery from 1619 through 1865, endured the practices and laws of segregation during the Jim Crow Era, and continue to face the ramifications of systemic racism through unjust and discriminatory structures and policies;

Whereas, before the enactment of the Medicare program, the United States' health care system was highly segregated, and, as late as the mid-1960s, hospitals, clinics, and doctors' offices throughout Northern and Southern States complied with Jim Crow laws and were completely segregated by race—leaving Black communities with little to no access to health care services;

Whereas, between 1956 and 1967, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) Legal Defense and Education Fund litigated a series of court cases to eliminate discrimination in hospitals and professional associations;

Whereas the landmark case *Simkins v. Moses H. Cone Memorial Hospital*, 323 F.2d 959 (1963), challenged the Federal Government's use of public funds to expand, support, and sustain segregated hospital care, and provided justification for title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act and the Medicare hospital certification program—establishing Medicare hospital racial integration guidelines that applied to every hospital that participated in the Federal program;

Whereas, in 1967, President Lyndon B. Johnson established the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders, which concluded that white racism is responsible for the pervasive discrimination and segregation in employment, education, and housing, resulting in deepened racial division and continued exclusion of Black communities from the benefits of economic progress;

Whereas language minorities, including Latinos, Asian Americans, and Pacific Islanders, were not assured non-discriminatory access to Federally-funded services, including health services, until the signing of Executive Order 13166 in 2000;

Whereas the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act included provisions to expand the Medicaid program and—for the first time in the United States—established a Federal prohibition against discrimination

on the basis of race, color, national origin, sex, age, or disability in certain health programs, building on other Federal civil rights laws;

Whereas the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act required reporting to Congress on health disparities based on race, color, national origin, sex, age, or disability;

Whereas several Federal programs have been established to address some, but not all, of the health outcomes that are disproportionately experienced by communities of color, including sickle cell disease, tuberculosis, infant mortality, and HIV/AIDS;

Whereas the National Center for Chronic Disease Prevention and Health Promotion works to raise awareness of health disparities faced by minority populations in the United States, such as Native Americans, Asian Americans, Black Americans, and Latino Americans, aiming to reduce risk factors for groups affected by such health disparities;

Whereas the United States' health care system and other economic and social structures remain fraught with racism and racial, ethnic, sex (including sexual orientation and gender identity), and class biases that lead to health inequity and health disparities;

Whereas life expectancy rates for Black and Native American people in the United States are significantly lower than those of white people in the United States;

Whereas disparities in health outcomes are exacerbated for LGBTQIA+ people of color;

Whereas disparities in health outcomes are worsened for people of color with disabilities due to bias and inequitable access to health care;

Whereas several States with higher percentages of Black, Latino, and Native American populations have not expanded their Medicaid programs—continuing to disenfranchise minority communities from access to health care to this day;

Whereas 16 States have failed to take advantage of the Federal option to expand access to Medicaid and the Children's Health Insurance Program to lawfully-residing immigrant children within the first 5 years of lawful status, and 26 States have failed to do so for similarly-situated pregnant women;

Whereas, between 2016 and 2018, the child uninsured rate increased from 4.7 percent to 5.2 percent and the Latino child uninsured rate increased from 7.7 percent to 8.1 percent, and children of color are far more likely to be uninsured than white children;

Whereas a climate of fear and confusion for immigrant families due to the public charge rule discourages such families from enrolling eligible children in Medicaid and the Children's Health Insurance Program;

Whereas Pacific Islanders from the Freely Associated States experience unique health disparities resulting from United States nuclear weapons tests on their home islands, but such people have been categorically denied access to Medicaid and other Federal health benefits;

Whereas the United States has historically facilitated outsider status toward Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders, such as the authorization of the internment of Japanese Americans during World War II, which resulted in profound economic, social, and psychological burdens for the people impacted;

Whereas the history and persistence of racist and non-scientific medical beliefs are associated with ongoing racial disparities in treatment and health outcomes;

Whereas implicit racial and ethnic biases within the health care system have an impact on the quality of care experienced by communities of color, such as the undertreatment of pain in Black patients;

Whereas the historical context of unethical practices and abuses experienced by Black

patients and research participants, such as the Tuskegee Syphilis Study, serve as symbols of the Black community's mistrust of the medical system;

Whereas women of color continue to face attacks, documented throughout history, on their prenatal, maternal, and reproductive health and rights;

Whereas enslaved Black women were forced to endure egregiously unethical and cruel treatment, as subjects of insidious medical experiments, to advance modern gynecology;

Whereas, through the late 1960s and early 1980s, physicians routinely sterilized people of color, performing excessive and medically unnecessary procedures on patients of color without their informed consent;

Whereas Black and Native American women are 2 to 4 times more likely than white women to suffer severe maternal morbidity or die of pregnancy-related complications, and implicit racial biases and lower quality care are contributing factors to the health care disparities that lead to these outcomes;

Whereas Black and Native American infants are twice as likely to die as white infants, and the Black infant mortality rate in the United States is higher than in 97 countries worldwide;

Whereas researchers have developed the analytical framework of "weathering" to describe how the constant stress of racism leads to poor health outcomes for Black Americans;

Whereas the daily experience of racism is associated with stress, depression, and anxiety, and may cause physiological reactivity or contribute to chronic health conditions;

Whereas racism is linked to mental health challenges for children and adolescents;

Whereas children of color are overrepresented in the United States child welfare system, and up to 80 percent of children in foster care enter State custody with significant mental health challenges;

Whereas disparities in educational access and attainment, along with racism experienced in the educational setting, affect the trajectory of academic achievement for children and adolescents, and ultimately impact health and racial inequities in school discipline, which has long-term consequences for children;

Whereas racism and segregation in the United States contribute to poor health outcomes by segregating Black, Latino, and Native American communities from opportunity;

Whereas, for decades, discriminatory housing practices, such as redlining, systemically excluded people of color from housing, robbing them of capital in the form of low-cost, stable mortgages and opportunities to build wealth, and the Federal government used its financial power to segregate renters in newly-built public housing;

Whereas environmental injustices, such as proximity and exposure to toxic waste or hazardous air pollutants, continue to harm the health of communities of color, low-income communities, and Indigenous communities around the Nation;

Whereas social inequities such as differing access to quality health care, healthy food and safe drinking water, safe neighborhoods, education, job security, and reliable transportation affect health risks and outcomes;

Whereas, during the COVID-19 pandemic, the effects of racism and discrimination are seen in COVID-19 infection, hospitalization, and mortality rates—disproportionately high among Black, Latino, and Native American populations compared to the overall population—exacerbating health disparities and highlighting barriers to care for Black,

Latino, and Native American patients across the United States;

Whereas, because of racial and ethnic disparities, people of color are more likely to have pre-existing, preventable, and chronic conditions, which lead to higher COVID-19 morbidity and mortality rates;

Whereas people of color are overrepresented in the number of people in the United States living under poor air quality conditions, which can increase the likelihood of COVID-19 morbidity and mortality;

Whereas the COVID-19 pandemic has worsened barriers for Black, Latino, and Native American households that suffer from disproportionately higher rates of food insecurity;

Whereas Black and Latino workers make up a disproportionate number of frontline workers, are less likely to receive paid sick leave or have the ability to work from home, and have been excluded from many forms of relief readily available to other groups;

Whereas people of color are disproportionately impacted by the criminal justice and immigration enforcement systems and face a higher risk of contracting COVID-19 within prison populations and detention centers due to the over-incarceration of people of color;

Whereas, during the COVID-19 pandemic, an increased use of anti-Asian rhetoric has resulted in Asian Americans being harassed, assaulted, and scapegoated for the pandemic;

Whereas communities of color continue to bear the burdens of inequitable social, economic, and criminal justice policies, practices, and investments that cause deep disparities, hurt, harm, danger, and mistrust;

Whereas over 40 percent of Latinos report being discriminated against or harassed because they are Hispanic;

Whereas approximately 24 percent of the Latino population in the United States identifies as "Afro-Latino" and is thus potentially subject to both race and national origin discrimination;

Whereas, because of racism, Black people in the United States share a unique set of challenges and experiences that require heightened levels of awareness and risk while performing everyday tasks—such as jogging in neighborhoods, driving while Black, or playing in a park—that are not experienced by other populations;

Whereas Black people in the United States are 3 times more likely to be killed by police than white people in the United States, and police violence is the 6th leading cause of death for young Black men;

Whereas the police brutality and violence experienced by Black people in the United States adversely impacts mental health among Black communities;

Whereas Black communities led the Nation in mourning the killings of Ahmaud Arbery, Breonna Taylor, George Floyd, Elijah McClain, and countless other Black Americans—calling for justice and long-term changes to dismantle systems of oppression;

Whereas throughout our Nation's history, people of color have been at the forefront of civil rights movements for essential freedoms, human rights, and equal protection for marginalized groups and continue to fight for racial and economic justice today;

Whereas a public health issue is defined as meeting the following 4 criteria:

(1) The condition affects many people, is seen as a threat to the public, and is continuing to increase.

(2) The condition is distributed unfairly.

(3) Preventive measures could reduce the effects of the condition.

(4) Those preventive measures are not yet in place;

Whereas racism meets the criteria of a public health crisis, and public health experts agree;

Whereas a Federal public health crisis declaration defines racism as a pervasive health issue and alerts the Nation to the need to enact immediate and effective cross-governmental efforts to address the root causes of institutional racism and their downstream impacts; and

Whereas such declaration requires the response of the Government to engage significant resources to empower those communities that are impacted: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the resolutions drafted, introduced, and adopted by cities and localities across the Nation declaring racism a public health crisis;

(2) declares racism a public health crisis in the United States;

(3) commits to—

(A) establishing a nationwide strategy to address health disparities and inequity across all sectors in society;

(B) dismantling systemic practices and policies that perpetuate racism;

(C) advancing reforms to address years of neglectful and apathetic policies that have led to poor health outcomes for communities of color; and

(D) promoting efforts to address the social determinants of health—especially for Black, Latino, and Native American people in the United States, and other people of color; and

(4) places a charge on the Nation to move forward with urgency to ensure that the United States stands firmly in honoring its moral purpose of advancing the self-evident truths that all people are created equal, that they are endowed with certain unalienable rights, and that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

SENATE RESOLUTION 656—RECOGNIZING THE IMPORTANCE OF THE BLUEBERRY INDUSTRY TO THE UNITED STATES AND DESIGNATING JULY 2020 AS "NATIONAL BLUEBERRY MONTH"

Ms. STABENOW (for herself, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. KING, and Ms. COLLINS) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 656

Whereas the blueberry is a fruit native to North America;

Whereas blueberries were first—

(1) managed and harvested as wild blueberries by the native Wabanaki through specialized burning practices that are still used in 2020; and

(2) used fresh and dried in food and medicines by Native Americans, who introduced blueberries to early colonists, which led to new uses and forms of blueberries, including frozen, establishing traditions still observed in 2020;

Whereas the pioneering work conducted in New Jersey in the early 1900s by Elizabeth White and Dr. Frederick Coville, a botanist at the Department of Agriculture, to domesticate wild lowbush blueberries resulted in the development of the hybrid for cultivated highbush blueberries;

Whereas, because of those early efforts, highbush blueberries are large, sweet, juicy berries that can be commercially produced and shipped;

Whereas wild blueberries—

(1) are small and sweet; and

(2) are not planted, but still grow and are harvested where they have naturally occurred for thousands of years;

Whereas the blueberry industry in the United States, including both highbush and wild blueberries, is an important agricultural industry with an annual economic impact of \$4,700,000,000;

Whereas highbush and wild blueberries—

(1) have a total harvested area estimated at more than 140,000 acres; and

(2) are produced in 48 States by more than 15,000 growers and their families;

Whereas highbush and wild blueberry production in the United States has continually increased, with particular growth during the first 2 decades of the 21st century, reaching a total harvest of 700,000,000 pounds in 2019;

Whereas blueberries are—

(1) low in fat; and

(2) a source of fiber, vitamins, and minerals;

Whereas blueberries are being studied to examine the role that the berries may play in promoting good health in areas such as cardiovascular health, brain health, exercise, insulin response, and gut health; and

Whereas blueberries are harvested in the United States from March through early September, with the peak of the harvest occurring in July: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates July 2020 as “National Blueberry Month”;;

(2) recognizes the contributions of blueberry growers in the United States and their families; and

(3) recognizes that purchasing blueberries grown in the United States supports farmers, jobs, and the economy of the United States.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 2487. Mr. ENZI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2301 proposed by Mr. INHOFE to the bill S. 4049, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2488. Ms. MCSALLY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2301 proposed by Mr. INHOFE to the bill S. 4049, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2489. Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2301 proposed by Mr. INHOFE to the bill S. 4049, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2490. Mr. ROUNDS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2301 proposed by Mr. INHOFE to the bill S. 4049, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 2487. Mr. ENZI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2301 proposed by Mr. INHOFE to the bill S. 4049, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle F of title XXXI, add the following:

SEC. 3168. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON IMPORTANCE OF EXTRACTING AND PROCESSING URANIUM IN THE UNITED STATES.

It is the sense of Congress that extracting and processing uranium in the United States increases the resiliency of the United States to counter uranium producers owned or controlled by hostile foreign governments.

SA 2488. Ms. MCSALLY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2301 proposed by Mr. INHOFE to the bill S. 4049, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title VII, add the following:

SEC. 708. MANDATORY REFERRAL OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES FOR MENTAL HEALTH EVALUATION.

Section 1090a of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (e) as subsection (f); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (d) the following new subsection:

“(e) **PROCESS APPLICABLE TO MEMBER DISCLOSURE.**—The regulations required by subsection (a) shall—

“(1) establish a phrase that enables a member of the armed forces to trigger a referral of the member by a commanding officer or supervisor for a mental health evaluation;

“(2) require a commanding officer or supervisor to make such referral as soon as practicable following disclosure by the member to the commanding officer or supervisor of the phrase established under paragraph (1); and

“(3) ensure that the referral process protects the confidentiality of the member in a manner similar to the confidentiality provided for members making restricted reports under section 1565b(b) of this title.”.

SA 2489. Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2301 proposed by Mr. INHOFE to the bill S. 4049, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Add at the end of subtitle G of title XII the following:

SEC. 1287. UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR GLOBAL MEDIA.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This section may be cited as the “U.S. Agency for Global Media Reform Act”.

(b) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of Congress that the Office of Cuba Broadcasting should—

(1) remain an independent entity of the United States Agency for Global Media; and

(2) continue taking steps to ensure that the Office is fulfilling its core mission of promoting freedom and democracy by providing the people of Cuba with objective news and information programming.

(c) **AUTHORITIES OF THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER; LIMITATION ON CORPORATE LEADERSHIP OF GRANTEEES.**—Section 305 of the United States International Broadcasting Act of 1994 (22 U.S.C. 6204) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (20), by inserting “in accordance with subsection (c)” before the period at the end;

(B) in paragraph (21)—

(i) by striking “including with Federal officials,”; and

(ii) by inserting “in accordance with subsection (c)” before the period at the end; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(23) To—

“(A) require semi-annual content reviews of each language service of each surrogate network, consisting of a review of at least 10 percent of available weekly content, by fluent language speakers and experts without direct affiliation to the language service being reviewed, who are seeking any evidence of unprofessional content, which shall be submitted to the Office of Policy and Research, the head and Board of the respective service, and the Chief Executive Officer; and

“(B) submit to the appropriate congressional committees a list of anomalous reports, including status updates on anomalous services during the 3-year period commencing on the date of receipt of the first report of unprofessional content.”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(c) **LIMITATION ON CORPORATE LEADERSHIP OF GRANTEEES.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Chief Executive Officer may not award any grant under subsection (a) to RFE/RL, Inc., Radio Free Asia, the Middle East Broadcasting Networks, the Open Technology Fund, or any other grantee authorized under this title (collectively referred to as ‘Agency Grantee Networks’) unless the incorporation documents of any such grantee require that the corporate leadership and Board of Directors of such grantee be selected in accordance with this Act.

“(2) **CONFLICTS OF INTEREST.**—

“(A) **CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER.**—The Chief Executive Officer may not serve on any of the corporate boards of any grantee under subsection (a).

“(B) **FEDERAL EMPLOYEES.**—A full-time employee of a Federal agency may not serve on a corporate board of any grantee under subsection (a).

“(3) **QUALIFICATIONS OF GRANTEE BOARD MEMBERS.**—Individuals appointed under subsection (a) to the Board of Directors of any of the Agency Grantee Networks shall have requisite expertise in journalism, technology, broadcasting, or diplomacy, or appropriate language or cultural understanding relevant to the grantee’s mission.”.

(d) **INTERNATIONAL BROADCASTING ADVISORY BOARD.**—Section 306 of the United States International Broadcasting Act of 1994 (22 U.S.C. 6205) is amended—

(1) by striking subsections (a) through (c) and inserting the following:

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The International Broadcasting Advisory Board (referred to in this section as the ‘Advisory Board’) shall advise the Chief Executive Officer of the United States Agency for Global Media, as appropriate. The Advisory Board as established shall exist within the Executive branch of Government as an entity described in section 104 of title 5.

“(b) **COMPOSITION OF THE ADVISORY BOARD.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Advisory Board shall consist of 7 members, of whom—

“(A) 6 shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, in accordance with subsection (c); and

“(B) 1 shall be the Secretary of State.

“(2) **CHAIR.**—The President shall designate, with the advice and consent of the Senate, 1

of the members appointed under paragraph (1)(A) as Chair of the Advisory Board.

“(3) PARTY LIMITATION.—Not more than 3 members of the Advisory Board appointed under paragraph (1)(A) may be affiliated with the same political party.

“(4) TERMS OF OFFICE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), members of the Advisory Board shall serve for a single term of 4 years, except that, of the first group of members appointed under paragraph (1)(A)—

“(i) 2 members who are not affiliated with the same political party, shall be appointed for terms ending on the date that is 2 years after the date of the enactment of the U.S. Agency for Global Media Reform Act;

“(ii) 2 members who are not affiliated with the same political party, shall be appointed for terms ending on the date that is 4 years after the date of the enactment of the U.S. Agency for Global Media Reform Act; and

“(iii) 2 members who are not affiliated with the same political party, shall be appointed for terms ending on the date that is 6 years after the date of the enactment of the U.S. Agency for Global Media Reform Act.

“(B) SECRETARY OF STATE.—The Secretary of State shall serve as a member of the Advisory Board for the duration of his or her tenure as Secretary of State.

“(5) VACANCIES.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The President shall appoint, with the advice and consent of the Senate, additional members to fill vacancies on the Advisory Board occurring before the expiration of a term.

“(B) TERM.—Any members appointed pursuant to subparagraph (A) shall serve for the remainder of such term.

“(C) SERVICE BEYOND TERM.—Any member whose term has expired shall continue to serve as a member of the Advisory Board until a qualified successor has been appointed and confirmed by the Senate.

“(D) SECRETARY OF STATE.—When there is a vacancy in the office of Secretary of State, the Acting Secretary of State shall serve as a member of the Advisory Board until a new Secretary of State is appointed.”;

(2) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (c);

(3) by amending subsection (c), as redesignated—

(A) in the subsection heading, by inserting “ADVISORY” before “BOARD”; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by inserting “who are” before “distinguished”; and

(4) by striking subsections (e) and (f) and inserting the following new subsections:

“(d) FUNCTIONS OF THE ADVISORY BOARD.—The members of the Advisory Board shall—

“(1) provide the Chief Executive Officer of the United States Agency for Global Media with advice and recommendations for improving the effectiveness and efficiency of the Agency and its programming;

“(2) meet with the Chief Executive Officer at least 4 times annually, including twice in person as practicable, and at additional meetings at the request of the Chief Executive Officer or the Chair of the Advisory Board;

“(3) report periodically, or upon request, to the congressional committees specified in subsection (c)(2) regarding its advice and recommendations for improving the effectiveness and efficiency of the United States Agency for Global Media and its programming;

“(4) obtain information from the Chief Executive Officer, as needed, for the purposes of fulfilling the functions described in this subsection;

“(5) consult with the Chief Executive Officer regarding budget submissions and strategic plans before they are submitted to the

Office of Management and Budget or to Congress;

“(6) advise the Chief Executive Officer to ensure that—

“(A) the Chief Executive Officer fully respects the professional integrity and editorial independence of United States Agency for Global Media broadcasters, networks, and grantees; and

“(B) agency networks, broadcasters, and grantees adhere to the highest professional standards and ethics of journalism, including taking necessary actions to uphold professional standards to produce consistently reliable and authoritative, accurate, objective, and comprehensive news and information; and

“(7) provide other strategic input to the Chief Executive Officer.

“(e) APPOINTMENT OF HEADS OF NETWORKS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The heads of Voice of America, the Office of Cuba Broadcasting, RFE/RL, Inc., Radio Free Asia, the Middle East Broadcasting Networks, the Open Technology Fund, or of any other grantee authorized under this title may only be appointed or removed if such action has been approved by a majority vote of the Advisory Board.

“(2) REMOVAL.—After consulting with the Chief Executive Officer, 5 or more members of the Advisory Board may unilaterally remove any such head of network or grantee network described in paragraph (1).

“(3) QUORUM.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—A quorum shall consist of 4 members of the Advisory Board (excluding the Secretary of State).

“(B) DECISIONS.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), decisions of the Advisory Board shall be made by majority vote, a quorum being present.

“(C) CLOSED SESSIONS.—The Advisory Board may meet in closed sessions in accordance with section 552b of title 5, United States Code.”.

(e) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—The United States International Broadcasting Act of 1994 (22 U.S.C. 6201 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 304—

(A) in the section heading, by striking “BROADCASTING BOARD OF GOVERNORS” and inserting “UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR GLOBAL MEDIA”; and

(B) in subsection (a), by striking “Broadcasting Board of Governors” and inserting “United States Agency for Global Media”; and

(C) in subsection (b)(1), by striking “Broadcasting Board of Governors” and inserting “United States Agency for Global Media”; and

(D) in subsection (c), by striking “Board” each place such term appears and inserting “Agency”; and

(2) in section 305—

(A) in subsection (a)—

(i) in paragraph (6), by striking “Board” and inserting “Agency”; and

(ii) in paragraph (13), by striking “Board” and inserting “Agency”; and

(iii) in paragraph (20), by striking “Board” and inserting “Agency”; and

(iv) in paragraph (22), by striking “Board” and inserting “Agency”; and

(B) in subsection (b), by striking “Board” each place such term appears and inserting “Agency”; and

(3) in section 308—

(A) in subsection (a), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “Board” and inserting “Agency”; and

(B) in subsection (b), by striking “Board” each place such term appears and inserting “Agency”; and

(C) in subsection (d), by striking “Board” and inserting “Agency”;

(D) in subsection (g), by striking “Board” each place such term appears and inserting “Agency”;

(E) in subsection (h)(5), by striking “Board” and inserting “Agency”; and

(F) in subsection (i), in the first sentence, by striking “Board” and inserting “Agency”;

(4) in section 309—

(A) in subsection (c)(1), by striking “Board” each place such term appears and inserting “Agency”; and

(B) in subsection (e), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “Board” and inserting “Agency”; and

(C) in subsection (f), by striking “Board” each place such term appears and inserting “Agency”; and

(D) in subsection (g), by striking “Board” and inserting “Agency”; and

(5) in section 310(d), by striking “Board” and inserting “Agency”; and

(6) in section 310A(a), by striking “Broadcasting Board of Governors” and inserting “United States Agency for Global Media”; and

(7) in section 310B, by striking “Board” and inserting “Agency”; and

(8) by striking section 312;

(9) in section 313(a), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “Board” and inserting “Agency”; and

(10) in section 314—

(A) by striking “(4) the terms ‘Board and Chief Executive Officer of the Board’ means the Broadcasting Board of Governors” and inserting the following:

“(2) the terms ‘Agency’ and ‘Chief Executive Officer of the Agency’ mean the United States Agency for Global Media and the Chief Executive Officer of the United States Agency for Global Media, respectively,”; and

(B) in paragraph (3)—

(i) by striking “includes—” and inserting “means the corporation having the corporate title described in section 308”; and

(ii) by striking subparagraphs (A) and (B); and

(11) in section 316—

(A) in subsection (a)(1), by striking “Broadcasting Board of Governors” and inserting “United States Agency for Global Media”; and

(B) in subsection (c), by striking “Broadcasting Board of Governors” and inserting “United States Agency for Global Media”.

(f) RULEMAKING.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the United States Agency for Global Media may not revise part 531 of title 22, Code of Federal Regulations, which took effect on June 11, 2020, without explicit authorization by an Act of Congress.

(g) SAVINGS PROVISIONS.—Section 310 of the United States International Broadcasting Act of 1994 (22 U.S.C. 6209) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsections:

“(f) MAINTENANCE OF PROPRIETARY INFORMATION.—No consolidation of grantees authorized under subsection (a) involving any grantee shall result in any legal transfer of ownership of any proprietary information or intellectual property to the United States Agency for Global Media or any other Federal entity.

“(g) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—No consolidation of grantees authorized under subsection (a) shall result in the consolidation of the Open Technology Fund or any successor entity with any other grantee.”.

(h) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in the United States International Broadcasting Act of 1994 or any other provision of law may be construed to make the Open Technology Fund an entity authorized under such Act until the effective date of legislation authorizing the establishment of the Open Technology Fund.

SA 2490. Mr. ROUNDS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to

amendment SA 2301 proposed by Mr. INHOFE to the bill S. 4049, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle D of title XII, insert the following:

SEC. 1242. FEASIBILITY STUDY ON INCREASED ROTATIONAL DEPLOYMENTS TO GREECE AND ENHANCEMENT OF UNITED STATES-GREECE DIPLOMATIC ENGAGEMENT.

(a) **FEASIBILITY STUDY.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of Defense shall conduct a study on the feasibility of increased rotational deployments of members of the Armed Forces to Greece, including to Souda Bay, Alexandroupoli, Larissa, Volos, and Stefanoviko.

(2) **ELEMENT.**—The study required by paragraph (1) shall include an evaluation of any infrastructure investment necessary to support such increased rotational deployments.

(3) **REPORT TO CONGRESS.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the results of the study required by paragraph (1) that includes the estimated costs associated with such increased rotational deployments.

(b) **DIPLOMATIC ENGAGEMENT.**—The Secretary of State is encouraged to pursue persistent United States diplomatic engagement with respect to the Greece-Cyprus-Israel and Greece-Cyprus-Egypt trilateral agreements beyond the occasional participation of United States diplomats in the regular summits of the countries party to such agreements.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I have 8 requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs is authorized to

meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, July 22, 2020, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

The Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, July 22, 2020, at 9:45 p.m. to conduct a hearing on nominations.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, July 22, 2020, at 2 p.m., to conduct a hearing on nominations.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

The Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, July 22, 2020, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, July 22, 2020, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

The Committee on Rules and Administration is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, July 22, 2020, at 10:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, July 22, 2020, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON WATER AND POWER

The Subcommittee on Water and Power of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, July 22, 2020, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

GLIOBLASTOMA AWARENESS DAY

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of and the Senate now proceed to S. Res. 617.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 617) designating July 22, 2020, as "Glioblastoma Awareness Day".

There being no objection, the committee was discharged, and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. CRAMER. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of June 15, 2020, under "Submitted Resolutions.")

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, JULY 23, 2020

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m., Thursday, July 23; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; further, that following leader remarks, the Senate resume consideration of Calendar No. 483, S. 4049; finally, that all time during recess, adjournment, morning business, and leader remarks count postcloture on substitute amendment No. 2301, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 8:55 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, July 23, 2020, at 9:30 a.m.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

IN HONOR OF THE LIFE OF CHIEF
SHAWN BABENDURE

HON. KEVIN BRADY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 2020

Mr. BRADY. Madam Speaker, I rise to honor the life and service of Shawn Babendure, a husband, father, coach, U.S. Army veteran and District Chief of the Spring, Texas Fire Department who tragically passed away this week much too young and far too early.

A native Texan, born and raised in Houston, Shawri leaves a legacy of a lifetime of service to his community and his country which began when Shawn joined the Champions Fire Department in 1990 while attending Cypress Creek High School.

His service continued when he enlisted in the United States Army in 1993. He served honorably and well for nearly four years as a Communications Repair Specialist with the 11th Armored Cavalry Regiment at Fort Irwin, California, the Army's National Training Center. He distinguished himself as an expert marksman and earned his paratrooper wings. He was awarded the National Defense Service Medal, the Good Conduct Medal, the Army Achievement Medal, and the Army Commendation Medal for his service.

Shortly after his military service, Shawn earned his Bachelor of Science degree from the University of Houston. Shawn worked in the financial services industry where he served as Vice President of Wealth Management for a global wealth management firm, a position he still held at the time of his death.

In 2007, Shawn chose to serve his community once again and returned to public service as a fireman at the Spring Fire Department. Shawn's work ethic and professionalism were evidenced by his promotion to positions of increasing responsibility at the Spring Fire Department where he impressively earned more than ten professional certificates for every facet of fire, rescue and emergency service and rose in rank from fireman to District Chief.

Shawn's love for his community and his contagious laughter were hallmarks of his personality and his service and he passed on his care and compassion for others by training and mentoring the next generation of firefighters.

I join the entire Spring community in honoring Chief Babendure's lifetime of service and join his wife, Jessica, and their children, Sophia and Harrison, in mourning their loss. Chief Babendure will be deeply mourned and greatly missed.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. RICHARD HUDSON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 2020

Mr. HUDSON. Madam Speaker, I was unknowingly exposed to someone who later tested positive for Coronavirus. Out of an abundance of caution and for the health and well-being of my colleagues, I am in self-quarantine until Thursday, July 23, 2020 at 12:01 a.m. As such, I had to miss this vote series.

Had I been present, I would have voted NAY on Roll Call No. 139; NAY on Roll Call No. 140; NAY on Roll Call No. 141; NAY on Roll Call No. 142; YEA on Roll Call No. 143; NAY on Roll Call No. 144; NAY on Roll Call No. 145; NAY on Roll Call No. 146; NAY on Roll Call No. 147; NAY on Roll Call No. 148; NAY on Roll Call No. 149; NAY on Roll Call No. 150; YEA on Roll Call No. 151; and YEA on Roll Call No. 152.

WILLIAM M. (MAC) THORNBERRY
NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2021

SPEECH OF

HON. JOHN GARAMENDI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 20, 2020

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of the fiscal year 2021 National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA). I would like to start by thanking Chairman SMITH, Ranking Member THORNBERRY, and the House Armed Services Committee staff who have worked many long nights putting together this year's NDAA. The bill that is before the House is a good bill and I encourage my colleagues to support its passage.

As the Chairman of the Readiness Subcommittee, I believe the bill upholds our responsibility to provide congressional oversight of and support to the sustainment, logistics, infrastructure, and readiness of our military. I'd like to take a moment and thank my staff for their tireless work—the Readiness Subcommittee staff, Brian Garrett, Jeanine Womble, Melanie Harris, Jay Vallario, John Muller, Dave Sienicki, and Sean Falvey, and my personal staff, Bradley Bottoms, Betsy Thompson, Marcus Jones, and Danusia Hubah. I am proud of the Readiness Subcommittee's contribution to this year's bill and I'd like to highlight the following provisions.

The Readiness portion of the bill continues to emphasize the need to address vulnerabilities in installation and energy resiliency, both in response to climate change and to ensure the Department can continue to operate when fuel supplies and utilities are disrupted. The bill:

requires the Department to report on efforts to consider fuel consumption, distribution, and

logistics and the steps being taken to decrease consumption of fossil fuels by 30 percent to reduce the number of resupply convoys and oilers required in a contested environment;

requires the Department to institute energy metering on critical military facilities to assess their energy requirements and to ensure resilient power sources for these facilities.

strengthens an existing preference for the purchase of electric or hybrid vehicles for official business on military installations; and

requires a report on the implementation of provisions from last year's NDAA to include installation master planning, updates to building codes, sea-level rise modeling, and climate assessment tools.

Last year's NDAA made sweeping reforms in response to concerns that courageous military families raised regarding the management, oversight, and condition of military family housing. This year, we pick up where we left off. The bill:

requires a report on known environmental hazards in government-owned housing and requires the Department to report on the feasibility of standardizing privatized housing performance metrics; and

requires partners to put funding of maintenance and recapitalization of housing units ahead of fees that enrich corporate management in all future and renegotiated privatized housing agreements.

Similarly, we build on previous efforts to address PFAS contamination around military installations. The bill:

requires the Department of Defense to notify the congressional defense committees when there has been an uncontrolled release of a PFAS-containing firefighting agent that may impact human health or the environment;

requires the Department of Defense to publish on a public website the results of drinking and ground water PFAS testing conducted on military installations or former defense sites;

makes technical corrections to ensure all National Guard installations are eligible for funding for PFAS remediation in our National Guard communities; and

requires the Department to survey and report on technologies that will help facilitate the on-time phase-out of PFAS containing firefighting agents.

While the Department of Defense talks a lot about modernization and development of new capabilities, we must ensure that the appropriate focus remains on the sustainment of these weapon systems and the logistics required to move and supply them in a conflict. To that end, the bill:

requires the Department to examine and periodically report on the sustainment and logistics requirements, gaps, and mitigations necessary to support force structure, power projection, and other elements of the national defense strategy;

helps ensure Congress continues to receive timely and relevant information regarding both

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

domestic and overseas infrastructure requirements and posture of U.S. forces; and requires a report on bulk fuel management strategies in the Indo-Pacific to meet current and future requirements.

In partnership with the Government Accountability Office, the bill leverages their expertise to assist the subcommittee with continued oversight on topics that include F-35 operations and sustainment, Air Force use of contract air support services, and aviation and ship maintenance. The previous reports and analytical work produced by GAO helped inform the Readiness mark and I'd like to take this opportunity to thank the members of the GAO's Defense Capabilities and Management team for their support of this subcommittee's oversight work.

Next, the health and safety of our military and civilian personnel remain a priority for this subcommittee. Following a review of a number of fatal ground vehicle training mishaps, the subcommittee is concerned that the Department's approach to collecting, reporting, and analyzing vehicle mishap data may be insufficient and hampers the ability to share lessons learned or put in place mitigations to prevent future mishaps. To that end, the bill includes a reporting requirement that will help clarify responsibilities for collecting and analyzing mishap data, how data is being used to identify mishap trends, and actions the Department is taking to standardize data collection.

In addition to concerns with ground vehicle mishaps, the committee has identified critical failures and safety issues in the munitions enterprise. To start addressing these concerns, the bill requires a report on munitions safety waivers and mishaps, an assessment of the resilience of the munitions enterprise, and clarifies the role and authority of the Chairman of the Defense Explosives Safety Board.

The bill also supports the civilian workforce of the Department of Defense by addressing a pay disparity affecting the Department's wage-grade civilian workforce and including non-title 5 employees who were left out of last year's Paid Parental Leave provision.

This year's NDAA also begins a unified, whole-of-government approach that leverages the best attributes of the government and commercial fleets to increase resiliency in our maritime logistics. The bill includes several provisions, that together, establish a National Maritime Logistics Fleet approach by strengthening U.S.-flagged vessel requirements for the transportation of military cargo and fuels, creating a Tanker Security Program to address the shortfall in U.S.-flagged, U.S.-crewed tankers, and requiring the Navy to initiate an affordable, domestic built sealift ship. Strengthening our maritime logistics will also enhance our military's capabilities by improving the over-arching defense industrial base that supports each branch of our armed services.

Additionally, this year's NDAA supports the missions at Travis and Beale Air Force Bases in my district. The funds authorized in this bill will support the new KC-46 mission at Travis Air Force Base and enable Beale Air Force Base to continue to support intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (ISR) and multi-domain operations.

I'm also pleased this NDAA includes a 3 percent pay raise for our troops and includes language from two of my bills, H.R. 2617, the Occupational and Environmental Transparency Health Act, to require the DOD and VA to

retroactively update records based on information contained in the Burn Pit Registry, since many veterans' health records do not account for their exposures, and H.R. 4710, the Pharmaceutical Independence Long-Term Readiness Reform Act, to require the DOD to identify the vulnerabilities faced by our country's dependence on Chinese pharmaceuticals and the steps needed to secure the supply chain.

This bill helps advance our military's near-term readiness goals and drives the Department to plan for and take action against long-term threats, and with that, I urge my colleagues to support the FY21 NDAA.

CELEBRATING MARGARET AND
SYLVESTER WALORSKI ON
THEIR 65TH WEDDING ANNIVERSARY

HON. JACKIE WALORSKI

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 2020

Mrs. WALORSKI. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Margaret and Sylvester "Syl" Walorski of Englewood, Colorado, on their 65th wedding anniversary.

Margaret and Syl met at a U.S.O. dance in the summer of 1951 just before Syl left for the Korean War. Placing their love in God's hands, Margaret and Syl sent each other countless letters during Syl's deployment and could not wait to be reunited. Syl returned to the U.S. and presented Margaret with a ring and a marriage proposal as soon as he could. They were married on August 22, 1955.

To finish school and secure a bright future for his family, Syl moved with Margaret to South Bend, Indiana, where they had two children. However, having briefly stayed at a military base in Colorado after being discharged, Syl felt drawn to the state's breathtaking sites, fresh air, and freedom. So in 1958 the couple moved to Englewood, Colorado, where they continued to grow their family and build a beautiful life together. A true embodiment of the American Dream, Margaret and Syl bought their first home in 1959 and have lived there ever since.

Sixty-five years of marriage is a marvelous accomplishment that speaks volumes about their compassion and the tremendous foundation of respect, gratitude, and faith they share with one another. Stronger together, Margaret and Syl have found the more love they have for each other, the more they have to offer others. They have always been active in their church and community, and their children watched as they led their lives in service to the Lord and as shining examples of the American spirit.

Their lasting commitment not only to each other but also to their five children, 15 grandchildren, and 17 great-grandchildren is rooted in their devotion and faithfulness. Having dedicated themselves to teaching their children strong American values, like working hard and giving back to those in need, they have touched the lives of countless people in their community and across the country. I feel blessed to know such compassionate, tenacious, and whole-hearted people who make this nation and the world a better place with everything they do.

Madam Speaker, I would like to extend my sincerest congratulations to Aunt Margaret,

Uncle Syl, and their entire family. It is my hope that their love continues to grow stronger with each passing year.

HONORING THE RETIREMENT OF
MASTER GUNNERY SERGEANT
RONGALETT D. GREEN, UNITED
STATES MARINE

HON. J. FRENCH HILL

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 2020

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Rongalett D. Green, Master Gunnery Sergeant, United States Marine Corps, who will retire from that organization after over 30 years of distinguished service to our country; August 6, 1990 through September 30, 2020. The mission of the United States Marine Corps is as America's expeditionary force in readiness since 1775, the U.S. Marines are forward deployed to win our Nation's battles swiftly and aggressively in times of crisis. We fight on land, sea and air, as well as provide forces and detachments to naval ships and ground operations.

Master Gunnery Sergeant Green currently serves with Manpower and Reserve Affairs, at the Promotions Branch. She is the Senior Enlisted Staff Non-commissioned Officer, responsible for the Special Selection Board for Officer Promotion Packages.

Master Gunnery Sergeant (MGySgt) Rongalett "Ronnie" Green, of Little Rock, Arkansas, enlisted in the Marine Corps, in 1990 as a 0151 (0111, Administrative Chief). Following basic training and military occupational school, she has served at each level of administration, such as: Squadron, Battalion, Consolidated Administrative Center, Staff Secretary, and Group. During her career, she participated in military training exercises, in Japan and South Korea, has two successful tours as a Marine Corps Drill instructor, at both recruit training depots, Parris Island, South Carolina and San Diego, California, training male and female recruits.

MGySgt Green spent two years, at Marine Corps Forces Europe, where she attended the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) School. She has participated in two deployments, Marine Central Command, Forward located in Djibouti, Africa (OIF) and Afghanistan (OEF). MGySgt Green served as the Senior Enlisted Advisor and Security Manager at Marine Corps University, Quantico, VA. MGySgt Green served on Capitol Hill as a 2015 Marine Corps Congressional Fellow in the U.S. Senate, and later became the Senior Enlisted Advisor to the Legislative Director to the Commandant, Marine Corps Office of Legislative Affairs. She was the Senior Enlisted Advisor for the White House Military Office (WHMO).

She has a Bachelor's Degree, in Human Resources with the University of Maryland University College, a Master's of Science Degree, in Organizational Leadership, an Executive certificate in Strategic Human Resources Leadership with Cornell University, and currently studying for a certificate in Project Management at Syracuse University.

MGySgt Green's awards and decorations include: The Presidential Service Badge, Meritorious Service Medal (x2); Navy and Marine Corps Commendation Medal; Navy and Marine Corps Achievement Medal (x3); Navy Unit

Commendation; Navy Meritorious Unit Commendation; Marine Corps Good Conduct Medal (x9); National Defense Service Medal (x2); Afghanistan Campaign Medal; Global War on Terrorism Expeditionary Medal; Sea Service Deployment Ribbon (x4); Marine Corps Drill Instructor Ribbon (x2); NATO Medal ISAF—Afghanistan; Certificate of Commendation; Letter of Commendation; Letter of Appreciation (x6); and Meritorious Mast (x3).

MGySgt Green's candid and transparent message is "challenge the odds and strive for greatness, and this will only happen if you can get out of your own way". Every day while serving on active duty, my mission is to "serve and take care of others, people on my left and right, because we are a team and they in turn will take care of me."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. DAN NEWHOUSE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 2020

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Madam Speaker, due to unforeseen travel delays, I regrettably missed roll call votes as indicated below.

Had I been present, I would have voted nay on rollcall No. 139; nay on rollcall No. 140; nay on rollcall No. 141; nay on rollcall No. 142; and nay on rollcall No. 143.

REMEMBERING THE ACHIEVEMENTS OF ENTERTAINER AND PUBLIC SERVANT SHIRLEY D. LOVE

HON. CAROL D. MILLER

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 2020

Mrs. MILLER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to posthumously recognize, Mr. Shirley Love. Shirley was born to Earl and Winona Love on May 15, 1933. The name "Shirley" was suggested by the Love's family nurse, for his resemblance to her husband, Shirley Donnelly. Shirley Donnelly was a popular West Virginia newspaper columnist during the 1930's; unbeknownst to Earl and Winona at the time, their naming of their child not only passed on the uniqueness of the Shirley namesake but also a destiny for media greatness.

Shirley Love always had a phenomenal voice. Before he was entertaining countless West Virginians on Radio & TV, he used his voice to serve God every Sunday in Oak Hill United Methodist Church's Choir. The owner of WOAY in the early 1950's was Robert Thomas. He was a member of the church's congregation and always paid close attention to the charm of Shirley's voice. After Shirley graduated Collins High School in 1952, Robert Thomas offered him a once-in-a-life-time-opportunity as an announcer on his Network. Shirley accepted and quickly became the face of WOAY TV & Radio.

Shirley served WOAY and entertained the people of West Virginia from 1952 to 1997. He was best known for becoming one of Southern West Virginia's first TV nightly news anchors. He also hosted several programs through WOAY, including Friday Night Barn Dance,

West Virginia Band Stand, and Saturday Night Wrestling. Of these, Saturday Night Wrestling was the most popular. Shirley kept audiences watching for decades through the way he handled fan interviews and intense competitor interactions.

Shirley was appointed to represent West Virginia's Senate District 11 in 1994 by Governor Caperton. He later retired from WOAY in 1997 and began to focus fully on public service rather than entertainment. Between 1994 and 2008, Shirley was elected and subsequently re-elected to Senate District 11 three times. He was later elected to the West Virginia House of Delegates from 2016 to 2018. Between both Chambers, Shirley selflessly served the people of Fayette County in the West Virginia Legislature for sixteen years. I had the honor of working along side him in the House of Delegates. I witnessed first-hand his integrity, honesty, and straight forwardness in the Legislature. He was truly a man of the people.

A list of Shirley's other accomplishments includes—One of West Virginia's Representatives to the National Democratic Convention from 1972 to 2016, Fayette County Democratic Executive Committee Member, West Virginia State Democratic Executive Committee Member, Member of the West Virginia Broadcasting Hall of Fame, one of Saturday Night Live's first guests in America, a lifetime member of the Oak Hill United Methodist Church, husband, and father to three children.

May God bless Shirley Dean Love. I wish I could thank him for all he did for the great State of West Virginia. He will always be remembered by his family, friends, and the countless people he impacted throughout his life. I send my sincerest condolences to his wife, children, and grandchildren.

TRIBUTE TO NOHA KOLKAILAH—CALIFORNIA'S 24TH CONGRESSIONAL WOMEN OF THE YEAR

HON. SALUD O. CARBAJAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 2020

Mr. CARBAJAL. Madam Speaker, each year, through the Women of the Year Award, my office extends special recognition to women on the Central Coast who have made a difference in our community. I would like to recognize one outstanding Women of the Year Award recipient, Noha Kolkailah of Arroyo Grande, California.

Noha currently serves as the Principal and Director of Olive Grove Charter School in San Luis Obispo. She has been a fierce champion for education and social justice for many years. After the 2016 election, Noha mobilized the Muslim community to speak out for a positive and just future for all people at the Women's March SLO. The following year, she organized a "Get to Know Your Muslim Neighbors" event attended by over 800 people, advocating for compassion, kindness, commitment to diversity and unity, global awareness, and responsibility. She also helped start the Muslim Student Association at Cal Poly.

Noha founded the Peace Academy of the Sciences and Arts, which offers an enriching summer program for children ages 6 to 11, with a focus on self-awareness, global citizen-

ship, social justice, and environmental awareness. Through real-world applications, students are empowered to learn more about each other, embrace differences, and learn how to build on each other's strengths in a way that inspires creative innovation.

Despite experiencing prejudice, Noha remains a compassionate advocate for a world in which we can co-exist in peace and harmony, and leads with her heart, courage and kindness. She is a strong Muslim woman and she is not afraid to speak her truth, setting the example for others to do the same.

Her work on the Central Coast in educating the community at large on the issues marginalized communities face, her tireless efforts to bring people together in understanding and accepting differences, and her resilience in facing adversity with grace make Noha a wonderful asset to our community. As a champion for youth, women, and the marginalized, we are so lucky to have Noha in our district. I ask all Members to join me today in honoring an exceptional woman of California's 24th Congressional District, Noha Kolkailah, for her incredible service to her community.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. GARY J. PALMER

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 2020

Mr. PALMER. Madam Speaker, I was absent from the House and missed votes on 7/20/20 and 7/21/20 because I was in quarantine after potential exposure to someone with COVID-19.

Had I been present, I would have voted NAY on Roll Call No. 139; NAY on Roll Call No. 140; NAY on Roll Call No. 141; NAY on Roll Call No. 142; NAY on Roll Call No. 143; NAY on Roll Call No. 144; NAY on Roll Call No. 145; NAY on Roll Call No. 146; NAY on Roll Call No. 147; NAY on Roll Call No. 148; NAY on Roll Call No. 149; NAY on Roll Call No. 150; YEA on Roll Call No. 151; and NAY on Roll Call No. 152.

TRIBUTE TO REV. DR. C.T. VIVIAN

HON. DANNY K. DAVIS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 2020

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, C.T. Vivian was a key member of Dr. King's leadership group at SCBC during the height of the movement. He began his activism in Peoria, Illinois and as many others talented activist oriented individuals did, he found his way to Dr. King and became a valued member of the team.

Rev. C.T. was a fiery orator who lead marches, motivated and inspired crowds and was activity engaged in strategy development. He was viciously attacked by an Alabama Sheriff, but held his ground. C.T., as we fondly called him, came to Chicago and helped develop the Black Strategy Center with Dr. Archie Hargraves, Chester Robinson, Rev. Jesse Jackson and others.

I got to know Rev. Vivian in 1975, when a group of us spent a month in Nairobi, Kenya

on a study colloquium for a doctoral dissertation writing. Rev. Vivian spent the rest of preaching developing social change programs and being engaged in activities designed to help make the work a better place in which to live. Living during the same time as Rev. C.T. Vivian and knowing him and his work has been gratifying and inspirational.

He was a great contributor to positive change in America and may he rest in peace.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BEN RAY LUJÁN

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 2020

Mr. LUJÁN. Madam Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 148 on H.R. 6395, I mistakenly recorded my vote as Yes when I should have voted No.

WILLIAM M. (MAC) THORNBERRY NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2021

SPEECH OF

HON. PETER A. DeFAZIO

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 20, 2020

Mr. DeFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I will vote in support of H.R. 6395, the William M. (Mac) Thornberry National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) for Fiscal Year (FY) 2021. Make no mistake: I have opposed NDAA legislation in previous years, and I still have concerns about a number of provisions included in this year's legislation, but this year's Democratic-led legislation also contains numerous policy priorities that I strongly support.

First, this legislation grants our men and women in uniform a well-deserved pay raise of 3 percent. This is the very least we can do for those who continue to make extraordinary sacrifices for our country.

As Chair of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, I fought to successfully include vital provisions important to Oregon coastal communities. This includes the Maritime Transportation System Emergency Relief Act, which authorizes the Maritime Administration to provide financial assistance to stabilize and ensure the reliable functioning of the U.S. Maritime Transportation System in the event of a national emergency or disaster, as well as the Elijah E. Cummings Coast Guard Authorization Act of 2020, legislation to authorize funds for, reinforce, and support the United States Coast Guard.

Given the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee's jurisdiction over the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), I am proud that this legislation makes a long-overdue correction to ensure that the more than 45,000 FAA employees, as well as VA and other federal civilian employees who were inexcusably left out of last year's bill, receive twelve weeks of paid parental leave. I am also pleased that this legislation prohibits the Department of Defense from excluding any civilian employees from their collective bargaining rights.

As a long-time advocate for strengthening Congress's constitutional authority to declare

war and limiting executive authority to engage in armed conflict without Congress's consent, I strongly support this bill's provisions to prohibit U.S. participation in the Saudi-led coalition's war in Yemen without congressional authorization. I also voted in strong support of an amendment which was adopted to prohibit President Trump's dangerous and unnecessary proposals to initiate new nuclear weapons testing.

Given President Trump's ongoing and disturbing use of force on peaceful protesters exercising their First Amendment rights—including his use of National Guard service members to quell peaceful protesters outside the White House—I am pleased that an amendment which I voted for, and which was adopted, will add crucial oversight and transparency guardrails when a President deploys active duty military within the United States. I am also a strong supporter of this legislation's provision to require federal law enforcement officers deployed in response to public protests to visibly display their name and agency on their uniform. This requirement is especially crucial given Trump's appalling use of unidentifiable federal agents and unmarked vehicles to detain peaceful protesters in Portland, Oregon.

I am pleased this legislation includes provisions to bolster our country's COVID-19 response, including granting important funding for the Maritime Security Program (MSP) to enable MSP carriers to keep their ships fully crewed despite the lack of cargo as a result of COVID-19. To further increase our country's pandemic preparedness and response, this legislation establishes a Pandemic Preparedness and Resilience National Security Fund and provides additional funding to the Department of Defense's (DOD's) Cooperative Threat Reduction Program to focus on detecting and confronting biological threats. I also strongly support an amendment—which I cosponsored—to ensure the president finally uses the Defense Production Act to its full extent in order to meet our country's most critical needs to combat COVID-19, including securing vital personal protective equipment, testing supplies, and more for our frontline healthcare workers and citizens in Oregon and across the country.

Furthermore, this legislation accelerates the closure of the Guantanamo Bay detention facility by lifting a restriction on transfer of current detainees. This unnecessary prison—estimated to be the most expensive in the world—costs approximately \$540 million each year to house 40 prisoners and has been used as a top recruiting tool by terrorists. This prison has been a black eye for the U.S., eroding relationships with our allies, undermining U.S. missions abroad, and putting U.S. troops and citizens at risk of retaliation.

While Congress must do much more to achieve racial justice in this country, H.R. 6395 takes first steps to move closer to this goal. I am pleased that H.R. 6395 takes the long-overdue action of requiring the DOD to change the names of all military bases and infrastructure named for Confederate individuals within one year, prohibits display of the Confederate flag on DOD installations, and adds diversity requirements for DOD military and civilian personnel.

This legislation includes hundreds-of-millions in funding for the construction of additional housing and barracks for training and enlisted

personnel, as well as for oversight and improvement of the Military Housing Privatization Initiative (MHPI) program. The bill also includes a number of provisions to support the education of military dependent students, childcare services for military dependent children, and maternity uniforms for pregnant servicemembers. The NDAA also continues Congress's work to address the military's culture of sexual misconduct by including provisions to enhance the prevention of and response to incidents of sexual trauma.

Far too many of our veterans, especially those that served in Iraq and Afghanistan, are grappling with the serious medical complications linked to burn pits. While I believe Congress can and must do more to care for these veterans, I am pleased that this legislation takes modest steps to improve the identification of and care for veterans exposed to burn pits.

I am also pleased this bill includes provisions to assist student loan borrowers who have privately held debt, providing \$10,000 in immediate assistance to pay down the student loan. These students received no financial relief under the CARES Act. This provision will ensure the 200,000 servicemembers who owe nearly \$3 billion in student loan debt receive some form of student debt relief during the pandemic.

This bill includes necessary provisions that help to address PFAS and PFOA contamination on military bases that pose a public health threat to our military members and Americans living near installations. It requires the DOD to make public vital information about the level of PFAS contaminates in drinking water and groundwater at these sites. Although more can always be done to protect our environment, the bill makes an effort to fund climate change research initiatives and includes several public lands bills that will help to preserve and protect parts of America's wilderness for generations to come. It also makes strides toward protecting our most spectacular natural treasures, like ensuring the area around the Grand Canyon will not be polluted or scarred by mining.

While I strongly support many provisions in this year's NDAA, I believe this legislation should have included additional provisions to rein in our bloated and wasteful defense spending, take back Congress's constitutional war powers authority, and more.

I believe this legislation could have made responsible cuts to our defense budget without jeopardizing the safety of our troops or undermining our national security. For years, Congress has continued to increase the Pentagon's budget despite overwhelming evidence of its waste and abuse of taxpayer money. That's why I supported an amendment to responsibly reduce the Pentagon budget while retaining exceptions to protect service members, civilian employees, and the vital Defense Health Program from this reduction.

In particular, I have always opposed the DOD's Overseas Contingency Operations (OCO) account, a fiscally irresponsible fund that is not counted in the budget, recklessly adds to our mounting debt, and has no congressional/oversight. OCO is a Pentagon slush fund that gives a blank check to fund endless wars that Congress hasn't authorized. I will continue fighting to finally eliminate this irresponsible fund.

I have long supported a financial audit of the Pentagon. Unlike every other federal

agency, the DOD has yet to pass a financial audit. For two years in a row, the Pentagon has spectacularly failed full audits, both of which highlighted numerous examples of waste and abuse. It is ridiculous to provide the Pentagon a massive spending increase—as this bill does—when the Pentagon cannot even account for how it spends taxpayer money. That's why I offered an amendment to require and incentivize each DOD component to pass an audit by FY25. Unfortunately, my amendment did not receive a vote.

Along with Yemen, I believe this legislation should have included more provisions to take back Congress's constitutional war powers authority. That's why I cosponsored an amendment to prevent the president from using unauthorized force against Iran and voted in support of an amendment to accelerate withdrawal of U.S. troops from Afghanistan. I also believe this legislation should have repealed the long-outdated 2001 and 2002 authorizations for the use of military force (AUMFs), as well as prohibited funding for the deployment of dangerous low-yield nuclear weapons. However, I am encouraged that this year's House Defense Appropriations bill repeals both the 2001 and 2002 AUMFs and prevents use of funds for any unauthorized use of force against Iran.

I am also disappointed that several amendments I supported were not made in order, including amendments to add several diseases to the VA's list of presumptive diseases connected to Agent Orange, to curb the Pentagon's 1033 program that transfers surplus military equipment to local law enforcement agencies, to block the Trump administration's cruel ban on transgender individuals serving in the military, and my amendment to abolish the military draft. I also believe this legislation could have done far more to prevent the president from raiding billions more in funding for his unnecessary, ineffective border wall.

The bottom line is that fiscal responsibility and accountability at the DOD would allow for taxpayer funds to be better spent supporting the needs of our troops, meeting our obligations to veterans, and ensuring our legitimate defense needs are prioritized while also bolstering long-underfunded domestic priorities. I strongly encourage the Senate to keep the strong House NDAA provisions and not water the bill down.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. HARLEY ROUDA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 2020

Mr. ROUDA. Madam Speaker, at the advice of the Office of the Attending Physician, I voted on agreeing to Amendment No. 29 offered by Rep. TAKANO printed in H. Rept. 116-457, on the Motion to Recommit with Instructions to H.R. 6395, and passage of H.R. 6395 by proxy pursuant to section 3(c) of House Resolution 965 and in accordance with regulation C.6. Due to this recommendation, I was unable to vote on agreeing to Amendment No. 11 offered by Rep. Dean printed in H. Rept. 116-457. Had I been present or been permitted to vote by the Office of the Clerk or the Office of the Attending Physician, I would have voted yea on rollcall No. 149.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MARTHA ROBY

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 2020

Mrs. ROBY. Madam Speaker, I was unable to vote on Monday, July 20 due to a family medical emergency. Had I been present I would have voted as follows: "nay" on rollcall No. 153; "nay" on rollcall No. 154; "nay" on rollcall No. 155; and "yea" on rollcall No. 156.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, July 23, 2020 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

JULY 28

10 a.m.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Subcommittee on Communications, Technology, Innovation, and the Internet

To hold hearings to examine the PACT Act and Section 230, focusing on the impact of the law that helped create the internet and an examination of proposed reforms for today's online world.

SD-106

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings to examine the development and deployment of large-scale carbon dioxide management technologies in the United States, including technological and natural carbon removal, carbon utilization, and carbon storage.

SD-366

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

To hold an oversight hearing to examine COVID-19 financial relief packages.

VTC

Committee on the Judiciary

Subcommittee on Intellectual Property

To hold hearings to examine how the DMCA contemplates limitations and exceptions like fair use.

SD-226

10:15 a.m.

Committee on Finance

To hold hearings to examine protecting the reliability of the U.S. medical sup-

ply chain during the COVID-19 pandemic.

SD-215

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Armed Services

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Lieutenant General D. VanHerck, USAF, to be general and Commander, United States Northern Command/Commander, North American Aerospace Defense Command, and General James H. Dickinson, USA, to be general and Commander, United States Space Command.

SD-106

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

Subcommittee on Regulatory Affairs and Federal Management

To hold hearings to examine modernizing telework, focusing on a review of private sector telework policies during the COVID-19 pandemic.

VTC

Joint Economic Committee

To hold hearings to examine reducing uncertainty and restoring confidence during the Coronavirus recession.

VTC

JULY 29

10 a.m.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

To hold hearings to examine the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau's semi-annual report to Congress.

WEBEX

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To hold hearings to examine building a stronger and more resilient seafood sector.

SR-253

Committee on Environment and Public Works

To hold hearings to examine lessons learned from remote working during COVID-19, focusing on if the government can maximize use of leased space.

SD-106

Committee on the Judiciary

To hold hearings to examine certain pending nominations.

SD-226

10:15 a.m.

Committee on Finance

To hold hearings to examine WTO reform, focusing on making global rules work for global challenges.

SD-215

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Indian Affairs

To hold an oversight hearing to examine preparing to head back to class, focusing on how to safely reopen Bureau of Indian Education schools.

SD-628

3 p.m.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs

To hold hearings to examine VA telehealth during and beyond COVID-19, focusing on challenges and opportunities in rural America.

SD-G50

JULY 30

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Armed Services

To hold hearings to examine the nomination of Anthony J. Tata, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary of Defense for Policy.

SD-G50

AUGUST 4

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Armed Services

To hold hearings to examine the findings
and recommendations of the Cyber-
space Solarium Commission.

SD-106

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S4363–S4431

Measures Introduced: Thirty-two bills and two resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 4258–4289, and S. Res. 655–656. **Pages S4421–22**

Measures Reported:

S. 2525, to require the Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology to conduct a study of personal protective equipment worn by firefighters to determine the prevalence and concentration of per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. **Page S4421**

Measures Passed:

Reinforcing American-Made Products Act: Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation was discharged from further consideration of S. 4065, to make exclusive the authority of the Federal Government to regulate the labeling of products made in the United States and introduced in interstate or foreign commerce, and the bill was then passed. **Pages S4397–99**

Driftnet Modernization and Bycatch Reduction Act: Senate passed S. 906, to improve the management of driftnet fishing, after agreeing to the committee amendment. **Pages S4398–99**

Glioblastoma Awareness Day: Committee on the Judiciary was discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 617, designating July 22, 2020, as “Glioblastoma Awareness Day”, and the resolution was then agreed to. **Page S4431**

Measures Considered:

National Defense Authorization Act—Agreement: Senate continued consideration of S. 4049, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, taking action on the following amendments proposed thereto:

Pages S4365–97, S4399–S4414

Adopted:

By 94 yeas to 6 nays (Vote No. 136), Tester Modified Amendment No. 1972 (to Amendment No. 2301), to expand the list of diseases associated with exposure to certain herbicide agents for which there is a presumption of service connection for veterans who served in the Republic of Vietnam. (Pursuant to the order of Thursday, July 2, 2020, the amendment having achieved 60 affirmative votes, was agreed to.) **Pages S4370–71, S4375**

Rejected:

By 23 yeas to 77 nays (Vote No. 135), Sanders/Markley Amendment No. 1788 (to Amendment No. 2301), to reduce the bloated Pentagon budget by 10 percent and invest that money in jobs, education, health care, and housing in communities in the United States in which the poverty rate is not less than 25 percent. (Pursuant to the order of Thursday, July 2, 2020, the amendment having failed to achieve 60 affirmative votes, was not agreed to.)

Pages S4371–75

Pending:

Inhofe Amendment No. 2301, in the nature of a substitute. **Page S4365**

McConnell (for Portman) Amendment No. 2080 (to Amendment No. 2301), to require an element in annual reports on cyber science and technology activities on work with academic consortia on high priority cybersecurity research activities in Department of Defense capabilities. **Page S4365**

During consideration of this measure today, Senate also took the following action:

By 87 yeas to 13 nays (Vote No. 137), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn, having voted in the affirmative, Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on Inhofe Amendment No. 2301 (listed above). **Pages S4375–76**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the bill at approximately 9:30 a.m., on Thursday, July 23, 2020; and that all time during recess, adjournment, morning business, and Leader remarks count post-cloture on Inhofe Amendment No. 2301, as amended.

Page S4431

Message from the President: Senate received the following message from the President of the United States:

Transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the continuation of the national emergency with respect to transnational criminal organizations that was established in Executive Order 13581 on July 24, 2011; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs. (PM–55)

Page S4419

Messages from the House: Page S4419

Enrolled Bills Presented: Page S4419

Executive Communications: Pages S4419–21

Executive Reports of Committees: Page S4421

Additional Cosponsors: Pages S4422–25

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: Pages S4425–27

Additional Statements: Pages S4416–19

Amendments Submitted: Pages S4429–31

Authorities for Committees to Meet: Page S4431

Record Votes: Three record votes were taken today. (Total—137) Pages S4375–76

Adjournment: Senate convened at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 8:55 p.m., until 9:30 a.m. on Thursday, July 23, 2020. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on page S4431.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

UNITED STATES AND CHINA

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Subcommittee on Economic Policy concluded a hearing to examine the United States and China, focusing on winning the economic competition, after receiving testimony from J. Christopher Giancarlo, Willkie Farr and Gallagher, Jersey City, New Jersey; Tim Morrison, Hudson Institute, and Martijn Rasser, Center for a New American Security, both of Washington, D.C.; and Lisa D. Cook, Michigan State University, East Lansing.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

S. 933, to improve data collection and monitoring of the Great Lakes, oceans, bays, estuaries, and coasts, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 1730, to direct the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to make grants to State and local governments and nongovernmental organizations for purposes of carrying out climate-resilient living shoreline projects that protect coastal communities by supporting ecosystem functions and habitats with the use of natural materials and systems, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 3152, to require the Federal Communications Commission to incorporate data on maternal health outcomes into its broadband health maps, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 3771, to require the Secretary of Commerce to establish the Federal Advisory Committee on the Development and Implementation of Artificial Intelligence, with an amendment;

S. 3891, to require the Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology to advance the development of technical standards for artificial intelligence, to establish the National Program to Advance Artificial Intelligence Research, to promote research on artificial intelligence at the National Science Foundation, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 3958, to amend title 49, United States Code, to permit the use of incentive payments to expedite certain federally financed airport development projects, with an amendment;

S. 4144, to amend the Dingell-Johnson Sport Fish Restoration Act with respect to sport fish restoration and recreational boating safety;

S. 4162, to provide certainty for airport funding; and

The nominations of Joel Szabat, of Maryland, to be Under Secretary of Transportation for Policy, Michael P. O'Rielly, of New York, to be a Member of the Federal Communications Commission, Michael J. Walsh, Jr., of Virginia, to be General Counsel, and Mary A. Toman, of California, to be Under Secretary Economic Affairs, both of the Department of Commerce, and routine lists in the Coast Guard,

WATER AND POWER LEGISLATION

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Water and Power concluded a hearing to examine S. 2718, to provide for the conduct of certain water security measures in the State of New Mexico, S. 3811, to provide financial assistance for projects to address certain subsidence impacts in the State of California, S. 4188, to provide for drought preparedness and improved water supply reliability, S. 4189, to provide for drought preparedness and improved water supply reliability, and an original bill entitled, "Water-Energy Technology Demonstration and Deployment Act", after receiving testimony

from Senators Feinstein and Udall; Aubrey Bettencourt, Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Water and Science; Dan Keppen, Family Farm Alliance, Klamath Falls, Oregon; and Joe S. Whitworth, The Freshwater Trust, Portland, Oregon.

ZOONOTIC DISEASE

Committee on Environment and Public Works: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the increased risk of zoonotic disease from illegal wildlife trafficking, after receiving testimony from Catherine E. Semcer, Property and Environment Research Center, Bozeman, Montana; Jonathan Epstein, EcoHealth Alliance, New York, New York; and Dan Ashe, Association of Zoos and Aquariums, Washington, D.C.

COMPETITION WITH CHINA

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee concluded a hearing to examine advancing effective United States competition with China, focusing on objectives, priorities, and next steps, after receiving testimony from Stephen E. Biegun, Deputy Secretary of State.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

S. 4204, to establish an Interagency Task Force to analyze preparedness for national pandemics, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 4210, to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to authorize the transfer of certain equipment during a public health emergency, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 4153, to require the Federal Emergency Management Agency to evaluate the National Response Framework based on lessons learned from the COVID-19 pandemic, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 4157, to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to expand the authority of the National Infrastructure Simulation and Analysis Center, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 4158, to examine the extent of the reliance of the United States on foreign producers for personal protective equipment during the COVID-19 pandemic and produce recommendations to secure the supply chain of personal protective equipment, with amendments;

S. 4133, to modernize the REAL ID Act of 2005, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 4165, to repeal section 692 of the Post-Katrina Emergency Management Reform Act of 2006, with an amendment;

S. 3997, to strengthen the security and integrity of the United States scientific and research enterprise, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 4200, to establish a program to facilitate the adoption of modern technology by executive agencies, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 4077, to amend the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 to provide for regulatory impact analyses for certain rules;

S. 92, to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that major rules of the executive branch shall have no force or effect unless a joint resolution of approval is enacted into law;

S. 4138, to amend title 5, United States Code, to make permanent the authority of the United States Patent and Trademark Office to conduct a telework travel expenses program;

S. 4222, to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to require Federal agencies to submit to the Comptroller General of the United States a report on rules that are revoked, suspended, replaced, amended, or otherwise made ineffective;

S. 3287, to modify the governmentwide financial management plan, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 3455, to prohibit certain individuals from downloading or using TikTok on any device issued by the United States or a government corporation, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 4024, to establish in the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency of the Department of Homeland Security a Cybersecurity Advisory Committee, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 2967, to establish the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations of the United States to facilitate the fullest cooperation, coordination, and mutual accountability among all levels of government, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 3658, to establish an Office of Equal Rights and Community Inclusion at the Federal Emergency Management Agency, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 3038, to promote innovative acquisition techniques and procurement strategies;

S. 3896, to amend title 5, United States Code, to require the Director of the Office of Personnel Management to establish and maintain a public directory of the individuals occupying Government policy and supporting positions, with amendments;

S. 4224, to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to assess technology needs along the Southern border and develop a strategy for bridging such

gaps, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

H.R. 1313, to amend the Implementing Recommendations of the 9/11 Commission Act of 2007 to clarify certain allowable uses of funds for public transportation security assistance grants and establish periods of performance for such grants, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

H.R. 4727, to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish a mentor-protégé program, with an amendment;

H.R. 542, to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish the National Urban Security Technology Laboratory, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 3461, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2600 Wesley Street in Greenville, Texas, as the “Audie Murphy Post Office Building”;

S. 3462, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 909 West Holiday Drive in Fate, Texas, as the “Ralph Hall Post Office”;

S. 3839, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2719 South Webster Street in Kokomo, Indiana, as the “Opha May Johnson Post Office”;

S. 4126, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 104 East Main Street in Port Washington, Wisconsin, as the “Joseph G. Demler Post Office”; and

The nominations of Derek Kan, of California, to be Deputy Director of the Office of Management and Budget, and Mark A. Robbins, Carl Ezekiel Ross, and Elizabeth J. Shapiro, each to be an Associate Judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia.

COLLEGE ATHLETICS

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee concluded a hearing to examine protecting the integrity of college athletics, after receiving testimony from Dan Radakovich, Clemson University, Clemson, South Carolina; Matthew J. Mitten, Marquette University Law School, Milwaukee, Wisconsin; George Wrihster, Unafraid Show, Los Angeles, California; Mark Emmert, National Collegiate Athletic Association, Indianapolis, Indiana; Ramogi Huma, National College Players Association, Norca, California; William C. Miller, Jr., American Gaming Association, Washington, D.C.; and Heather Lyke, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

2020 GENERAL ELECTION PREPARATIONS

Committee on Rules and Administration: Committee concluded a hearing to examine 2020 general election preparations, after receiving testimony from Tre Hargett, Tennessee Secretary of State, Nashville; Mac Warner, West Virginia Secretary of State, Charleston; Rick Stream, Saint Louis County Election Board, St. Louis County, Missouri; and Kristen Clarke, Lawyers’ Committee for Civil Rights Under Law, Washington, D.C.

NOMINATIONS

Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Christopher C. Miller, of Virginia, to be Director of the National Counterterrorism Center, who was introduced by Senator Grassley, and Patrick Hovakimian, of California, to be General Counsel, both of the Office of the Director of National Intelligence, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 15 public bills, H.R. 7718–7732; and 1 resolution, H. Res. 1061, were introduced. **Pages H3692–93**

Additional Cosponsors: **Page H3694**

Report Filed: A report was filed today as follows:

H. Res. 1060, providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 7608) making appropriations for the Department of State, foreign operations, and related

programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2021, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 116–459).

Page H3692

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein she appointed Representative Cuellar to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H3615**

Recess: The House recessed at 9:49 a.m. and reconvened at 10 a.m. **Page H3621**

Fostering Undergraduate Talent by Unlocking Resources for Education Act: The House agreed to

the Jayapal motion to concur in the Senate amendment to H.R. 2486, to reauthorize mandatory funding programs for historically Black colleges and universities and other minority-serving institutions, with an amendment specified in section 4(a) of H. Res. 891, by a yea-and-nay vote of 233 yeas to 183 nays, Roll No. 153. **Pages H3624–42, H3666**

Fostering Undergraduate Talent by Unlocking Resources for Education Act: The House agreed to the Jayapal motion to concur in the Senate amendment to H.R. 2486, to reauthorize mandatory funding programs for historically Black colleges and universities and other minority-serving institutions, with an amendment specified in section 4(b) of H. Res. 891, by a yea-and-nay vote of 231 yeas to 184 nays, Roll No. 154. **Pages H3624–42, H3666–67**

Taxpayer First Act: The House agreed to the Grijalva motion to concur in the Senate amendments to H.R. 1957, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modernize and improve the Internal Revenue Service, by a yea-and-nay vote of 310 yeas to 107 nays, Roll No. 155. **Pages H3642–57, H3667–68**

Agreed to amend the title so as to read: “To amend title 54, United States Code, to establish, fund, and provide for the use of amounts in a National Parks and Public Land Legacy Restoration Fund to address the maintenance backlog of the National Park Service, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, the Bureau of Land Management, the Forest Service, and the Bureau of Indian Education, and to provide permanent, dedicated funding for the Land and Water Conservation Fund, and for other purposes.”

Unanimous Consent Agreement—Consideration of H.R. 7573: Agreed by unanimous consent that debate under clause 1(c) of rule XV on the motion to suspend the rules relating to H.R. 7573 be extended to one hour. **Pages H3657–58**

Suspensions: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measure:

Directing the Architect of the Capitol to replace the bust of Roger Brooke Taney in the Old Supreme Court Chamber of the United States Capitol with a bust of Thurgood Marshall to be obtained by the Joint Committee on the Library and to remove certain statues from areas of the United States Capitol which are accessible to the public, to remove all statues of individuals who voluntarily served the Confederate States of America from display in the United States Capitol: H.R. 7573, amended, to direct the Architect of the Capitol to replace the bust of Roger Brooke Taney in the Old Supreme Court Chamber of the United States Capitol with a bust of Thurgood Marshall to be ob-

tained by the Joint Committee on the Library and to remove certain statues from areas of the United States Capitol which are accessible to the public, to remove all statues of individuals who voluntarily served the Confederate States of America from display in the United States Capitol, by a 2/3 yea-and-nay vote of 305 yeas to 113 nays, Roll No. 156.

Pages H3657–65, H3668–69

Agreed to amend the title so as to read: “To direct the Joint Committee on the Library to replace the bust of Roger Brooke Taney in the Old Supreme Court Chamber of the United States Capitol with a bust of Thurgood Marshall to be obtained by the Joint Committee on the Library and to remove certain statues from areas of the United States Capitol which are accessible to the public, to remove all statues of individuals who voluntarily served the Confederate States of America from display in the United States Capitol, and for other purposes.”

Pages H3668–69

Presidential Message: Read a message from the President wherein he notified Congress that the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13581 with respect to significant transnational criminal organizations is to continue in effect beyond July 24, 2020—referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed (H. Doc. 116–137).

Pages H3670–71

Senate Referral: S. 3989 was held at the desk.

Senate Message: Message received from the Senate today appears on page H3642.

Quorum Calls—Votes: Four yea-and-nay votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H3666, H3666–67, H3667–68, and H3668–69.

Adjournment: The House met at 9 a.m. and adjourned at 9:50 p.m.

Committee Meetings

EXAMINING THE NATIONAL RESPONSE TO THE WORSENING CORONAVIRUS PANDEMIC: PART II

Committee on Homeland Security: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Examining the National Response to the Worsening Coronavirus Pandemic: Part II”. Testimony was heard from Peter T. Gaynor, Administrator, Federal Emergency Management Agency.

LEGISLATIVE MEASURES

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee for Indigenous Peoples of the United States held a hearing on H.R. 958, the “Native Youth and Tribal Officer Protection Act”; H.R. 6237, the “PRC for Native

Veterans Act”; H.R. 6535, the “Coverage for Urban Indian Health Providers Act”; and H.R. 7119, the “Alaska Native Tribal Health Consortium Land Transfer Act of 2020”. Testimony was heard from Jason O’Neal, Assistant Deputy Director, Bureau of Indian Affairs—Office of Justice Services, Department of the Interior; Rear Admiral Michael D. Weahkee, Director, Indian Health Service, Department of Health and Human Services; and public witnesses.

F-35 JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER: ENSURING SAFETY AND ACCOUNTABILITY IN THE GOVERNMENT’S TRILLION DOLLAR INVESTMENT

Committee on Oversight and Reform: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “F-35 Joint Strike Fighter: Ensuring Safety and Accountability in the Government’s Trillion Dollar Investment”. Testimony was heard from Lieutenant General Eric T. Fick, Program Executive Officer, F-35 Joint Program Office, Department of Defense; Theresa Hull, Assistant Inspector General, Department of Defense; Ellen Lord, Under Secretary for Acquisitions and Sustainment, Department of Defense; Diana Maurer, Director, Defense Capabilities and Management, Government Accountability Office; and a public witness.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE, FOREIGN OPERATIONS, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2021

Committee on Rules: Full Committee held a hearing on H.R. 7608, the “Department of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 2021” [State, Foreign Operations, Agriculture, Rural Development, Interior, Environment, Military Construction, and Veterans Affairs Appropriations Act, 2021]. The Committee granted, by record vote of 8–4, a structured rule providing for consideration of H.R. 7608, the “State, Foreign Operations, Agriculture, Rural Development, Interior, Environment, Military Construction, and Veterans Affairs Appropriations Act, 2021”. The rule provides one hour of general debate on the bill equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. The rule provides that an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116–59 shall be considered as adopted and the bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended. The rule provides that clause 2(e) of Rule XXI shall not apply during consideration of the bill. Section 2 of the rule provides that following debate, each further amendment printed in the Rules Committee report not

earlier considered as part of amendments en bloc pursuant to section 3 shall be considered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, may be withdrawn by the proponent at any time before the question is put thereon, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question. Section 3 of the rule provides that at any time after debate the chair of the Committee on Appropriations or her designee may offer amendments en bloc consisting of further amendments printed in the Rules Committee report not earlier disposed of. Amendments en bloc shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for 30 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their designees, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question. The rule waives all points of order against the amendments printed in the Rules Committee report and amendments en bloc described in section 3. The rule provides that during consideration of the amendments described in sections 2 and 3, it shall not be in order to use a decrease in Overseas Contingency Operations funds to offset an amendment that increases an appropriation not designated as Overseas Contingency Operations funds or vice versa. The rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions. Testimony was heard from Chairman Lowey, and Representatives Rogers of Kentucky, Bishop of Georgia, Fortenberry, McCollum, Joyce of Ohio, Wasserman Schultz, Carter of Texas, Jackson Lee, Titus, Burgess, Crawford, Gianforte, González-Colón of Puerto Rico, Graves of Louisiana, Grothman, and Stauber.

21ST CENTURY SBA: AN ANALYSIS OF SBA’S TECHNOLOGY SYSTEMS

Committee on Small Business: Subcommittee on Investigations, Oversight, and Regulations held a hearing entitled “21st Century SBA: An Analysis of SBA’s Technology Systems”. Testimony was heard from Guy Cavallo, Deputy Chief Information Officer, Small Business Administration.

SAFETY FOR ALL: ENDING SEXUAL HARASSMENT IN THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

Committee on Veterans’ Affairs: Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations; and Women Veterans Task Force held a joint hearing entitled “Safety for All: Ending Sexual Harassment in the Department of Veterans Affairs”. Testimony was heard from Pamela Powers, Acting Deputy Secretary, Department of

Veterans Affairs; Cindy Brown Barnes, Director, Education, Workforce, and Income Security, Government Accountability Office; and a public witness.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THURSDAY, JULY 23, 2020

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Subcommittee on Communications, Technology, Innovation, and the Internet, to hold hearings to examine the state of United States spectrum policy, 10 a.m., SR-253.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: to hold an oversight hearing to examine the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic on users of public lands, forests, and national parks, 10 a.m., SD-366.

Committee on Foreign Relations: to hold hearings to examine the nominations of Lisa S. Kenna, of Vermont, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Peru, Leora Rosenberg Levy, of Connecticut, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Chile, Aldona Z. Wos, of North Carolina, to be Ambassador to Canada, and William W. Popp, of Missouri, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Guatemala, all of the Department of State, 10 a.m., SD-106.

Committee on the Judiciary: business meeting to consider S. 4212, to amend title 28, United States Code, to strip foreign sovereign immunity of certain foreign states to secure justice for victims of novel coronavirus in the United States, and the nominations of David W. Dugan, and Stephen P. McGlynn, both to be a United States District Judge for the Southern District of Illinois, John W. Holcomb, to be United States District Judge for the Central District of California, Hala Y. Jarbou, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Michigan, Iain D. Johnston, and Franklin Ulyses Valderrama, both to be a United States District Judge for the Northern District of Illinois, Brett H. Ludwig, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Wisconsin, R. Shireen Matthews, and Todd Wallace Robinson, both to be a United States District Judge for the Southern District of California, Christy Criswell Wiegand, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Pennsylvania, and Roderick C. Young, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Virginia, 10 a.m., SD-325.

Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship: to hold hearings to examine capital access for minority small businesses, focusing on COVID-19 resources for an equitable and sustainable recovery, 10 a.m., SD-430.

House

Committee on Agriculture, Subcommittee on Commodity Exchanges, Energy, and Credit, hearing entitled “On Farm Energy Production: Impacts on Farm Income and

Rural Communities”, 10 a.m., 1300 Longworth and Webex.

Committee on Education and Labor, Subcommittee on Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education, hearing entitled “Underfunded and Unprepared: Examining How to Overcome Obstacles to Safely Reopen Public Schools”, 10:15 a.m., 2175 Rayburn and Webex.

Committee on Financial Services, Full Committee, hearing entitled “The Heroes Act: Providing for a Strong Economic Recovery from COVID-19”, 2128 Rayburn and Webex.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, Full Committee, hearing entitled “The Trump Administration’s FY2021 Foreign Assistance Budget Request”, 9:30 a.m., 2172 Rayburn and Webex.

Committee on the Judiciary, Full Committee, markup on H.R. 2678, the “No President is Above the Law Act”; H.R. 7694, the “Abuse of the Pardon Prevention Act”; and to Ratify Subcommittee Assignments, 10 a.m., CVC-200 and Webex.

Committee on Natural Resources, Full Committee, hearing entitled “The Transformation of the Puerto Rico Electric Power Authority (PREPA)”, 3:30 p.m., 1324 Longworth and Webex.

Committee on Oversight and Reform, Subcommittee on National Security, hearing entitled “Empowering Women and Girls and Promoting International Security”, 10 a.m., 2154 Rayburn and Webex.

Committee on Veterans’ Affairs, Full Committee, hearing on H.R. 6039, to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to seek to enter into an agreement with the city of Vallejo, California, for the transfer of Mare Island Naval Cemetery in Vallejo, California, and for other purposes; H.R. 6082, the “Forgotten Vietnam Veterans Act”; H.R. 4908, the “Native American PACT Act”; H.R. 2791, the “Department of Veterans Affairs Tribal Advisory Committee Act of 2019”; H.R. 4526, the “Brian Tally VA Employment Transparency Act”; H.R. 3582, to amend title 38, United States Code, to expand the scope of the Advisory Committee on Minority Veterans, and for other purposes; H.R. 96, to amend title 38, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to furnish dental care in the same manner as any other medical service, and for other purposes; H.R. 4281, the “Access to Contraception Expansion for Veterans Act”; H.R. 3010, the “Honoring All Veterans Act”; H.R. 7163, the “VA FOIA Reform Act of 2020”; H.R. 7111, the “Veterans Economic Recovery Act of 2020”; H.R. 2435, the “Accelerating Veterans Recovery Outdoors Act”; H.R. 7287, to clarify the licensure requirements for contractor medical professionals to perform medical disability examinations for the Department of Veterans Affairs; H.R. 3228, the “VA Mission Telehealth Clarification Act”; H.R. 6141, the “Protecting Moms Who Served Act”; H.R. 6493, the “Veterans Benefits Fairness and Transparency Act”; H.R. 7445, to amend title 38, United States Code, to expand eligibility for home loans from the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to certain members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces; legislation on the Burial Equity for Guards and Reserves Act of 2020; legislation to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend

certain employment and reemployment rights to members of the National Guard who perform State active duty; and legislation to amend title 38, United States Code, to clarify the scope of procedural rights of members of the uniformed services with respect to their employment and reemployment rights, and for other purposes, 10 a.m., HVC-210 and Webex.

Committee on Ways and Means, Subcommittee on Trade, hearing entitled “Trade, Manufacturing, and Critical Supply Chains: Lessons from COVID-19”, 2 p.m., Webex.

Joint Meetings

Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe: to hold hearings to examine human rights at home, focusing on media, politics and safety of journalists, 11 a.m., Webex.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

9:30 a.m., Thursday, July 23

Senate Chamber

Program for Thursday: Senate will continue consideration of S. 4049, National Defense Authorization Act.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

9 a.m., Thursday, July 23

House Chamber

Program for Thursday: Consideration of H.R. 7608—State, Foreign Operations, Agriculture, Rural Development, Interior, Environment, Military Construction, and Veterans Affairs Appropriations Act, 2021 (*Subject to a Rule*).

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Brady, Kevin, Tex., E661
Carbajal, Salud O., Calif., E663
Davis, Danny K., Ill., E663
DeFazio, Peter A., Ore., E664

Garamendi, John, Calif., E661
Hill, J. French, Ark., E662
Hudson, Richard, N.C., E661
Luján, Ben Ray, N.M., E664
Miller, Carol D., W.Va. E663
Newhouse, Dan, Wash., E663

Palmer, Gary J., Ala., E663
Roby, Martha, Ala., E665
Rouda, Harley, Calif. E665
Walorski, Jackie, Ind., E662



Congressional Record

printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Publishing Office, at www.govinfo.gov, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Publishing Office. Phone 202-512-1800, or 866-512-1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, contactcenter@gpo.gov. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197-9000, or phone orders to 866-512-1800 (toll-free), 202-512-1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202-512-2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Publishing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.