



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 166

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MAY 27, 2020

No. 99

Senate

The Senate was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Thursday, May 28, 2020, at 11 a.m.

House of Representatives

WEDNESDAY, MAY 27, 2020

The House met at 10 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,
May 27, 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 11:50 a.m.

BLACK LIVES MATTER

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

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, and still I rise, as I rise today, Mr.

Speaker, to speak the truth about the circumstance as it relates to African Americans in the United States of America.

I rise to say, Mr. Speaker, that Black lives do not matter as much as White lives. If Black lives matter as much as White lives, Mr. George Floyd would still be breathing. If Black lives matter as much as White lives, Ahmaud Arbery would have finished his jog. If Black lives matter as much as White lives, Christian Cooper wouldn't have been falsely accused.

Black lives do not matter as much as White lives. Why? Because we tolerate hatred, bigotry, and invidious discrimination. We tolerate it. And because we tolerate it, we allow it to be perpetuated.

We in this country have the power to do something about the racism that exists as it relates to Black people. We have tolerated it since 1619 and the arrival of Black people in the Americas. But it is time for us to do something about it.

We have had the opportunity to do something.

When the Chief Executive Officer of this country is a racist and a bigot, we should do something about that. And we had the opportunity to, but we did not. We tolerated it. And there were some who went so far as to almost justify it with some of their commentary about the comments that were being made: Oh, he is just a jerk.

Black lives matter, and we ought not tolerate it to the extent we have.

I believe that we in the Congress of the United States of America have a

duty to do what has been done in the past. We declared a war on poverty. We declared a war on drugs. Why not declare a war on racism? Why not decide that, here and now, we are not going to allow racism to continue in this country to the extent that people lose their lives?

What happened to some of the persons who have lost their lives as of late is almost predictable, because we have seen circumstances similar occur and we have not taken aggressive action.

The officers in the Floyd case should not only be arrested; they ought to be prosecuted. I was a magistrate. I know probable cause when I see it, and there is probable cause to arrest and prosecute those officers.

Black lives matter. And those who have not allowed the Black Lives Matter movement to continue, to become the movement that could make a difference in the lives of people in this country, have some responsibility because they fought the very movement that was going to make a difference in the lives of people, may have saved some lives of people.

So I rise today, Mr. Speaker, to say that we in Congress have some responsibility to the people we serve; and a part of that responsibility is to assure them that they can go jogging and return home, that if they are arrested by the police, they won't be suffocated to the extent that they lose their lives. We have to make sure that we tell this country, in no uncertain terms, that Black lives do matter.

And, finally, this: It is not about Democrats and not about Republicans.

□ 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.

H2285

I am not blaming the Republicans for what is happening. I am not blaming the Democrats for what is happening. I am blaming people who hold public trust and tolerate hate and invidious discrimination.

We are the people who can make a difference, and we ought to make a difference. We ought to demand that the people running for public office make public statements about how they plan to end invidious discrimination, not how they plan to tolerate it, how they plan to manage it.

How do you plan to end it?

How do you plan to end it in banking?

How do you plan to end it in hiring and promotions?

This is our time. If we don't do it now, when will we do it? No candidate should be off limits. Every one of them ought to have to tell us what they plan to do.

And, finally, as my final comments: I love my country. And because I love my country, I feel that I have this duty, obligation, and responsibility to speak up when these kinds of injustices occur.

I love my country, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

FOLLOW THE SCIENCE, FOR A CHANGE

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

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, just a few months ago, America enjoyed the most promising economic expansion in our lifetimes, lifting millions of Americans out of poverty, boosting wages for American workers, and producing the lowest unemployment rates in 50 years. Today, the American economy lies in rubble, with tens of millions of Americans thrown into unemployment, poverty, and despair.

Now, that damage was not done by a virus. It was done by ordering entire populations into indefinite home detention, shuttering countless businesses, and desecrating the most fundamental human rights that our Constitution demands our government to protect.

Now, we are told to follow the science and data. That would be nice, for a change.

What does the science tell us about the severity of COVID-19? Well, we know that about 80 percent of those who get it either have no symptoms at all or experience it as a mild respiratory infection. In New York, 74 percent of those who died were over age 65 and six one-hundredths of 1 percent were under the age of 18. Three-quarters of those who died had underlying medical conditions.

So how does it follow the science to close the schools where it poses the

least danger while packing infected patients into nursing homes where it poses the greatest danger?

Once epidemiologists began surveying general populations, they discovered the disease isn't nearly as severe as the claims that set off the global panic. Researchers at Stanford University surveyed the population of Santa Clara, California, and estimated a fatality rate of seventeen one-hundredths of 1 percent. New York serology tests revealed a fatality rate of one-half of 1 percent.

So, simply stated, if you get the flu, your chance of survival is 99.9 percent; and according to these studies, if you get COVID-19, your chance of survival is better than 99.5 percent.

So how does this science justify throwing nearly 40 million Americans into unemployment?

Does the science support population-wide lockdowns?

In 2006, based upon an Albuquerque teenager's science paper, the Bush administration proposed mass lockdowns in the event of a severe flu pandemic. Leading epidemiologists warned at the time that: "The negative consequences of large-scale quarantine are so extreme that this mitigation measure should be eliminated from serious consideration." It wasn't.

New York Governor Andrew Cuomo has now admitted that 84 percent of COVID-19 hospitalizations in New York are people who are either already quarantined at home or are at nursing homes.

Statistical analysts, including Stanford University's Michael Levitt, Tel Aviv University's Isaac Ben-Israel, Kentucky State University's Wilfred Reilly, and Cypress Semiconductor's T. J. Rodgers, are finding no significant statistical difference in the infection curves between those jurisdictions that have destroyed their economies and those that haven't. In fact, a study by J.P. Morgan has found an inverse relationship as economies began to open back up.

A study of 318 outbreaks involving 1,245 cases in China found just one outbreak that occurred outdoors, involving just two cases. Eighty percent of the outbreaks occurred in people's homes. So how does it follow the science to close outdoor venues and order people indoors?

Mr. Speaker, it is high time we considered how many Americans will die because of the COVID-19 lockdowns. The Well Being Trust predicts up to 75,000 "deaths of despair" due to suicide and drug and alcohol abuse because of the lockdown.

In March, the Epic Health Research Network warned of a 94 percent decline in breast, colon, and cervical cancer screenings. The Rape, Abuse & Incest National Network reports a 22 percent increase in children calling for help.

A 2011 Columbia University study funded by the National Institutes of Health estimated that 4½ percent of all deaths in the United States are related

to poverty. So how does it follow the science to destroy the livelihoods of millions of Americans, cut them off from their social networks, force them into isolation, and plunge them into poverty and despair?

Now, I don't blame public health officials. They have the luxury of ignoring the effect of their policies beyond their area of expertise. The responsibility rests, rather, with public officials who failed to consider the catastrophic collateral damage that they have caused, who became so drunk with power and so besotted with self-righteousness that they lost any reference to common sense or any concern for the damage they have done.

NEED FOR FIFTH CORONAVIRUS STIMULUS BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) for 5 minutes.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor to echo the rising chorus for a fifth coronavirus bill and to applaud three vital provisions addressed to the special circumstances of the District of Columbia in that bill.

Speaker NANCY PELOSI and the Democrats have taken needed initiative in introducing the HEROES Act to get ahead of this virus, instead of chasing it.

The first four bills have proven themselves. Jurisdictions following the CDC guidelines, like the District of Columbia, are seeing deaths decrease. Across the country, careful reopenings are occurring. To be sure, scientists are warning of prolonging the virus unless there is more social distancing and masking, because that is far from universal.

But my Republican friends have called for a pause. Of course, we have seen unprecedented spending, but this is an unprecedented virus. The virus has shut down the entire world.

I am pleased that Republicans may be declaring the end of their pause barely a week after House passage of the HEROES Act. Yesterday, the Senate majority leader said Congress will probably have to pass a fifth bill. Thank you, Senator MCCONNELL.

President Trump said—and I am quoting him—"I think the United States will need another round of stimulus."

They may be following Federal Reserve Chairman Jerome Powell, who said more is needed for the economy shortly after the April report showed a 14.7 percent unemployment rate.

Mr. MCCONNELL only wants to fund increased losses due to COVID-19, whatever that means. But tailoring the next bill based on whether COVID-19 or something else caused the losses would require an inexact calculus that itself could bog down the next bill, particularly what I regard as the most essential part of the HEROES Act, \$1 trillion for State and local government.

This is the government, State and local government, that is closest to the people. This is the government that funds first responders and healthcare workers in local hospitals. This is the government that funds the workers who pick up your garbage twice a week. This is the government running on fumes.

So are the American people who need another cash payment, an additional \$1,200 per family member, up to \$6,000 per household, and other essentials like unemployment benefits and housing benefits, a 15 percent increase in nutrition programs. People have got to eat during this crisis.

□ 1015

I also have been able to get included in the HEROES Act a trifecta of provisions that the District must have, beginning with the \$755 million in retroactive funding Republicans in the Senate removed from the CARES Act by treating the District for the first time in American history as a territory, when we have always been treated for what we are, a State for funding purposes, and, of course, the D.C. statehood bill has enough cosponsors to pass this very year.

We have always received State-level funding because we pay the highest Federal taxes per capita in the United States. The HEROES Act also includes money for State, county, and city funding, the first time the District has ever had to break down its funding. The District is a unique jurisdiction in the United States because it operates at all three levels.

The HEROES Act also authorizes the District to participate in the municipal liquidity facilities funding of the Federal Reserve, if that should become necessary. The \$3 trillion HEROES Act sent to the Senate last week is a marker. It will probably not be enough, as large as it is, to contain this virus. But, at a minimum, it should get us started on sensible negotiations.

Time, Mr. Speaker, is not on the side of the virus. Let's beat it with the HEROES Act.

LOWERING PRESCRIPTIONS COSTS FOR SENIORS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend President Trump and the administration for taking decisive action to lower drug costs for America's seniors.

Currently, 34.2 million people in the U.S. have diabetes. One in every three seniors on Medicare has diabetes, and over 3.3 million beneficiaries use at least one type of insulin.

Thanks to President Trump, the out-of-pocket cost for insulin has been cut. Participating plans will cap costs at just \$35 a month per type of insulin. This is tremendous news.

For far too long, seniors have been subjected to escalating insulin prices. Now, Americans will save an average of \$446 on insulin costs in just a year.

I thank President Trump for continuing to put the American people first.

ADMINISTRATION AIDING NORTH CAROLINA

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, there is no substitute for swift and decisive action. Since the initial outbreak of COVID-19 in China, President Trump and the administration have worked tirelessly to protect the American people.

First, President Trump closed our borders and enacted a travel ban to protect the American people. This was a necessary precaution that undoubtedly saved lives. In response, the mainstream media's political pundits cried foul and claimed this was an ill-advised tactic intended to score political points. That could not be farther from the truth.

Sadly, my colleagues across the aisle and those in the media would rather search for the newest outrage du jour instead of focusing on the efforts of the President and the administration to combat COVID-19.

It is time to correct the record and cast aside the falsehoods that Democrats and the mainstream media are pushing against President Trump and the administration.

For example, let's look at what is being done to help North Carolinians during this pandemic. Under the direction of President Trump, FEMA has obligated almost \$30 million for COVID-19 response efforts in North Carolina.

From the Strategic National Stockpile, North Carolina received to date: Over 250,000 N95 masks; over 580,000 surgical masks; over 100,000 medical gowns; over 115,000 face shields; and over 425,000 pairs of gloves.

In addition, President Trump approved Governor Roy Cooper's Major Disaster Declaration, and then directed FEMA to fund 100 percent of the emergency assistance activities provided by the North Carolina National Guard.

President Trump and the administration are deeply committed to protecting not only North Carolinians, but also Americans across our country.

If my colleagues across the aisle shared the same sentiment of being "in it together," they would work with us to deliver for the American people and set aside their relentless impeachment crusade.

It is time to get our country back on its feet, and I am proud that President Trump and the administration are working day in and day out to do so. We will win this fight, and I am certain we will emerge stronger and more resilient.

THE NAVAJO NATION AND THE CORONAVIRUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. O'HALLERAN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. O'HALLERAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share with my colleagues in Washington—and all watching at home—the dire situation COVID-19 has created in the Navajo Nation and across our Nation.

But first, standing in this Chamber today, I want to recognize the nearly 100,000 lives lost thus far to the coronavirus, a staggering number that has affected families, communities, economy, frontline first responders, and many others.

Though some Americans may feel they have reached a new normal, hot spots across our Nation are still in the thick of this pandemic, and the fear for what might come in the fall and winter is at the forefront of our thoughts.

One of those hot spots is the Navajo Nation. Per capita, the Navajo Nation has more confirmed coronavirus cases than any U.S. State. Under the CARES Act, signed into law March 27, my colleagues and I fought to include \$8 billion for Tribal governments to use for expenses incurred during the pandemic.

The first round of that funding did not reach the Navajo Nation until May 5. Much of the delay was because officials within the Department of the Interior were considering allocating a portion of this \$8 billion to the Alaska Natives Corporation, a group of for-profit entities that generate billions of dollars in revenue each year, and answer to individual stakeholders.

I immediately joined the voices of Tribes across our Nation in demanding that these funds reach established Tribal governments, not corporations.

On April 27, a U.S. district judge announced that the Treasury Department could begin distributing money to federally-recognized Tribes, and not to this corporate group. Delayed funding is not the only issue here. While Tribes wait for the rest of the CARES Act money they were promised, politics in Washington continue to complicate already acute public health concerns on Navajo.

Recent reports indicate that respirator masks sent to Navajo Nation hospitals through a Federal contract with a former White House staffer may be faulty. I have serious concerns about the lack of oversight and accountability in this contract-awarding process, considering that this \$3 million deal was awarded to a friend of the administration with no prior Federal contracting experience, who had only been in business for 11 days.

It is unacceptable for government to be delivering anything other than what is needed to any community, much less a hard-hit community like Navajo.

I have asked my colleagues here to help me launch an immediate investigation into the potentially faulty PPE, and to make sure that the entire contracting process receives more oversight.

While Tribes deal with the fallout politics has caused, they endure other

factors that have complicated this pandemic as well. Critical water, sanitation, and broadband projects throughout the Navajo Nation remain unfunded and firmly on Congress' back burner.

Since coming to Washington in 2017, I have tried to raise the alarm about these long-overlooked issues. I have worked with Tribal governments, shareholders in my district, and my colleagues here on Capitol Hill to find solutions to the problems faced by Indian Country.

This public health crisis continues to shine a brighter light on the hurdles that many Tribal families face every day, not just during a global pandemic. I hope I can count on the many who have joined me in speaking up for Tribal communities to continue to do so after this crisis because lives are at stake here.

Tribal communities are tired of partisan games and political spin. They need the resources they were promised so each sovereign Nation can care for their people.

The Dine people are resilient and they will win this fight.

In a report yesterday from my friend and Navajo Nation President Jonathan Nez, he noted that the Navajo Nation's own aggressive public health measures have helped flatten the curve of COVID-19 significantly.

The situation could have been much worse without his leadership, and the region remains at a high risk if the Federal Government does not step up and do its part.

ECONOMIC AND INTELLECTUAL COMPETITION WITH CHINA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognize the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. JOYCE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, for far too long, the Chinese Communist Party has taken advantage of innocent people in its own country and around the world.

Now, America is engaged in an economic and intellectual competition with China that existed long before the coronavirus crossed our borders. The current pandemic merely has exposed the Chinese Communist Party's sinister lies, and the depths to which it will reach.

There is no question that we must hold this regime accountable for all of its actions. As a member of the China Task Force, I am committed to combating the Chinese Government's threats to our great Nation. We must be focused on strengthening and protecting our supply chains to ensure that we are never beholden to this regime for critical medicines and critical supplies.

Americans must once again lead in innovation. We must, and we will.

SURVEILLANCE OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, October 2001, under the shadow of 9/11, with the House office buildings evacuated because of the threat of anthrax, a bill authored by Chairman JIM SENSENBRENNER and the Bush White House was brought before the House. It was called the USA PATRIOT Act.

Now, who could, in the shadow of 9/11, vote against anything called the USA PATRIOT Act? Well, I did, as did 66 other Members; 3 Republicans, 62 Democrats, and 1 Independent, because of the unbelievably, unconstitutionally broad powers that would be granted for surveillance of all the American people in myriad ways.

Now, there wasn't even a copy of the bill available. I came to the floor, and I said: Can I have a copy of the bill? They said: Sorry, there is only one. It is on the Republican side. I said: Well, it is not the Senate. I can't filibuster, but I will make it a long day with the adjournment votes. Get me a copy. They printed out a copy, it was hot off the Xerox. I got rushed on this side by Members of the Judiciary Committee who ostensibly authored the bill to try and find out what the heck was in it, but people still voted for it. The abuses that have come under this are myriad and well-documented.

Now, I credit ZOE LOFGREN for trying to amend the most egregious section, 215, and my colleague, RON WYDEN from Oregon. Senator WYDEN almost succeeded in the Senate, short one vote. And ZOE tried on the last reauthorization and this one to amend that. Unfortunately, she was pressured by and forced to, since otherwise they would block her amendment, to water down her revisions to section 215.

Now, Senator WYDEN is opposed, as are others. What is section 215? Unbelievably broad, warrantless, intrusive, internet searches of everything you look at, browse online. For what purpose? Who knows? What are they going to do with that information? Well, maybe they are going to apply an algorithm and find something. They gather so much data, they don't know what to do with it.

□ 1030

What is the legal standard? A presumption of relevance to an investigation. Isn't that a laughable standard? You could presume relevance to virtually anything in the world at any time.

So this bill, even if that amendment should pass, even if the bill comes up today—it is questionable whether it will. We now have government by tweet on that side of the aisle.

Trump says jump; they jump. And last night, Trump said he is against this, even though it has a special provision in the bill for President Trump because of the Carter Page abuses.

It says the "Attorney General," in quotes—by the way, that means any senior official in the Justice Department—would have to sign off on targeting Federal officials or candidates for office.

First off, why should those people be exempt if they are engaged in terrorist activities or presumptive relevance of terrorist activities?

But, again, "Attorney General," with this laughable clown in the Attorney General's Office who jumps even higher than they do when the President tweets, I don't think so. Just think of how they could use that politically, not for intelligence purposes.

It does nothing to reform section 702, which is incidental backdoor accumulation of data. There are many, many documented abuses of section 202.

It does finally do away with what was revealed by Mr. Snowden, the massive gathering of all phone records.

Again, what are they going to do with it? Hundreds of millions of records, no effective algorithms, no way to figure out what it was about. It was useless, operationally, as analyzed by numerous commissions and others, but there was still massive compliance and errors.

Even the NSA said: No, we don't want that anymore; we can't do anything with it. But the administration asked that it be continued. This bill doesn't continue it, one of the few merits of this so-called reform bill.

This bill does not deserve passage. It does not undo the damage that was created in the shadow of 9/11, to the ignorance of most Members of Congress who voted for it.

PROTECT FARMERS' WATER AND PROPERTY RIGHTS

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, in that we do have other things going on in this country besides the virus, we do have a crisis up in the Klamath Basin on the border of California and Oregon right now.

The Klamath farmers up there are the owners of the Klamath Project water. It was created approximately 100 years ago to allow the ability to farm crops to returning World War I and World War II veterans at that point. Those growers owned the right to approximately 350,000 acre-feet from the Upper Klamath Lake, water created by the project which would not exist without the creation of the project.

This year, after many years of having their water pirated away from them, their allocation during a lesser water rainfall and snowfall season was 140,000 acre-feet, they were told on April 1, the second-worst allocation they have ever had, rivaled only by 2001 when they got zero acre-feet allocated to them. 140,000 acre-feet, they were told.

So as farmers do—I am a farmer; I get it—we go out and start the process of planting; tilling the ground; ordering up your fertilizer and your seed; applying the fertilizer; and then, finally, seeding the ground.

Well, lo and behold, a few weeks later, it was decided to release 50,000 acre-feet from that lake in order to help suppress a virus farther down the Klamath River called the C. shasta, which is supposed to be harmful to the coho salmon, a fish that is deemed endangered on the Klamath, yet not endangered in other areas of the country.

Right on the heels of the end of that 50,000 acre-foot release for C. shasta virus for coho salmon, it was decided that there is now not enough water in the lake. The incoming water supply was misestimated.

They were told they were going to have to cut back from the original 140,000 acre-feet. They were going to cut back approximately 60,000 acre-feet of that, leaving them with about 80,000 acre-feet for the entire season. This is crops already spent, the cost already incurred to be put in the ground.

The water supply is estimated to last until approximately June 15. From June 16 to September, they are going to be in a very dire way. They are going to be out of water, with the investment in the ground.

As devastating as 2001 was, this will break many farms up in the Klamath Basin. Unique crops they grow up there—mint, radishes, potatoes, many others—as well as the refuge that sits at the far end of that system that needs the water to flow through those irrigation districts so we will have a duck population, so we will have other wildlife that is extremely important not only for the area but for the entire State of California and the West Coast.

This duck population is going to be devastated. Just recently, when they had good water, they had a huge number of ducks hatch, and we had a good population. That is going to be devastated.

Farming is the only major economic industry, really, in the region, other than some tourism. There are about 12,000 farms in that Klamath Basin. Approximately \$75 million has been spent putting those crops in. It is thought, as it is being estimated right now, the total effect on the region, if this water is taken away and not restored by somewhere around June 15, \$200 to \$300 million more is coming out of that area. We have created a crisis up there.

This water, by law, belongs to the irrigators, not to the Endangered Species Act, not to a Federal agency. The irrigators themselves spend \$30 million a year to maintain and operate, if it is actually operating, the project. They still have to pay that bill.

But the Endangered Species Act is being interpreted to require water that doesn't belong to the government to be taken and given either to keep the lake fuller for the sucker fish or run downstream in order to allegedly help the

coho salmon. There are science and arguments out there that this doesn't help those two species, yet we continue down this blind path, doing it year after year after year, for at least 20 years.

At this point, with the uncertainty of our Nation's food supply, from the farm gate to the markets, this is what we have going on with farmers up there, having their property rights taken. We must do better. We must take immediate action.

GIVE STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS FUNDS TO CONDUCT TESTING, CONTACT TRACING

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

Mr. MALINOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, for the last 3 months, tens of millions of our fellow Americans have chosen to make painful sacrifices to keep one another safe.

They made that choice before any Governor of any State told them they had to. They did what they thought was right, what was decent, what was responsible. Overwhelmingly, the American people still believe that social distancing to protect our neighbors is the right thing to do even where States have lifted stay-at-home orders.

You wouldn't know this by watching the news because the news dwells on conflict, not consensus. The loudest voices say: "Reopen everything now. Yes, people will die, but people die of car crashes, of cancer, of heart disease. We don't stay home for that." The angriest voices say: "Go to the grocery store. Throw off your mask. Make them call the police." They pretend to be brave. They shout childish slogans about liberty, as if liberty meant the right to endanger the lives of others for our own convenience.

On social media, there is an effort to make everything about this pandemic partisan; as if whether you are a Democrat or Republican should determine what medicines you should take or whether you should wear a mask.

I have been to plenty of countries where everything is made to be political, where everything is made to be tribal. I never thought I would see people in the United States of America trying to make our country like that.

But, Mr. Speaker, America is not like that. The vast majority of Republicans and Democrats still say that of course we should do what is needed to protect others. We are still a country that cares whether people live or die more than we care about the stock market.

In New Jersey this year, we have had 177 road fatalities. Thus far, we have lost more than 11,000 people to the coronavirus, and that number would be vastly higher if not for the lockdowns.

Now, nobody is rushing to our State capital with guns, screaming to keep the economy closed. No one ever loudly clamors for shared sacrifice. But the quiet majority still say that we should

put public health first. The vast majority still want to be sure that we have to do this only once, and therefore, we have to do it right.

So, yes, I get a lot of questions back home about when things are going to reopen. But the most urgent question I get is not when do we reopen, but: How are you going to help us safely reopen? What are you doing about that?

Right now, the only responsible answer is that we must vastly expand contact tracing and testing for the coronavirus so that people can go back to normal life, knowing it is safe.

Unfortunately, the administration's plan for testing, which we just received, basically states to the States around our country: We will give you some supplies, but otherwise, you are on your own.

It is a shameful abdication of responsibility. At this point, I am done with expecting better from our President. We are on our own in New Jersey, in Michigan, in Ohio, in California.

So, let's at least give our State and local governments the resources they need to bear this burden that our national government will not.

The HEROES Act would provide \$75 billion to help our States conduct the testing and contact tracing that we need if we want to go back to work and school safely. The HEROES Act also provides the funding our State and local governments have been pleading for to make up for revenues lost because of coronavirus.

Mr. Speaker, in my district, I represent 75 small towns. We have more Republican mayors in those towns than Democrats, but this is not partisan in my district. Every one of them would rather spend money to pay our cops, our firefighters, and our teachers to do their jobs than spend money to pay for their unemployment.

My message to those who are stepping down from responsibility is at least help us to help those who are stepping up. You want to go to the beach, to a ball game? You want to hold political rallies? Fine, so do I. Help the people who are risking their lives to make it safer for us to do those things. Help the people who are working, who never stopped working, to give us liberty without giving us death.

That is what the HEROES Act does. If the Senate has a better plan, then let's hear it; let's negotiate; let's find our common ground. Otherwise, let's send it to the President and get this job done.

HIGHLIGHTING THE LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CUNNINGHAM) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to bring attention to the Land and Water Conservation Fund, otherwise known as the LWCF.

Families across the Lowcountry are turning to green spaces to cope during

this pandemic, and it is clear that we need more parks and trails where folks can get outside with social distancing. That is what LWCF does for communities.

Our region relies on tourism and outdoor recreation, sectors that are taking a major hit these days. That is why I am standing with the businesses that make up the Outdoor Recreation Roundtable in calling on Congress to pass the bipartisan Great American Outdoors Act to fully fund LWCF and restore our parks.

Whether it is our seafood, our beaches, the opportunities to hunt and fish, access to nature is one reason the Lowcountry is so special. Let's keep it that way by investing in conservation that supports our health and our economy.

□ 1045

COVID-19

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, we are in the backdrop of commemorating Memorial Day just 2 days ago, when the Nation bowed their heads to honor the fallen. We did that without question, without equivocation. But we also acknowledge, and I stand here today acknowledging, the sacrifice of those heroes, acknowledging that 1,000 veterans, as well, have lost their lives from COVID-19.

I stand here today to say to America, almost 100,000 of our fellow Americans, our fellow residents, our mothers and fathers, sisters and brothers, cousins, aunts, uncles, grandparents, loved ones, and neighbors, dear friends, classmates, and all around us have been the victims of COVID-19.

So I speak for the overwhelming number of Americans who say yes to the HEROES Act.

Mr. Speaker, I ask those in the other body and in the administration: Have you ever seen a headline that said, when a city tried to do its best, \$15 million in rental assistance runs out in 90 minutes—in my hometown of Houston.

Mr. Speaker, I say thank you to the mayor, thank you to the county judge. They are trying.

Have you ever seen someone who's never had to beg for food or ask for food sit in the hot Sun in their car for 7 hours—I have—to be able to get groceries for their children?

Have you ever seen folks line up to be tested, because they should have been tested in February, March, but there were no kits?

So working in a public-private partnership with UMMC, I opened seven testing sites. The first one opened before any governmental site was opened.

So I say today, that is why I am on the floor supporting \$75 billion in testing, \$1 trillion in making sure that brave municipal workers, firefighters, teachers, and all those who do our

work every day, police and others, are standing and supporting the community.

That is why I am supporting the direct payment, because Chairman Powell of the Fed said we have to go big.

There are going to ultimately maybe be 36 million people unemployed. That is why I am supporting rental assistance and mortgage assistance. That is why I am supporting food assistance.

Mr. Speaker, has anybody seen the faces of these people? Do we not understand the pain of what they are going through?

That is why I am here on the floor dealing with the support of the HEROES Act that must be signed by the President and passed by the other body, the U.S. Senate.

WE MUST DEMAND JUSTICE

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I want to pause for a moment and now come to something that has soaked my very DNA and my soul, and that is that a young man by the name of Ahmaud Arbery cannot jog in Georgia and be left to his constitutional rights. They were denied. He was gunned down for absolutely no reason whatsoever.

It must be addressed. There must be a trial, and there must be justice. Justice will render not his life back to his family, but it will render truth.

As a member of the Judiciary Committee, I have written letters, and I look forward to us organizing a response that I have asked for in terms of hearing from the victims and their various representatives.

Brianna Taylor was going to be a nurse; Mr. Arbery was going to be an electrician. She was going to be a nurse. She was doing what Americans do—sleeping, getting ready for work the next day—and lo and behold, she was bombarded; she was invaded. And she was the wrong house and the wrong person, and that person was in custody already.

We must demand justice.

When you have the color of law and when you have those whom you look to for sanctity and you can respect them when they are doing their work, you must also—and I ask my fellow lawmakers and, also, law upholders—stand together.

Now, brother George Floyd, I was up until 2 in the morning with the pain of the video. George Floyd, his family—he was raised in Houston in my district—went to Jack Yates High School. There are people mourning in Houston, Texas. He lived there for 40 years, a gentle giant, and he was taken away from us by a knee on his neck, crying for his mama.

There must be charges. They must be brought to justice, even if they wear a uniform, in order for law and order to be upheld. Everyone is watching that.

I have had fellow officers send me messages: Outrageous.

My heart is burning; my heart is hurting. I am crying when I heard him say, "Mama, Mama, Mama," and his brothers and sisters have the pain of hearing that over and over again.

People were asking, Good Samaritans, saying: Please take your knee off his neck, his trach. You are choking him. You are killing him.

How can this be?

I quietly say, Mr. Speaker, as I close, God is on our side. We are a nation of laws and the Constitution. All I ask for these families, all I ask, is fairness, simple justice, and mercy for these families.

May they rest in peace, those who have gone on, and others, at the hands of those who should not have brought them down.

God bless you.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 51 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. DEGETTE) at noon.

PRAYER

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

As Members return to the Capitol, keep them safe from infection during this time of pandemic.

In the work that they do, and how they do it, give them wisdom and patience. The world is affected tremendously for the first time in many decades, and new ways of living and working are going through fits and starts. Please be with us during these unique times.

As the summer begins, may all Americans remain vigilant in honoring their neighbors with the respect of appropriate distance and attention to the danger of the coronavirus. Keep us safe, and continue to bless those engaged in addressing this disease directly.

May everything done this day 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 Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. CICILLINE 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.

VOTE ON HEROES ACT IN THE SENATE

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Madam Speaker, almost 100,000 Americans have died from COVID-19. Nearly 40 million unemployment claims have been filed. Our economy is in shambles.

Two weeks ago, the House took action. We passed the HEROES Act, \$3 trillion in new relief funds, to protect the lives and livelihoods of the American people. Two weeks later, the Senate is on vacation. They were in session last week, but all they did was move forward on approving right-wing judges.

This is outrageous. The Senate is sitting on a bill that provides \$1 trillion to pay first responders, healthcare workers, teachers who are in danger of losing their jobs; \$200 billion for hazard pay; \$75 billion for testing, contact tracing, and isolation; and cash for families, up to \$6,000 per household.

The American people deserve better. They deserve a Senate that is committed to protecting their health and safety. They deserve an up or down vote on the HEROES Act in the Senate, not next week, not the week after, but right now. The virus isn't taking a break, the United States Senate shouldn't take a break either.

RUDI SCHEIDT'S INCREDIBLE LEGACY WILL NEVER BE FORGOTTEN

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

Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the incredible 95 years of life of Rudi Scheidt. Although born in Germany and raised in San Francisco, Rudi spent most of his life in Memphis.

Through Rudi and his wife, Honey's, active philanthropy and dedication to the arts, he touched almost every aspect of cultural life in the Memphis community.

Rudi and Honey helped expand the University of Memphis Music School, now known as the Rudi E. Scheidt School of Music. They aided the Memphis Wonders Series to both evolve and prosper.

Rudi was committed to the Jewish community, serving as President of Temple Israel. He remained a true leader for his synagogue.

Tony Bennett's lyrics were wrong on this occasion, for, you see, Rudi Scheidt didn't leave his heart in San Francisco. Rudi left his heart in Memphis.

I feel lucky to be able to call Rudi a friend. I know the city of Memphis and the Jewish community will feel his impact for years to come. Roberta and I will miss him.

My thoughts are with his wife, Honey, as well as their children: Susan; Helen; Rudi, Jr.; and Elkan during this difficult time.

UTAH BUSINESS OWNERS AFFECTED BY THE CORONAVIRUS

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

Mr. MCADAMS. Madam Speaker, I am in Washington to continue to fight for Utah's business owners and our working families affected by the coronavirus.

The Paycheck Protection Program was designed to help small businesses stay afloat and to keep employees on the payroll.

Utah financial lenders processed more than \$5.2 billion in loans to help our businesses, but we must make sure the program works for these businesses, and especially for their employees.

Some Utah small businesses affected by the COVID-19 shutdown, through no fault of their own, may not be open or fully functional within 8 weeks. That is the original deadline to spend the funds for loan forgiveness.

The bipartisan bill I support today extends the loan forgiveness period to include costs incurred over 24 weeks and provides additional flexibility to ensure PPP is the lifeline it was meant to be.

Utah small businesses are trying to do the right thing by their employees, their customers, and local communities. This legislation supports them in that effort and improves the likelihood of a stronger economic recovery.

THANK YOU TO SC HEALTH

(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 to SC Health and their President, Alex Szkaradek, and their general counsel, John Pincelli, for their generous donation of 10,000 protective masks to defeat the Wuhan virus. I had the opportunity to distribute them at the West Columbia City Hall, welcomed by Mayor Tem Miles and Columbia Mayor Steve Benjamin. We were also joined by Lexington Sheriff Jay Koon, and representatives of Richland Sheriff

Leon Lott, Aiken Sheriff Mike Hunt, and Orangeburg Sheriff Leroy Ravenell.

Masks were provided to chambers of commerce for small businesses represented by Carl Blackstone of Columbia, Richard Skipper of West Columbia, Mike Taylor of Batesburg-Leesville, Rebecca Hines of Chapin, Miriam Atria of Lake Murray, Terra Carroll of North Augusta, and Phil Frye of Blythewood.

The private sector, not just government, is making a difference.

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

FUNDING FRONTLINE WORKERS

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

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Madam Speaker, it is a horrible time our Nation is going through right now. One hundred thousand souls perished in this worldwide pandemic.

And through it all, every day, frontline workers are going to work; frontline workers like truck drivers, garbage collectors, nurses, and EMTs, and everybody getting our groceries to us, slugging it out, doing their job day in and day out. And through it all they are not getting anything extra but their regular pay.

That is why I introduced the Coronavirus Frontline Workers Fair Pay Act, and I was thrilled to see that get incorporated in the HEROES Act.

I call upon MITCH MCCONNELL and the Senate, get off the schneid and get to work and pass this. The American economy needs this relief, and we need you to stop delaying and pass this economic stimulus in the HEROES Act.

RECOGNIZING TYSON PLANT EMPLOYEES

(Ms. FOXX of North Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, our Nation's frontline workers must be commended for their tireless work during this pandemic.

I am reminded of the 2,200 employees in my district who work at the Tyson Food plant in Wilkesboro. These men and women come to work every day to help put food on kitchen tables across the country.

This week, a Wilkesboro salon restricted access to Tyson employees out of caution for COVID-19. While the salon owner's intentions may be good, there are safety measures that can be enacted to protect all patrons and employees.

It is critical that we understand the challenges that these frontline workers are facing, and we must do everything we can to support them.

Exclusionary actions are not the solution. We are in this fight together, and we must take care of one another.

RECOGNIZING THE PHYSICIAN SHORTAGE IN THE UNITED STATES

(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 address the physician shortage in the United States, and our need to act swiftly for the future.

If this pandemic has taught us one thing, that is the need to have an adequate number of physicians throughout our country. The current health crisis has emphasized the importance of making those kinds of investments in our healthcare system.

Earlier this month, the House passed the HEROES Act. I incorporated legislation that I had introduced that would expand medical education in underserved areas, like the San Joaquin Valley, that I represent. This legislation is critical to addressing the doctor shortages today and tomorrow in our country.

In January, I introduced the Expanding Medical Education Act. That is what we need to do.

I am pleased that my colleagues in the House supported this effort and included it in the HEROES Act. These are our heroes.

As negotiations for the next coronavirus relief bill continue, I urge my colleagues in the Senate to act, to recognize the importance of this issue. Do not delay. The need to enhance our healthcare capacity has never ever been more apparent.

As a result of COVID-19, we need doctors today, we need doctors tomorrow, and we need a part of our entire healthcare system to rebuild it, to invest in it. Those are the kind of investments we need to make.

I will continue to fight for every dollar to ensure that our Valley residents have access to the healthcare they deserve.

RECOGNIZING THE CAREER OF RICK BECK

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

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the career of Rick Beck, a teacher who has shaped the future of foreign language learning in the Yakima Valley.

Drawing from German culture and his own high school experience, Rick developed a nationally-recognized German language program in the West Valley School District.

Through years of hard work and curriculum development, Mr. Beck created bonds with his students, teaching them about language, leading exchange trips to help them better understand German culture, and inspiring several to pursue higher education in German linguistics and international relations.

In November 2019, West Valley High School and German teacher Rick Beck were recognized by the American Association of Teachers of German as a German Center of Excellence, a crowning achievement of Rick's career.

Now, as Rick enters into retirement, his legacy and the language program he developed will continue to inspire students at West Valley High School and beyond.

I thank Rick for his service and commitment to students across the globe. I wish him the best in his retirement.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF ROBERT GALLAGHER

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the life and legacy of a good friend and great leader from south Sutter County, Robert Gallagher.

Born and raised in Rio Oso, California, Bob spent his life dedicated to family, farming, and service to his country.

After serving in the Army Air Corps during World War II, Bob returned home to the family farm, which has been owned and operated by the Gallagher family for the last seven generations. There, he and his wife of 53 years, Marian, raised their seven children. Indeed, they have a very large, proud Irish family.

When he was not with his family, Bob served as a Sutter County supervisor, and was chairman of the board. And this is a legacy that has been passed down to his grandson, James, who also served as a Sutter County supervisor, and indeed has gone on to serve in the California legislature.

Now, Bob was always a fun guy, and a guy I enjoyed meeting up with every time I had a chance to be in Sutter County. He would be known for a quip like—really helpful to politicians—“Don't put your mouth in gear before you put your brain in gear,” which is something that can be very helpful in a lot of venues.

He had a passion for family, for baseball, and treating people well. That is his legacy. We will miss him. What a dear man and a dear friend. God bless him and his family.

SUICIDE PREVENTION HOTLINE

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

Mr. STEWART. Madam Speaker, I recently had an experience with a group of, maybe, 50 people, and I asked them: How many of you have been impacted by suicide or an attempted suicide, someone in your family, someone that you love and care about? Nearly every hand went up.

We are experiencing a crisis among our youth, a crisis among our veterans,

and now with COVID-19, a crisis among the general population as we go into our social isolation. It is worse now than it was, and it has been a crisis for a long time.

There is a tool that will help. The Suicide Prevention Hotline number that creates a national hotline number, 988. No matter where you are in the country, if you are in the middle of a mental health crisis you can get help.

We have been working on this for 3 years. It is bipartisan, it is bicameral, it will save thousands of lives, especially now in the midst of this other crisis that is creating so much emotional stress on so many Americans.

Madam Speaker, I am asking the leadership, bring it up, finish it, give us unanimous consent today. Let's make this tool available to help Americans who need the help, please.

□ 1215

REMEMBERING ARNOLD AND LORLEE TENENBAUM

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the lives of Mr. Arnold Tenenbaum, who passed away on March 24, and his loving wife, Mrs. Lorlee Tenenbaum, who passed away just 5 days later on March 29.

Mr. and Mrs. Tenenbaum were pillars in the Savannah community and committed their lives to serving others through their work with United Way, the Georgia Chamber of Commerce, food banks, and more.

Mr. Tenenbaum was a renowned businessman, philanthropist, and civic leader, and Lorlee joined alongside him in giving back to their community through serving on numerous boards and spearheading projects to promote Savannah's bright future.

Arnold was influential in both his business ventures, leading Chatham Steel Corporation, and his pursuits to better the lives of youth in his community through his efforts to improve public education in Savannah.

Devoting their lives to helping others and always bringing positivity to every room they entered, they greatly impacted the culture of Savannah.

The Tenenbaums loved others deeply and were loved by many, including their four amazing children.

I am proud and thankful to have had such an honorable couple dedicate their lives to serving their community in the First Congressional District of Georgia, and I am grateful for the lasting impact they made on Savannah.

My heart goes out to their family and friends and the entire Savannah community during this most difficult time.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair

will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The House will resume proceedings on postponed questions at a later time.

UYGHUR HUMAN RIGHTS POLICY ACT OF 2020

Mr. SHERMAN. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 3744) to condemn gross human rights violations of ethnic Turkic Muslims in Xinjiang, and calling for an end to arbitrary detention, torture, and harassment of these communities inside and outside China.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 3744

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This Act may be cited as the “Uyghur Human Rights Policy Act of 2020”.

(b) **TABLE OF CONTENTS.**—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

Sec. 2. Statement of purpose.

Sec. 3. Findings.

Sec. 4. Sense of Congress.

Sec. 5. Updating statement of United States policy toward the People’s Republic of China.

Sec. 6. Imposition of sanctions.

Sec. 7. Report on human rights abuses in Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region.

Sec. 8. Report on protecting citizens and residents of the United States from intimidation and coercion.

Sec. 9. Report on security and economic implications of repression in Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region by the Government of the People’s Republic of China.

Sec. 10. Classified report.

SEC. 2. STATEMENT OF PURPOSE.

The purpose of this Act is to direct United States resources to address human rights violations and abuses, including gross violations of human rights, by the Government of the People’s Republic of China through the mass surveillance and internment of over 1,000,000 Uyghurs, ethnic Kazakhs, Kyrgyz, and members of other Muslim minority groups in Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region.

SEC. 3. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The Government of the People’s Republic of China has a long history of repressing Turkic Muslims and other Muslim minority groups, particularly Uyghurs, in Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region. In recent decades, central and regional Chinese government policies have systematically discriminated against these minority groups by denying them a range of civil and political rights, including the freedom of expression, religion, and movement, and the right to a fair trial.

(2) In May 2014, the Government of the People’s Republic of China launched its latest “Strike Hard Against Violent Extremism” campaign, using wide-scale, internationally-linked threats of terrorism as a pretext to justify pervasive restrictions on and serious human rights violations of members of ethnic minority communities in Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region. The August 2016 appointment of former Tibet Au-

tonomous Region Party Secretary Chen Quanguo to be Party Secretary of Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region accelerated the crackdown across the region. Scholars, human rights organizations, journalists, and think tanks have provided ample evidence substantiating the establishment by the Government of the People’s Republic of China of internment camps. Since 2014, the Government of the People’s Republic of China has detained more than 1,000,000 Uyghurs, ethnic Kazakhs, Kyrgyz, and members of other Muslim minority groups in these camps. The total ethnic minority population of Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region was approximately 13,000,000 at the time of the last census conducted by the People’s Republic of China in 2010.

(3) The Government of the People’s Republic of China’s actions against Uyghurs, ethnic Kazakhs, Kyrgyz, and members of other Muslim minority groups in Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region violate international human rights laws and norms, including—

(A) the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, to which the People’s Republic of China has acceded;

(B) the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, which the People’s Republic of China has signed and ratified;

(C) the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, which the People’s Republic of China has signed; and

(D) the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

(4) Senior Chinese Communist Party officials, including current Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region Party Secretary Chen Quanguo, who executes Chinese government policy in the region, and former Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region Deputy Party Secretary Zhu Hailun, who crafted many of the policies implemented in the region, bear direct responsibility for gross human rights violations committed against Uyghurs, ethnic Kazakhs, Kyrgyz, and members of other Muslim minority groups. These abuses include the arbitrary detention of more than 1,000,000 Uyghurs, ethnic Kazakhs, Kyrgyz, and members of other Muslim minority groups, separation of working age adults from children and the elderly, and the integration of forced labor into supply chains.

(5) Those detained in internment camps in Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region have described forced political indoctrination, torture, beatings, food deprivation, and denial of religious, cultural, and linguistic freedoms. These victims have confirmed that they were told by guards that the only way to secure their release was to demonstrate sufficient political loyalty. Poor conditions and lack of medical treatment at such facilities appear to have contributed to the deaths of some detainees, including the elderly and infirm.

(6) Uyghurs and ethnic Kazakhs who have obtained permanent residence or citizenship in other countries report being subjected to threats and harassment from Chinese officials. At least 5 journalists for Radio Free Asia’s Uyghur service have publicly detailed abuses their family members in Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region have endured in response to their work exposing the Government of the People’s Republic of China’s abusive policies.

(7) In September 2018, United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights Michelle Bachelet noted in her first speech as High Commissioner the “deeply disturbing allegations of large-scale arbitrary detentions of Uyghurs and other Muslim communities, in so-called reeducation camps across Xinjiang”.

(8) In 2019, the Congressional-Executive Commission on China concluded that, based on available evidence, the establishment and actions committed in the internment camps in Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region may constitute “crimes against humanity”.

(9) On December 31, 2018, President Donald J. Trump signed into law the Asia Reassurance Initiative Act of 2018 (Public Law 115-409), which—

(A) condemns the People’s Republic of China’s “forced disappearances, extralegal detentions, invasive and omnipresent surveillance, and lack of due process in judicial proceedings”;

(B) authorizes funding to promote democracy, human rights, and the rule of law in the People’s Republic of China; and

(C) supports sanctions designations against any entity or individual that—

(i) violates human rights or religious freedoms; or

(ii) engages in censorship activities.

SEC. 4. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the President should—

(A) condemn abuses against Uyghurs, ethnic Kazakhs, Kyrgyz, members of other Muslim minority groups, and other persons by authorities of the People’s Republic of China; and

(B) call on such authorities to immediately—

(i) close the internment camps;

(ii) lift all restrictions on, and ensure respect for, human rights; and

(iii) allow people inside the People’s Republic of China to reestablish contact with their loved ones, friends, and associates outside the People’s Republic of China;

(2) the Secretary of State should consider strategically employing sanctions and other tools under the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 (22 U.S.C. 6401 et seq.), including measures resulting from the designation of the People’s Republic of China as a country of particular concern for religious freedom under section 402(b)(1)(A)(ii) of such Act (22 U.S.C. 6442(b)(1)(A)(ii)), that directly address particularly severe violations of religious freedom;

(3) the Secretary of State should—

(A) work with United States allies and partners and through multilateral institutions to condemn the mass arbitrary detention of Uyghurs, ethnic Kazakhs, Kyrgyz, and members of other Muslim minority groups in Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region; and

(B) coordinate closely with the international community on targeted sanctions and visa restrictions;

(4) the journalists of the Uyghur language service of Radio Free Asia should be commended for their reporting on the human rights and political situation in Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region despite efforts by the Government of the People’s Republic of China to silence or intimidate their reporting through the detention of family members and relatives in China;

(5) the United States should expand the availability of and capacity for Uyghur language programming on Radio Free Asia in Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region;

(6) the Federal Bureau of Investigation and appropriate United States law enforcement agencies should take steps to hold accountable officials from the People’s Republic of China or individuals acting on their behalf who harass, threaten, or intimidate persons within the United States; and

(7) United States companies and individuals selling goods or services or otherwise operating in Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region should take steps, including in any public or financial filings, to ensure that—

(A) their commercial activities are not contributing to human rights violations in Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region or elsewhere in China; and

(B) their supply chains are not compromised by forced labor.

SEC. 5. UPDATING STATEMENT OF UNITED STATES POLICY TOWARD THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA.

Section 901(b) of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1990 and 1991 (Public Law 101-246; 104 Stat. 84) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (7), (8), and (9) as paragraphs (8), (9), and (10), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (6) the following:

“(7) United States policy toward the People's Republic of China should be explicitly linked to the situation in Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region, specifically as to whether—

“(A) the internment of Uyghurs, ethnic Kazakhs, Kyrgyz, and members of other Muslim minority groups in internment camps has ended;

“(B) all political prisoners are released;

“(C) the use of mass surveillance and predictive policing to discriminate against and violate the human rights of members of specific ethnic groups has ceased and is not evident in other parts of China; and

“(D) the Government of the People's Republic of China has ended particularly severe restrictions of religious and cultural practice in Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region.”.

SEC. 6. IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS.

(a) REPORT REQUIRED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and not less frequently than annually thereafter, the President shall submit a report to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate, the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives that identifies each foreign person, including any official of the Government of the People's Republic of China, that the President determines is responsible for any of the following with respect to Uyghurs, ethnic Kazakhs, Kyrgyz, members of other Muslim minority groups, or other persons in Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region:

(A) Torture.

(B) Cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment or punishment.

(C) Prolonged detention without charges and trial.

(D) Causing the disappearance of persons by the abduction and clandestine detention of those persons.

(E) Other flagrant denial of the right to life, liberty, or the security of persons.

(2) FORM.—The report required under paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may contain a classified annex.

(b) IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS.—The President shall impose the sanctions described in subsection (c) with respect to each foreign person identified in the report required under subsection (a)(1).

(c) SANCTIONS DESCRIBED.—The sanctions described in this subsection are the following:

(1) ASSET BLOCKING.—The President shall exercise all of the powers granted to the President under the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) to the extent necessary to block and prohibit all transactions in property and interests in property of a foreign person identified in the report required under subsection

(a)(1) if such property and interests in property—

(A) are in the United States;

(B) come within the United States; or

(C) come within the possession or control of a United States person.

(2) INELIGIBILITY FOR VISAS, ADMISSION, OR PAROLE.—

(A) VISAS, ADMISSION, OR PAROLE.—An alien described in subsection (a)(1) is—

(i) inadmissible to the United States;

(ii) ineligible to receive a visa or other documentation to enter the United States; and

(iii) otherwise ineligible to be admitted or paroled into the United States or to receive any other benefit under the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.).

(B) CURRENT VISAS REVOKED.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—An alien described in subsection (a)(1) is subject to revocation of any visa or other entry documentation regardless of when the visa or other entry documentation is or was issued.

(ii) IMMEDIATE EFFECT.—A revocation under clause (i) shall—

(I) take effect immediately; and

(II) cancel any other valid visa or entry documentation that is in the alien's possession.

(3) PENALTIES.—The penalties provided for in subsections (b) and (c) of section 206 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1705) shall apply to a foreign person that violates, attempts to violate, conspires to violate, or causes a violation of paragraph (1) to the same extent that such penalties apply to a person that commits an unlawful act described in subsection (a) of such section 206.

(d) IMPLEMENTATION.—The President may exercise all authorities provided under sections 203 and 205 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1702 and 1704) to carry out this section.

(e) WAIVER.—The President may waive the application of sanctions under this section with respect to a person identified in the report required under subsection (a)(1) if the President determines and certifies to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate, the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives that such a waiver is in the national interest of the United States.

(f) EXCEPTIONS.—

(1) EXCEPTION FOR INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES.—Sanctions under this section shall not apply to any activity subject to the reporting requirements under title V of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3091 et seq.) or any authorized intelligence activities of the United States.

(2) EXCEPTION TO COMPLY WITH INTERNATIONAL OBLIGATIONS AND FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT ACTIVITIES.—Sanctions under subsection (c)(2) shall not apply with respect to an alien if admitting or paroling the alien into the United States is necessary—

(A) to permit the United States to comply with the Agreement regarding the Headquarters of the United Nations, signed at Lake Success June 26, 1947, and entered into force November 21, 1947, between the United Nations and the United States, or other applicable international obligations; or

(B) to carry out or assist law enforcement activity in the United States.

(3) EXCEPTION RELATING TO IMPORTATION OF GOODS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The authorities and requirements to impose sanctions authorized under this section shall not include the authority or a requirement to impose sanctions on the importation of goods.

(B) GOOD DEFINED.—In this paragraph, the term “good” means any article, natural or manmade substance, material, supply, or manufactured product, including inspection and test equipment, and excluding technical data.

(g) TERMINATION OF SANCTIONS.—The President may terminate the application of sanctions under this section with respect to a person if the President determines and reports to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate, the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives not later than 15 days before the termination takes effect that—

(1) information exists that the person did not engage in the activity for which sanctions were imposed;

(2) the person has been prosecuted appropriately for the activity for which sanctions were imposed;

(3) the person has credibly demonstrated a significant change in behavior, has paid an appropriate consequence for the activity for which sanctions were imposed, and has credibly committed to not engage in an activity described in subsection (a)(1) in the future; or

(4) the termination of the sanctions is in the national security interests of the United States.

(h) SUNSET.—This section, and any sanctions imposed under this section, shall terminate on the date that is 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(i) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ADMISSION; ADMITTED; ALIEN.—The terms “admission”, “admitted”, and “alien” have the meanings given those terms in section 101 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101).

(2) FOREIGN PERSON.—The term “foreign person” means a person that is not a United States person.

(3) UNITED STATES PERSON.—The term “United States person” means—

(A) a United States citizen or an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence to the United States; or

(B) an entity organized under the laws of the United States or any jurisdiction within the United States, including a foreign branch of such an entity.

SEC. 7. REPORT ON HUMAN RIGHTS ABUSES IN XINJIANG UYGHUR AUTONOMOUS REGION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State, in consultation with the heads of other relevant Federal departments and agencies and civil society organizations, shall—

(1) submit a report on human rights abuses in Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives; and

(2) make the report described in paragraph (1) available on the website of the Department of State.

(b) MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.—The report required under subsection (a) shall include—

(1) an assessment of the number of individuals detained in internment camps in Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region;

(2) a description of the conditions in such camps for detainees, including, to the extent practicable, an assessment of—

(A) methods of torture;

(B) efforts to force individuals to renounce their faith; and

(C) other serious human rights abuses;

(3) to the extent practicable, an assessment of the number of individuals in the region in forced labor camps;

(4) a description of the methods used by People's Republic of China authorities to "reeducate" detainees in internment camps, including a list of government agencies of the People's Republic of China in charge of such reeducation;

(5) an assessment of the use and nature of forced labor in and related to the detention of Turkic Muslims in Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region, including a description of foreign companies and industries directly benefitting from such labor;

(6) an assessment of the level of access to Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region granted by the Government of the People's Republic of China to foreign diplomats and consular agents, independent journalists, and representatives of nongovernmental organizations;

(7) an assessment of the mass surveillance, predictive policing, and other methods used by the Government of the People's Republic of China to violate the human rights of persons in Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region;

(8) a description of the frequency with which foreign governments are forcibly returning Uyghurs, ethnic Kazakhs, Kyrgyz, and other refugees and asylum seekers to the People's Republic of China;

(9) a description, as appropriate, of United States diplomatic efforts with allies and other nations—

(A) to address the gross violations of human rights in Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region; and

(B) to protect asylum seekers from the region; and

(10) the identification of the offices within the Department of State that are responsible for leading and coordinating the diplomatic efforts referred to in paragraph (9).

SEC. 8. REPORT ON PROTECTING CITIZENS AND RESIDENTS OF THE UNITED STATES FROM INTIMIDATION AND COERCION.

Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, in consultation with the Secretary of State, shall submit a report to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate, the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate, the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives that outlines all of the efforts to protect United States citizens and residents, including ethnic Uyghurs and Chinese nationals legally studying or working temporarily in the United States, who have experienced harassment or intimidation within the United States by officials or agents of the Government of the People's Republic of China.

SEC. 9. REPORT ON SECURITY AND ECONOMIC IMPLICATIONS OF REPRESSION IN XINJIANG UYGHUR AUTONOMOUS REGION BY THE GOVERNMENT OF THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence, in coordination with the Secretary of State, shall submit a report to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate, the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives on the matters described in subsection (b).

(b) MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.—The report required under subsection (a) shall include—

(1) an assessment of the national and regional security threats posed to the United

States by the policies of the Government of the People's Republic of China in Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region;

(2) a description of—

(A) the acquisition or development of technology by the Government of the People's Republic of China to facilitate internment and mass surveillance in Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region, including technology related to predictive policing and large-scale data collection and analysis; and

(B) the threats that the acquisition, development, and use of such technologies pose to the United States;

(3) a list of Chinese companies that are involved in—

(A) constructing or operating the internment camps in Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region; or

(B) providing or operating mass surveillance technology in Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region; and

(4) a description of the role of the Xinjiang Production and Construction Corps in internment and forced labor in Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region.

(c) FORM OF REPORT.—The report required under subsection (a) shall be submitted in an unclassified form, but may contain a classified annex.

SEC. 10. CLASSIFIED REPORT.

The Director of National Intelligence, in consultation with such elements of the Intelligence Community as the Director deems appropriate, shall submit a classified report to the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives that assesses the ability of the United States Government to collect and analyze intelligence regarding—

(1) the scope and scale of the detention and forced labor of Uyghurs, ethnic Kazakhs, Kyrgyz, and members of other Muslim minority groups in the People's Republic of China;

(2) the gross violations of human rights perpetrated inside the internment camps in Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region; and

(3) other policies of the Government of the People's Republic of China in Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region that constitute gross violations of human rights.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SHERMAN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include in the RECORD extraneous material on S. 3744.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, I should advise the House that we are taking up this bill about 1½ hours earlier than expected, and I hope that our colleagues from the Foreign Affairs Committee have changed their schedule so that they can come to join us to speak on this bill.

Let me point out that even in a pandemic, the American Congress focuses on human rights.

Madam Speaker, let me start by thanking our colleagues from both sides of the aisle and both Chambers for their work on this legislation. I especially want to thank Senators RUBIO and MENENDEZ, and Representatives MCGOVERN, SHERMAN, SMITH, SUOZZI, and others who have worked for well more than a year, well more than 2 years in most cases, to focus the world's attention on the deprivation of human rights in Xinjiang province and to work for an appropriate American response.

The Uyghur Human Rights Policy Act is the result of tireless work from so many individuals who focus on human rights. We have seen the reporting, the interviews, the pictures, the documentaries. The evidence is overwhelming: The Chinese Government has brutally detained and reeducated or sought to reeducate over 1 million Uyghurs and other ethnic minorities, chiefly Muslim minorities, in the northwest of China. It is horrific.

The goal of this inhumane campaign is clear: to force these minorities to assimilate, to erase all evidence of their unique language, culture, history, and religion.

Beijing has relied heavily on technology to carry out this abuse, transforming the Uyghur region of Xinjiang into a surveillance state. But even as the world has learned more and more about the extent of these atrocities, there has been nowhere near enough action.

Beijing has leveraged its economic clout to silence criticism of its horrific human rights abuses. So many countries, particularly Muslim countries that always speak out when any group of Muslims is being denied their human rights, have been pressured into silence. Now, China wants the world to forget about the Uyghurs as we grapple with this global pandemic.

We must push back. Today, we send a message loud and clear: We stand with the Uyghurs. We will fight for the oppressed. And we will not forget.

By passing the Uyghur Human Rights Policy Act today, the United States takes a meaningful step toward holding the perpetrators accountable. This bill will impose sanctions on those individuals responsible for human rights violations in Xinjiang. It also calls on our government experts to issue reports that can improve our understanding of the situation on the ground.

The persecution of the Uyghurs is one of the greatest human rights tragedies currently taking place. We must stand on the right side of history and respond decisively. This legislation is a critical step forward, and I am proud to support its passage. I hope all Members of this body will join me in that effort, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, the last several months have made it clear to the entire world that the Chinese Communist

Party, or the CCP, has little regard for human life. When faced with a decision, they have chosen and will continue to choose to preserve their own power over helping their own people.

Rather than alert the world to the true dangers the coronavirus posed to the world, they instead lied and orchestrated the worst coverup in human history, exposing the Chinese people and the entire world to a virus that has killed over 350,000 people, including nearly 100,000 innocent Americans. Another 5.5 million have been infected worldwide, and those numbers only continue to climb.

This atrocity is far from the only example of the CCP prioritizing its power over human life and liberty. At this very moment, the CCP's rubber-stamp legislature is working to dismantle Hong Kong's freedoms. Under the guise of national security legislation, the CCP plans to expand its police state to Hong Kong and fundamentally change Hong Kongers' way of life, freedom, and autonomy.

The CCP is showing the world that they are willing to tear up the international commitments they made to preserve freedom in Hong Kong.

We can no longer stand idly by while the CCP consolidates its power at the expense of freedom around the world. The ultimate example of what the CCP is willing to do in the name of national security has been clear for some time, and that is the cultural genocide of the Uyghurs and other ethnic minority Muslim groups in western China.

Over the last several years, these ethnic minorities have been rounded up and forced into concentration camps where they are brainwashed with state propaganda and forced to do grueling work as part of their "reform."

They live under a complete Orwellian surveillance program, an apparatus tracking their every move. Some have been tortured and killed. Others have been disappeared from their families, never to be returned, with no explanation from the CCP.

That is why I stand today in strong support of the Uyghur Human Rights Policy Act.

The goal of the Chinese Government is to completely eradicate an entire culture simply because it doesn't fit within what the Chinese Communist Party deems "Chinese." They want to remove the cultural, religious, and ethnic identity the Uyghurs have and indoctrinate them so that they love the Chinese Communist Party more than their family, their culture, or their religion. In total, 1 to 3 million Chinese citizens have been subjected to the state-sponsored cultural genocide.

Secretary of State Mike Pompeo has called this the "stain of the century," and he is absolutely right.

That is why we can't sit idly by and allow this to continue. As I have said before, our silence will be complicit, and our inaction will be our appeasement. But today we are acting, Madam Speaker, as a beacon of hope and free-

dom to the rest of the world, and the United States has a responsibility to take action.

Now is the time for all of us, Republican and Democrat, as Americans to stand together and show the CCP that their egregious human rights abuses will not go unchecked. We can do that by passing this bill today with strong bipartisan support to show the Chinese Communist Party and the entire world that their treatment of the Muslim Uyghurs is inexcusable and will not be allowed without serious consequences.

This legislation requires the President to submit a report that identifies Chinese Communist Party officials who have carried out these heinous crimes. These officials may then be sanctioned for their complicity.

This bill also requires a separate human rights report that highlights abuses specifically to Xinjiang, China.

Madam Speaker, I am hopeful that this is just one of many bipartisan actions that we can take as we push back on the world's most oppressive dictatorship.

We must acknowledge that the CCP is the greatest economic and national security threat of this generation. We must face this threat not as Republicans or Democrats, but as Americans.

As the chairman of the recently announced China Task Force in the House, I look forward to working with my colleagues to plan decisive action to push back on the CCP. We cannot allow the CCP to remain unchallenged on the world stage.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHERMAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), chair of the Rules Committee, chair of the Congressional-Executive Commission on China, co-chair of the Tom Lantos Human Rights Commission, and a man who is known for his dedication to human rights.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, today, I am proud the House and Senate have come together in a bipartisan way to pass S. 3744, the Uyghur Human Rights Policy Act of 2020.

This is monumental legislation that provides the administration a clear direction for implementing U.S. policy and sends a clear message that the United States supports the human rights of Uyghurs and other ethnic minority groups in China.

I thank Congressmen CHRIS SMITH, BRAD SHERMAN, and TOM SUOZZI, and Foreign Affairs Committee Chairman ENGEL and Ranking Member MCCAUL for their leadership on this bill.

We now believe that as many as 1.8 million Uyghurs and other ethnic minority groups have been arbitrarily detained in mass internment camps and subjected to forced labor, torture, and political indoctrination.

In recent months, we have seen leaked internal Chinese Government documents that show the scope and implementation of the mass internment

camp system, including: evidence that the camp system is organized at the direction of top Chinese Government officials, documentation that punishments can be based on the behavior of their relatives outside the camps, outlining the use of coercive force and punishment inflicted upon inmates in a manual, guidance for how Chinese officials should use surveillance to determine who to detain in the camps, and evidence of the assignment of mass internment camp detainees to forced labor.

□ 1230

There can be no doubt that the Chinese Government is trying to stamp out the Uyghur identity. The policies of the Chinese Government contravene the letter and the spirit of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and violate the government's obligations under the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, which China has signed but not ratified, and the International Covenant on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights ratified by China in 2001.

It is important to always make clear that our criticism is focused on the Chinese Government. We respect the Chinese people, many of whom have suffered from and are victims of the authoritarian policies of the government.

Last year, the Congressional-Executive Commission on China, which I chair, published a report making the case that the persecution of Uyghurs may fit the definition of crimes against humanity as defined in Article 7 of the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court.

In March, the Simon-Skjoldt Center for the Prevention of Genocide at the Holocaust Memorial Museum also determined that there is a "reasonable basis to believe that the Government of China is committing crimes against humanity."

Passage of the legislation is an important first step, but there is much more that we need to do.

First, the administration should impose Global Magnitsky Act sanctions on Chinese officials who are directing ongoing human rights abuses, including Chen Quanguo, the Xinjiang Communist Party Secretary.

Second, the administration should further expand the Commerce Department's "Entity List," which imposes restrictions on businesses and entities that provide technology, training, or equipment that has been used in mass detentions or surveillance.

Third, I have introduced the Uyghur Forced Labor Prevention Act, H.R. 6210, that would prohibit imports from Xinjiang to the United States unless companies can prove that their goods were not produced with forced labor.

Too many U.S. and international companies are complicit in the exploitation of the forced labor of Uyghur and other Muslim minorities.

I am proud to stand in solidarity with the Uyghur, Chinese, Tibetan,

and, indeed, all the people living under the rule of the Chinese Government in their struggle to live freely, practice their religious beliefs freely, and speak their own languages freely.

I look forward to the passage of this legislation and continuing our bipartisan work together to support human rights in China.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), the House sponsor of the Uyghur Human Rights Policy Act.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I want to thank my good friend for his very strong remarks today and his leadership, BRAD SHERMAN as well, and, of course, JIM MCGOVERN, as chairman, and I, as the ranking member of the China Commission, for the work that we have been doing to try to bring light to this terrible human rights tragedy, this genocide that is being committed against the Uyghur people.

Madam Speaker, Communist Party General Secretary Xi Jinping's ongoing genocide against the approximately 10 million Uyghurs living in Xinjiang in northwestern China demands action.

Today, more than a million Uyghurs are in concentration camps. Millions more are harassed, beaten, raped, and tortured.

S. 3744, which is nearly identical to legislation H.R. 649 that I and my good friend Mr. SUOZZI and 136 bipartisan cosponsors introduced 17 months ago, requires the administration to categorize and report on the human rights abuses being committed by the Chinese Government and take specific steps to sanction China's officials for these abuses, including visa denial and asset blocking, the essence of the Magnitsky Act, which is the prohibition of all financial transactions by an abuser.

Madam Speaker, at a 2018 congressional hearing, Mihrigul Tursun recounted her ordeal with torture, sexual abuse, and detention in one of Xi Jinping's concentration camps. She broke down weeping, telling us that she pleaded with God to end her life. Her Chinese jailers restrained her to a table, increased the electrical current coursing through her body, and mocked her belief in God.

She was tortured simply because she was an ethnic Uyghur and a Muslim living in China.

Madam Speaker, there are millions of stories like this waiting to be told about the crimes against humanity being committed by the Chinese Government against Uyghurs, Kazakhs, and other Turkic Muslims.

There are many people—we all know them; I have had them at my hearings in the past—women and men who have had their entire families back in this region, Xinjiang, arrested and put into concentration camps and harassed in other ways.

Chinese authorities initially denied the existence of the concentration camps and even tried to portray them

as vocational training centers. What a euphemism. They employed lies, censorship, and economic coercion to stifle discussion of their crimes.

Where have we heard that before? Look at what is going on with COVID-19 and the deceit and the lies that have come from Xi Jinping himself.

But documents obtained by The New York Times and the International Consortium of Investigative Journalists have, indeed, exposed the brutality behind Beijing's plans to radically and coercively transform the culture and religion of ethnic Uyghurs, Kazakhs, and other Muslims.

The leaked documents showed detailed plans to intern between 1 and 3 million Uyghurs into concentration camps, where they are subjected to severe human rights abuse and Orwellian indoctrination efforts for those whose thinking "has been infected"—that is to say, they are Muslims. To Xi Jinping, that is something that needs to be obliterated.

At the same time, Beijing instituted plans to erase the influence of Islam in western China, bulldozing mosques and shrines, severely throttling all religious practice, and forcing camp detainees to renounce their faith.

The leaked documents also show that Xi Jinping, himself, the so-called President—not elected by the people, of course—Xi Jinping, himself, directed the crackdown, saying that the Communist Party must put the "organs of dictatorship" to work and show "absolutely no mercy" in dealing with the Uyghurs and other Muslims.

In one speech, President Xi said: "The weapons of the people's democratic dictatorship must be wielded without any hesitation or wavering."

Continuing the quote, in February 2017, he told thousands of police officers and troops standing at attention in a vast square in Urumqi to prepare for a "smashing, obliterating offensive," which is exactly what they have done.

According to documents obtained again by The New York Times, Communist Party officials who were reluctant to carry out Xi Jinping's draconian and horrific policies were themselves investigated and expunged. "Secret teams of investigators have traveled across the region identifying those who were not doing enough. In 2017, the party opened more than 12,000 investigations into party members in Xinjiang."

Madam Speaker, we cannot be silent. Xi Jinping is smashing and obliterating an entire people. He is presiding over a genocide.

Mr. SHERMAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), a woman who has dedicated literally decades of her life to fighting for human rights, particularly in China, the distinguished Speaker of the House.

Ms. PELOSI. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I thank him and Mr. MCCAUL, Mr.

ENGEL, the chairman, ranking member, and senior member of the Foreign Affairs Committee for bringing this important legislation to the floor. It is an honor to be here with all of them, and with Mr. SUOZZI, who has been a champion for religious rights throughout the world.

Madam Speaker, Mr. SMITH and I go back decades in our fight for human rights in China, whether it is in Tibet, whether it is in Beijing, whether it is in Hong Kong. The list goes on and on. I thank Mr. SMITH for his ongoing leadership.

Madam Speaker, I also thank the chairman of the committee, Mr. MCGOVERN, the chair of the Congressional-Executive Commission on China and chair of the Tom Lantos Human Rights Commission. Mr. SMITH is the ranking member of the Congressional-Executive Commission on China, and I thank Mr. SMITH.

Today in this House of Representatives, in a very strong, bipartisan way, we are sending a message to the persecuted that they are not forgotten. We are saying to the President of China: "You may tell these people that they are forgotten, but they aren't."

On the floor of the House of Representatives, in bipartisan, bicameral legislation, we are here in support of the Uyghur Human Rights Policy Act, strong bipartisan legislation to address and defend the rights and dignity of the Uyghur people from China's oppression.

Today, again, we are sending that message even as we are heartbroken as to what China's people are suffering in terms of COVID-19 and that crisis. We are sad about that.

Madam Speaker, I thank CHRIS SMITH, again, and Mr. ENGEL and Mr. MCCAUL. I thank Senator RUBIO, also, for his leadership on this legislation. He has been a champion working with us on the China issues.

Beijing's barbarous actions targeting the Uyghur people are an outrage to the collective conscience of the world. Across Xinjiang, a Uyghur Autonomous Region, the Uyghur people and other Muslim minorities face brutal oppression, as Mr. SMITH was pointing out:

A pervasive state of mass surveillance and predictive policing used to discriminate and violate the human rights of minorities;

The mass incarceration of more than 1 million—and that is a small number, a very conservative, small number—innocent people, with beatings, solitary confinement, deprivation of food and medical treatment, and the number is probably much larger than that;

Forced sterilizations and other forms of torture;

Incidents of mass shootings, extrajudicial killings, and the intimidation and suppression of journalists courageously exposing the truth.

Today, with this overwhelming bipartisan legislation, the United States Congress is taking a firm step to counter Beijing's horrific human rights abuses against the Uyghurs.

In the House, when brought to the floor in December, this legislation passed on a nearly unanimous basis. In the Senate, it passed under unanimous consent, with more than 50 cosponsors from both sides of the aisle.

This legislation helps uncover the truth, requiring reports by the Director of National Intelligence, State Department, and FBI about the depths of the crisis and about China's campaign against journalists exposing the facts.

It creates accountability and ensures transparency of Chinese and foreign companies involved in the camps, and it engages the full firepower of American law and leadership, including by urging the application of targeted sanctions against those involved in the oppression of the Uyghur people.

We must continue to raise a drumbeat and shine a light on the abuse perpetrated by Beijing against the Uyghurs whenever we can—from this House floor, to the State Department, to our multilateral institutions.

Last Friday, as Speaker, I had the honor of appointing Nury Turkel, a human rights champion who was born in a camp in the Xinjiang region, to the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom, largely focused, with Ambassador Brownback's leadership, on freedom of religion in many countries. There, I am confident that he will continue to be a powerful voice for the Uyghur people and for the cause of justice around the world.

In just over a week—just think of it—the global community will mark the solemn milestone of 31 years since the Tiananmen Square massacre, when students, workers, and citizens were gunned down as they peacefully defied an oppressive regime to demand their liberties and human rights.

Sadly, today, Beijing's human rights abuses continue—blatantly continue—targeting so many, from the decades-long abuse faced by the Tibetan people—many of us have visited Tibet and seen firsthand what is happening there—to Hong Kong's fight for democracy and the rule of law, which has once again been targeted in recent days in a very shameful way, to the jailing of journalists, human rights lawyers, Christians, and democracy advocates throughout the mainland.

□ 1245

To honor all who have been persecuted, we must renew our commitment to speaking out against China's human rights abuses. If America does not speak out for human rights in China because of some commercial interest, then we lose all moral authority to speak out on human rights violations anywhere in the world. It is a challenge to our conscience. We must do the right thing, and that is what we are doing today.

In honor of the millions fighting for their dignity, safety, and rights in China and around the world, I strongly urge a bipartisan vote for the Uyghur Human Rights Policy Act of 2020.

I again thank those responsible, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SMITH, members of the Foreign Affairs Committee, and Mr. SUOZZI, who has been a champion, as I say, on religious freedom throughout the world.

I want to close by commending Mr. MCGOVERN, again, for being relentless and persistent in terms of shining a bright light on human rights violations throughout world and especially in China.

Madam Speaker, I urge an "aye" vote.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Speaker, I have no additional speakers, so I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHERMAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SUOZZI), an advocate for human and religious rights.

Mr. SUOZZI. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman, the ranking member, and Congressman SMITH for their good work and partnership on this issue.

I thank Chairman MCGOVERN and Speaker PELOSI for their leadership on all issues of human rights.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of the bipartisan Uyghur Human Rights Policy Act of 2020, which holds the Chinese Communist Party accountable for the horrific treatment of Uyghur Muslim minorities, including forced labor camps in western China, over 1 million Uyghurs in mass internment who are subjected to systematized brainwashing, Big Brother-like surveillance, and gross violations of their religious freedom.

Since President Nixon went to China in 1971, most Americans have believed that with increased economic integration and exposure to our system of democracy and our way of life, that China would become more like us. Clearly, that has not happened.

Not only does the Chinese Communist Party reject any real steps toward democracy, withhold information from the world community regarding the coronavirus, continue its unfair trade practices, and cheat by stealing our intellectual property, but it continually violates human rights, as we have seen, not only in Xinjiang with the Uyghurs, but also in Tibet with the Buddhists, and in Hong Kong with the students and the journalists.

Representative CHRIS SMITH and I originally introduced legislation regarding abuse of the Uyghurs in November of 2018 and, while it has taken too long, it is never too late to speak out for human rights and penalize China for its egregious violations.

Madam Speaker, Uyghur families are prohibited from practicing their faith. They are often separated from their family members and prohibited from reading the Koran and making their daily prayers and, in some instances, they are forced to eat pork during Ramadan.

The so-called "re-education camps" in China, where Uyghurs are forced to work in textile or manufacturing jobs

in or near mass internment camps are not only repugnant to our values, but also taint global supply chains.

The brutal, religious-based persecution of the Uyghurs in China is alarming but not new. China has continued to repress anyone who does not conform to their system, including Tibetans, Christians, and the people of Hong Kong.

Just last week in Hong Kong, the Chinese Communist Party proposed national security legislation that would erode Hong Kong's autonomy and civil liberties. We must remain vigilant.

This bill holds the Chinese Communist Party and Politburo members like Chen Quanguo accountable for their abuses.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the passage of this important, bipartisan legislation.

Mr. MCCAUL. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHERMAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), an advocate for human rights.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for his leadership. I thank Mr. SMITH for his leadership as well, and the gentleman from Texas, my colleague, for his leadership; and listening to the Speaker for her continued years of leadership.

The treatment of Uyghurs in China, which warranted the call for the Uyghur Human Rights Policy Act of 2020, S. 3744, the treatment is of such volcanic, mammoth proportions that we cannot even describe it on this floor.

We, in America, take our faith so seriously. We are gratified that whatever our faith is, and whatever the time that we have for our particular faith, whether we go to confession as Catholics or whether or not we take communion, as many faiths do, whether we honor Easter as a special moment for Christians of resurrection, whether or not we know the Passover and the specialness of that, or whether as Muslims we know Ramadan, we are clearly ones that understand how much faith is a part of our life.

Can you imagine being in a country that brutalizes you because you practice your faith; keeps you from reading the very book that gives you faith and inspiration, the Koran, and then, doing the most dastardly act, which is to separate you from your families?

Of course, many of us know, Ramadan just finished with Eid on Saturday. Americans who are Muslims had the opportunity to do and practice their faith and share it with their families without recrimination and violence.

Just imagine a Uyghur in China, fearful of your life, and not having the ability to practice your faith; and as one of my colleagues said, the worst, forcing you to eat pork and continuing to subject you to penalties and punishment.

So, I rise to support this legislation because we can do nothing less but to support the Human Rights Policy Act for the Uyghurs and bring them out of the terrible tragedy of oppression in China.

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

Just today, the Secretary of State announced, under the Hong Kong Human Rights and Democracy Act that we passed last November which requires an annual certification of Hong Kong's autonomy, he just announced that he cannot certify the autonomous nature of Hong Kong.

This is a very significant day, Madam Speaker, because the Chinese Communist Party now has cracked down on the free and loving people of Hong Kong and their autonomous nature under one country, two systems, back when the U.K.-Sino pact was signed. The CCP, Chinese Communist Party, are in violation now of the Sino-U.K. pact.

Madam Speaker, this bill, the Uyghur Human Rights Policy Act of 2020 is more proof that we can come together, as Republicans and Democrats, to address the generational threat by the Chinese Communist Party and champion American values.

Whether it be the Muslim population of the Uyghurs, whether it be the Tibetan population who have been persecuted, and the Dalai Lama, who is in exile, to the Christians who are persecuted in China by the Communist Party, this bill will help hold the Chinese Communist Party accountable for their atrocities and will show the world, including the Uyghur Muslim American community, that the United States Congress will not tolerate these appalling human rights violations. We will always stand for human rights across the globe.

And the one thing I respect about our committee, the Foreign Affairs Committee, is that we stand together when it comes to our foreign policy. As Chairman ENGEL often says, partisanship stops at the water's edge. And when it comes to human rights, we stand with our Founding Fathers and what they stood for in fighting oppression and tyranny and for democracy and freedom.

That is why, today, we stand with the Uyghur Muslim population in China. And for all those listening in China and, particularly, to those members of the Chinese Communist Party who are probably watching this broadcast on C-SPAN, we are watching you today. We will not back down. We will talk about this until it stops, and it will stop, hopefully, in our lifetime. It won't stop this Congress, but it must stop.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SHERMAN. Madam Speaker, having no further speakers, I yield myself such time as I may consume for the purpose of closing.

The bill before us represents a number of different bills in the Senate and the House, all of which have been blended together. All of these bills contain important complementary measures to counter one of the most important human rights violations of the present day, detention of over 1 million Uyghurs and other Muslims in the Xinjiang Province of China.

In particular, as chair of the Asia, the Pacific, and Nonproliferation Subcommittee, back in February of last year, I joined with our ranking member, TED YOHO, and Congressman CONNOLLY and Congresswoman WAGNER in introducing the Uighur Act. That legislation added to this bill the imposition of sanctions on individuals and entities found to have committed gross human rights abuses against Uyghurs, ethnic Kazakhs, Kyrgyz, and members of other Muslim minority groups and other persons in the Xinjiang Uyghur autonomous region.

This bill, I should point out, is not one that just expresses the view of Congress; not one that just demands reports be issued by the State Department to refocus the world on what is going with the Uyghurs and others. This bill imposes sanctions on those responsible.

The Chinese Communist Party has sought to erase the distinct Uyghur Muslim culture and religious traditions through mass detentions, re-education, and a coordinated campaign called "Strike Hard Against Violent Extremism" launched in 2014. Thanks to leaked Chinese Communist Party documents, we now know the impetus of this campaign came from the highest levels of the party.

In April of 2014, General Secretary Xi Jinping ordered party officials to show "absolutely no mercy" in using the "organs of dictatorship" to suppress Muslim minorities. More than a million Uyghurs have been imprisoned. And they have been imprisoned because, in the words of the Chinese Communist Party, "their thinking has been infected by unhealthy thoughts."

It appears, according to the Chinese Communist Party, a dedication to religion or to freedom and democracy is unhealthy and justifies incarceration.

Along with the re-education camps, the Strike Hard campaign has also involved high-tech surveillance and monitoring of the Uyghurs, monitoring and suppressing Muslim religious practice, including funeral practices, and suppression of the Uyghur language.

And the party has acted beyond the borders of China, intimidating Chinese Muslim minorities who are living abroad, preventing them, including some who are permanent residents of the United States, from leaving the Xinjiang region.

The legislation before us is an important start, but it is just a start in our efforts to counter Chinese repression of its Muslim minorities.

I think I have already highlighted the sanctions in this bill. In particular,

the bill requires the President to block assets of and deny and revoke visas with respect to any foreign person, including a Chinese Government official, who are determined to be responsible for the suppression and inhumane treatment of Uyghurs and other Muslim minorities in Xinjiang Province.

So I want to thank Chairman ENGEL of the Foreign Affairs Committee, who has put together the most bipartisan committee in either House of Congress; Ranking Member McCAUL, who has been an important part of that; Speaker PELOSI, who spoke to us earlier; our colleagues CHRIS SMITH and TOM SUOZZI, who have spoken to us earlier as well; Senators MARCO RUBIO and ROBERT MENENDEZ; my colleague in running the Asia, the Pacific, and Nonproliferation Subcommittee, TED YOHO; as well as GERRY CONNOLLY, ANN WAGNER, and everyone else who has been involved in the legislation.

I hope that we will see Muslim countries particularly in the world—but all countries—be willing to stand up to Beijing and speak out against this human rights travesty.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CHABOT. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of S. 3744, the Uyghur Human Rights Policy Act of 2020. I was proud to join Congressman CHRIS SMITH to introduce an earlier version of this important legislation at the beginning of last year and I'm glad that we are finally able to get this legislation across the finish line today.

As a senior Member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, and a committed defender of human rights, I have watched over the years as the Chinese Communist Party (CCP) routinely mistreats its people. The list of abuses is too long to recount here but it spans every sector of human life from religious freedom, to due process protections, to press freedom and freedom of assembly, to China's notorious population policies. Pretty much every freedom in our Bill of Rights is lacking in China.

Religious freedom, specifically, is a long-standing issue. The CCP seems to think that religion is a fundamental enemy. Not only are Christians hounded and mistreated, but Falun Gong practitioners are brutally persecuted, with many having their organs harvested involuntarily.

That brings us to the situation in Xinjiang and the Orwellian nightmare faced by Uyghur Muslims there today. As the problem has gotten worse and more facts have come out, the situation has become clear. China imprisons somewhere between one and three million Uyghurs in concentration camps where they undergo indoctrination and forced labor. Many are tortured. For Uyghurs outside the camps, the CCP also makes life difficult, subjecting them to intense surveillance and policing. Notably, Uyghurs both in and outside the camps are made to eat foods forbidden to Muslims and forced to abandon other practices of their faith. The Party even pursues Uyghurs in other countries by attempting to control their behavior through threats against family members still in China and by pressuring other countries to send them back to China.

No one deserves to live with this kind of persecution which is why this malicious treatment of the Uyghurs by the CCP must brought to an end. We all wish to see the day when China behaves like, and can be treated as, a normal country. Until that time, we delude ourselves if we treat it like one. That is why we must enact the Uyghur Human Rights Policy Act today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 3744.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the yeas have it.

Mr. SHERMAN. 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 are postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 1 p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1456

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. DEGETTE) at 2 o'clock and 56 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF THE SENATE AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 6172, USA FREEDOM REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2020

Mr. MCGOVERN, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 116-426) on the resolution (H. Res. 981) providing for consideration of the Senate amendments to the bill (H.R. 6172) to amend the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 to prohibit the production of certain business records, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

□ 1500

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF THE SENATE AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 6172, USA FREEDOM REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2020

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 981 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 981

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to take from the

Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 6172) to amend the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 to prohibit the production of certain business records, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendments thereto, and to consider in the House, without intervention of any point of order, a single motion offered by the chair of the Committee on the Judiciary or his designee that the House concur in the Senate amendments. The Senate amendments and the motion shall be considered as read. The motion shall be debatable for one hour equally divided among and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary and the chair and ranking minority member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question.

SEC. 2. Any motion pursuant to clause 4 of rule XXII relating to H.R. 6172 may be offered only by the Majority Leader or his designee.

SEC. 3. Notwithstanding the order of the House of May 22, 2020, if a veto message is laid before the House on House Joint Resolution 76, then after the message is read and the objections of the President are spread at large upon the Journal, further consideration of the veto message and the joint resolution shall be postponed until the legislative day of Wednesday, July 1, 2020; and on that legislative day, the House shall proceed to the constitutional question of reconsideration and dispose of such question without intervening motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule, House Resolution 981, providing for consideration of Senate amendments to H.R. 6172. The rule makes in order a motion offered by the chair of the Committee on the Judiciary or his designee that the House concur in the Senate amendments.

The rule provides 1 hour of debate on the motion, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary and the chair and the ranking member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. The rule provides that any motion pursuant to clause 4 of rule XXII relating H.R. 6172 may be offered only by the majority leader or his designee. Finally, the rule allows for consideration of a possible veto message on H.J. Res. 76 on July 1, 2020.

Madam Speaker, the protection of civil liberties has always been a

uniquely American value. I opposed the original PATRIOT Act and subsequent reauthorizations because I believe they crossed the line and compromised Americans' fundamental right to privacy.

We can prevent crime and terrorism without our government collecting data on law-abiding citizens. I have said that whether there has been a Republican President or a Democratic President in the White House.

This has not been a partisan notion, either. There are Members on both sides of the aisle who have consistently said the same. When I worked with my colleagues MARK POCAN and TOM MASSIE to introduce what was called the strongest antisurveillance bill to date, it was done with bipartisan support.

It is no surprise, then, that I don't support the underlying bill either. Every day, we ask Americans to choose between their right to privacy and a false sense of security. That is not a choice we should have to make.

Having said that, other Members in this Chamber—Democrats and Republicans—feel differently, and it is the Rules Committee's job to advance legislation to the floor.

A FISA reauthorization recently passed this Chamber with the support of over two-thirds of our Members. I did not support it. The Senate strengthened the bill, but quite frankly, it is not strong enough for me, though I do appreciate some of its reforms.

Now, each Member will have to decide where they stand. I know the President hasn't made this process easy. He has thrown a last-minute wrench into the process with his tweeting. If this bill passes, it will go directly to his desk. I am not sure if he will sign it or not. I am not sure he knows, quite frankly.

But we are giving every Member the chance to cast a straight up-or-down vote. Ultimately, the House will have worked its will.

I have said many times that I oppose this bill. The Government of the United States should not be able to go on fishing expeditions against citizens who haven't even broken the law. That is not a radical idea. To me, that is a fundamentally American idea. I don't want seemingly unlimited and, in my view, unconstitutional powers in the hands of President Trump and Attorney General Barr or any administration.

This Attorney General, quite frankly, has no respect for the rule of law. That is my view. I don't trust him.

I don't care whether it is a Republican or a Democrat in the White House. We can, and we must, fight terrorism and deter wrongdoing in a way that better respects Americans' civil liberties.

Madam Speaker, this is a serious matter. It deserves to be handled more responsibly than by a late-night tweet.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, my chairman is exactly right. We just came out of the Rules Committee just about an hour ago, and we did report this rule that does make in order a motion from the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary to concur in the Senate amendments. The Senate amendments do take a small step forward in making the underlying language better than it used to be, but we had an opportunity in the Rules Committee to consider other amendments.

We had an amendment by Mr. GOSAR, for example, that asked for additional certifications from the Attorney General. We had a bipartisan amendment from Mr. DAVIDSON and Ms. LOFGREN that would have gone even further in protecting civil liberties. I regret the rule we have today makes neither of those in order.

It comes as no surprise to any of us that we have some very successful House work product that we could have added here, and we made the decision to accede to the Senate language.

As I mentioned, just over an hour ago, Dr. BURGESS, who sits on the Rules Committee, and I were there.

Madam Speaker, with the chairman's indulgence, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) for any statement he may have.

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

Madam Speaker, I do want to point out that the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978—note the first word is “Foreign”—the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 provided authorities for the collection of foreign intelligence information to protect the United States from foreign threats. These authorities were expanded after 9/11, and their use has exceeded the original intent.

The Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court provides authorization via court order. Inspector General Horowitz's recent report revealed intentional abuse of the FISA process by FBI officials investigating the Trump campaign, investigating the Trump campaign for alleged collusion with Russia during the 2016 Presidential campaign. After extensive study by Special Counsel Robert Mueller, no such connection could be found.

In addition, agents of the FBI reportedly used official meetings with then-President-elect Trump and incoming National Security Advisor Michael Flynn for the purposes of gathering information on them, intelligence information. These politically driven actions by the FBI were highly irregular; inappropriate; and, in the case of inaccurate FISA court applications, actually criminal.

It is not legal to lie to a FISA court judge. Yet, no one has been held accountable. No one has stood trial. Certainly, no one has served a sentence to account for these crimes.

Madam Speaker, what is the point of passing a law if the enforcement agency is the one abusing it? This is malfeasance of the highest order, and it certainly must not go unpunished.

Let's be clear: We all want to protect the American people. Part of that responsibility includes authorizing certain activities by our intelligence agencies to obtain critical information on foreign targets. But, no, Americans' civil liberties should not be jettisoned for that effort.

When the House first passed H.R. 6172, the reauthorization of the USA FREEDOM Act, I supported the bill because of the improvements that were made to the FISA process. But since then, we have learned details that indicate that the abuse was much more widespread and much more deliberate than initially reported.

Given that, rather than place some additional requirements on the exercise of existing authorities, I think we must fully reevaluate the FISA authorities to resolve the right balance between protecting our Nation and the rights of the American people.

In addition, the administration does not support this bill in its current form, which means that this is going to be yet another in a long line of activities undertaken by the Democratic majority that is not going to be successful.

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

Madam Speaker, I oppose the underlying bill. It has nothing do with the Mueller investigation into the collusion between Trump operatives and the Russians.

Quite frankly, I look back at that episode in our history with great concern. A foreign power intervened in our election, and people close to the President lied about their interaction with the Russians, including General Michael Flynn, whom my colleague just referred to. He lied to the FBI, but he doesn't need to worry because the President is going to pardon him, or at least alluded to pardoning him because he is his friend.

It is that kind of lack of respect for the law that has me concerned about giving more power to this administration to be able to surveil American citizens.

By the way, the Attorney General is recommending a veto on this because he thinks it is too restrictive. He wants more power. This Attorney General wants more power. Give me a break.

Madam Speaker, people have differences of opinion on the underlying bill. There are Democrats who strongly support it, and there are Democrats who oppose it. There are Republicans who strongly support it, at least they did until the President did his tweet last night, and Republicans who oppose it. So, people can vote however they want to vote.

But my opposition to the underlying bill is longstanding, and I am not going

to sit here and listen to somebody try to rewrite history as to what happened between the Russians and Trump operatives. What happened should disturb every American, Democrat or Republican.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), my chairman, knows the great respect that I have for him—in fact, the great affection that I have for him.

Madam Speaker, I can tell him with complete sincerity that I have no interest in rewriting history, but I do have an interest in rewriting the future. And as we stand here today, my support for the underlying legislation does not wane because of a Presidential tweet; my belief that the legislation will be signed into law wanes because of a Presidential tweet.

Madam Speaker, whether you are on the side that says this bill is doing too much or whether you are on the side that says this bill is doing too little, if you are on the side that says we can do better together, then going down a path that the President's team has said would result in a veto advantages none of us.

Madam Speaker, it is painful. This is my last year in this institution, and I love this institution not because of the history that is in these walls, not because of the ancient tomes that I see here on Mr. GRIFFITH's desk, but because of the people who sacrifice themselves and their families on behalf of something that is bigger than themselves.

This idea that it is the United States of America that you and I have the privilege of playing a small leadership role in, that is universal. To be here on the floor of the House today, again, accentuating our divisions on a bill that is going nowhere, is worthless to me.

Madam Speaker, I love being on the House floor with my friend, the chairman, when he is full thunder on behalf of his ideas and his principles and I have to take the other side. That kind of debate, those kinds of differences of opinions among people who respect one another but simply come at things from a different perspective, that is exactly what this House was intended to produce.

Madam Speaker, to be here on the floor today, when my friend from Massachusetts is having to carry a rule for a bill that he opposes and wants to defeat, I am down here telling you that we had a great bipartisan solution, but we are not going to be able to talk about it on the House floor.

So, I have a bill that I support the underlying vision of but know it is going to go absolutely nowhere, and we are just going to back folks into their political corners. That is not what our constituents expect from us, and it is not, I would argue, what we have come

to expect from ourselves. It, sadly, is what the political theater advocates have come to expect from us.

Madam Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to a new rule to suspend the proxy voting until the D.C. Federal district court reviews a lawsuit and determines an outcome.

Madam Speaker, thinking about things that are within the walls of this institution, all the stories these walls tell, they will never tell a story of a single Member of Congress ever casting a vote from outside of this room where we are standing. Never has it happened. I would argue the Constitution flatly prohibits it. I cannot understand how one can read the Constitution differently.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD the text of my amendment, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1515

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I reference the tomes that sit on the gentleman from Virginia's desk.

At this time, I would like to yield 5 minutes to my good friend and, actually, Madam Speaker, as you know, someone who has worked in a bipartisan way, a surprising bipartisan way—never fails to surprise Members on both sides of the aisle—to protect this institution and all that it means to the American people.

There are many folks in this institution, Madam Speaker, I don't mind disagreeing with; and, in fact, the fact that we are on other sides humbly leads me to believe I am even more right than I thought that I was. When I find myself disagreeing with the gentleman from Virginia, I find myself having to go back and reflect on exactly why that is we have come down on different sides. And those individuals in this Chamber who provide us with that counsel, Madam Speaker, you know that we hold in such high regard.

Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GRIFFITH).

Mr. GRIFFITH. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the kind words of my good friend and colleague, and we will miss him when he goes on to do greater things elsewhere.

Madam Speaker, if we do not pass the motion to proceed to the previous question, we can put the proxy quorum voting rule on hold until after the courts have time to rule on its constitutionality.

Most on this side of the aisle and a handful on the other side of the aisle strongly believe that this proxy voting rule is unconstitutional. Accordingly, yesterday, a suit was filed to have the rule declared unconstitutional.

Under the suit, the court is asked to do many things, including asking for an injunction of our Clerk from counting the proxy votes on any measure and on counting proxies for purposes of determining a quorum. The courts must weigh in on this controversy before we take important votes using this new proxy quorum voting scheme.

The suit lays out constitutional requirements. Many of these arguments were made previously. It goes through the definitions of words like "to meet," "assemble," et cetera.

Madam Speaker, as you know, words are important and the meanings are important, and the filers of this suit couldn't have made me happier. When I was reading it, they used Samuel Johnson's dictionary of 1773. And just to let you know exactly how oddball I can be, I pulled my copy of Samuel Johnson's of 1773 off the shelf in my office. I checked to see what they had written down, and they got it exactly right. The term "meet" meant "to encounter, to be close face-to-face."

And in 1851, the Webster's dictionary says "to come together or approach near, or into company with; to assemble, to congregate." The example they used in Webster's in 1851 was: "The legislature will meet on the first Wednesday in March." Clearly, they knew what it meant to come together face-to-face.

Today, on the internet—knowing that some out there would say, "MORGAN, get yourself out of the dusty books"—it says, meet: to come into the presence of; to come face-to-face.

And "assemble," similarly, in Johnson's, it means "to bring together into one place"; Webster's: "To collect a number of individuals into one place or body"; internet, Merriam-Webster's, today: "To bring together, as in a particular place."

The suit lays out the constitutional requirements. Many of these arguments were made, as I said, previously.

Now, I know what many of you are thinking. MORGAN, you have got to get modern. Zoom is a place, as is Webex and a dozen others. Some say that if they had only known about it during the writing of the Constitution, they would have permitted it; but, Madam Speaker, they had the written word and they had the ability to send letters.

They also knew about dangers. They knew about wars with other nations, later, the burning of D.C., the Civil War.

Multiple plagues and fears have gripped the capitals of this country, but they never contemplated sending a note or a letter by friend or by post, saying—and can you imagine it saying: "Hey, give my vote to Harry Lee of Virginia or William Holman of Indiana. And not only count my vote as a vote on the bill, but count me present as a part of the quorum?"

Never did it, never thought they should, never thought they could.

So the lawsuit challenging the constitutionality of this so-called rule is well-founded.

Also, it is important we think about how the newfangled proxy quorum rule affects our work today. Some may say: "Let the courts do their thing and we will sort it out later." Well, that is more than just sloppy legislating; it is dangerous.

MORGAN, you say, how is that?

Let me explain. As an example, we are preparing to vote on the reauthorization of the Federal Intelligence Surveillance Act, FISA. On that, or any other vote that does anything of import, no matter how small—even the naming of a post office, because it spends money—the vote and the action of this House, under the proxy quorum rule, is tainted and the authority of that legislation, accordingly, called into question.

On FISA, if we pass it and the courts rule that the proxy quorum voting rule is unconstitutional, in whole or in part, we will have handed either a get-out-of-jail-free card to terrorists who are enemies of the United States or a hammer they can use against prosecutors trying to pursue justice.

Is that really what we want to do? I know it is not. And we have another way. We can put the proxy quorum rule on hold, suspend it until the courts can make a final ruling on its constitutionality.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GRIFFITH. We can put the proxy quorum rule on hold. We can suspend it until the courts can make a final ruling on its constitutionality. Once we have that answer, we can then move forward. But to move forward without knowing where we are going on constitutionality is dangerous, damaging, and destructive to every act we take in this body.

Madam Speaker, I would implore the Members of this House: Do not vote the party line. Do not say, "Oh, it is a previous question, it is a throwaway vote." Today, the previous question is an important vote on whether we move forward not knowing the way or whether we move forward knowing whether it is constitutional or unconstitutional.

I ask you all to vote for our great Republic and this august body. Vote "no" on the previous question and put the proxy quorum rule on hold until we have a definitive answer.

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

I want to thank the gentleman for reading from Webster's Dictionary to all of us, but I want to read from the Constitution. And let me quote: "Each House may determine the rules of its proceedings."

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from Erwin Chemerinsky, the renowned constitutional expert and dean of Berkeley School of Law, discussing the view that

the remote voting process we are considering today would, in fact, be constitutional.

In the letter, the dean says: “The Constitution bestows in each House of Congress broad discretion to determine the rules for its own proceedings. . . . This authority is expansive and would include the ability to adopt a rule to permit proxy voting. Nothing in the Constitution specifies otherwise.

“Moreover, if this were challenged in court, it is very likely that the case would be dismissed as a political question. The Supreme Court has ruled that challenges to the internal operation of the Congress are not justiciable in the Federal courts. . . . Indeed, I have written, the Court often ‘has held that congressional judgments pertaining to its internal governance should not be reviewed by the Federal judiciary.’”

BERKELEY LAW,
May 13, 2020.

Chairman MCGOVERN and Ranking Member COLE,

House Rules Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MCGOVERN AND RANKING MEMBER COLE: I have been asked for my view as to whether the House of Representatives could constitutionally adopt a rule to permit remote voting by proxy. As explained below, I believe that this would be constitutional and it is very unlikely that any court would invalidate such a rule, especially in light of the current public health emergency.

My understanding is that the system of remote voting by proxy that is being considered would have some key features:

Low-tech remote voting process through proxy voting;

Some number of Members would be present on the Floor for debate and in-Chamber voting;

Proxy would be used to establish a quorum and to register the yeas/nays;

The proxy holder would be another Member of the House;

The proxy holder would have NO discretion on the vote. Instead, the proxy holder would be required (through the rule and accompanying regulations) to cast the vote in accordance with the specific and exact instruction from the Member.

The Constitution bestows on each House of Congress broad discretion to determine the rules for its own proceedings. Article I, section 5 of the Constitution says: “Each House may determine the Rules of its proceedings.” This authority is expansive and would include the ability to adopt a rule to permit proxy voting. Nothing in the Constitution specifies otherwise.

Moreover, if this were challenged in court, it is very likely that the case would be dismissed as a political question. The Supreme Court has ruled that challenges to the internal operation of Congress are not justiciable in the federal courts. *See Field v. Clark*, 143 U.S. 649 (1892). Indeed, I have written, the Court often “has held that congressional judgments pertaining to its internal governance should not be reviewed by the federal judiciary.” Erwin Chernerinsky, *Constitutional Law: Principles and Policies* §2.8.5 (6th ed. 2019).

Especially in the context of the current public health emergency, it is highly unlikely that any court would review and invalidate the procedures adopted by the House of Representatives that would allow it to conduct its business without endangering the health of its members and its staff. Every branch of government is devising new procedures to accomplish this. The Supreme Court, for example, will conduct oral arguments by telephone for the first time in its

history. I am sure that the rules will ensure that the votes cast by proxy are accurate and carefully recorded.

I hope that this is helpful. Please do not hesitate to let me know if I can be of further assistance.

Sincerely,

ERWIN CHEMERINSKY.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I include in the RECORD a letter from Deborah Pearlstein, constitutional law professor from Cardozo School of Law.

In her letter, which I strongly recommend all of my colleagues read in full, Professor Pearlstein writes: “. . . I believe adopting procedures to allow for remote voting under these extraordinary circumstances is not only lawful, but essential to the maintenance of our constitutional democracy.”

“The Constitution . . . contains no specific requirement of physical presence for Members to vote. What the Constitution does instead—as the courts have repeatedly recognized—is leave it up to each House of Congress to ‘determine the Rules of its Proceedings.’”

“Indeed, it is just such constitutional flexibility that has enabled Congress to embrace the various informal solutions it has adopted over the years to ‘do business,’ including relying on Members to give ‘unanimous consent’ to a vote even if something less than an actual majority of Members is physically present on the floor.”

“Finally, the temporary remote voting procedures . . . bear an entirely ‘reasonable relation’ to the goal you aim to achieve, namely, ensuring that Congress preserves the ability to vote in a way that maintains the institution’s representative character, protects the transparency of its operation, and fairly and accurately reflects the will of the American people.”

CARDOZO LAW,
April 16, 2020.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MCGOVERN: Thank you for your statement today recommending the implementation of temporary remote voting procedures in Congress during this tragic pandemic. As a professor of constitutional law, and a scholar who has written extensively on separation of powers issues in U.S. Government, I believe adopting procedures to allow for remote voting under these extraordinary circumstances is not only lawful, but essential to the maintenance of our constitutional democracy. Recognizing that specific procedures for remote voting may still be in development, the analysis offered here focuses foremost on the broad scope of Congress’ constitutional authority to regulate its voting procedures.

As with much else in the Constitution, the description the text provides of how Congress is to fulfill its legislative “duties” once members have been elected is relatively brief. Article I, Section 5 provides that there must be “a Quorum to do business,” which the Constitution defines as constituting simply “a Majority” of each House. The same Section likewise specifies that each House must keep a “Journal of its Proceedings,” which must be published “from time to time,” and which may, if a sufficient number of members desire, reflect how every member voted “on any question.” The Constitution adds that neither House can adjourn for more than three days, or move the session to some other place, without the consent of the other House—a provision designed to prevent a single House from thwarting all congress-

sional action by simply absenting themselves indefinitely.

There can be little question that the Framers imagined the legislature would do its work while assembled in some physical location. In 1787 when the Constitution was drafted, they could scarcely have imagined any other functional way of proceeding. Various other constitutional provisions thus refer to Congress as “meeting” (Art. I, Sec. 4) or “assembling” (Art. I, Sec. 3), and one even provides a mechanism by which members can compel “the Attendance of absent Members,” (Art. I, Sec. 5) meaning presumably those members not otherwise present where Congress is meeting. Of course, none of the clauses in which those terms appear address how Congress casts or counts its votes. Indeed, neither the document itself nor any Supreme Court decision defines what counts as “attendance” or “assembling,” much less how such “attendance” may be taken, or such “assemblage” may be accomplished. The Constitution equally contains no specific requirement of physical presence for Members to vote. What the Constitution does instead—as the courts have repeatedly recognized—is leave it up to each House of Congress to “determine the Rules of its Proceedings.” (Art. I, Sec. 5) As the Supreme Court explained in *United States v. Ballin*, 144 U.S. 1 (1892), so long as there is a “reasonable relation between the mode or method of proceeding established by the rule and the result which is sought to be attained,” the content of those rules are “beyond the challenge of any other body or tribunal.”

Indeed, it is just such constitutional flexibility that has enabled Congress to embrace the various informal solutions it has adopted over the years to “do business,” including relying on members to give “unanimous consent” to a vote even if something less than an actual majority of members is physically present on the House floor. But while such well settled procedures are surely constitutional, they may not always function to advance the system of majority rule the Constitution so plainly contemplates. As we recently saw when Congress enacted a substantial stimulus bill just last month, it is possible for one House member, acting alone, to single-handedly defeat the manifest preference of the bipartisan majority by insisting upon an actual demonstration that a majority of members were “present” (a term contained in House Rules, not in the Constitution itself). This forced House leaders to make a choice the Constitution cannot be understood to compel—between surrendering the will of the majority to the demands of a single man, or insisting, as they did, that Members jeopardize their safety (and thus their ability to effectively represent their constituents going forward) by defying lawful public health restrictions to travel and meet in Washington, D.C.

It is precisely in order to avoid such absurd results that Congress has embraced a variety of measures throughout its history to adjust to developing technologies and changing demands. Thus, for example, current House Rules provide that in the event the existing electronic voting system is “inoperable,” the Speaker may direct the vote to be conducted through alternative methods, including through the use of “tellers” designated by the Speaker to “record the names of the Members voting on each side of the question.” The teller system was an innovation put in place before the current electronic system was available, one among key reforms designed to strengthen Congress’ ability to maintain a public record of Members’

votes. The particular challenge of ensuring that Congress could continue to operate during the outbreak of infectious disease was indeed the subject of one of Congress's first efforts to provide for alternative rules of operation. Following Congress' return after the yellow fever epidemic that devastated the then-capital of Philadelphia in the summer of 1793, Congress adopted a law providing that in circumstances when "the prevalence of contagious sickness" made it "be hazardous to the lives or health of the members to meet at the seat of Government," the President could "convene Congress at such other place as he may judge proper." If Congress can delegate to the President the power to move congressional operations entirely, surely it can reserve for itself the lesser power to make whatever far more modest amendment to process is required to ensure Congress is able to vote in the same, extraordinary circumstances.

Finally, the temporary remote voting procedures as you have sketched them thus far appear to bear an entirely "reasonable relation" to the goal you aim to achieve, namely, ensuring that Congress preserves the ability to vote in a way that maintains the institution's representative character, protects the transparency of its operations, and fairly and accurately reflects the will of the American people. By keeping remote voting procedures tied as closely as possible to the existing system, the proposed approach protects Members' ability to participate in votes regardless of geographic location, technical knowledge or means; minimizes the risk of foreign or other unlawful interference in the vote; and maximizes Congress's ability to fairly reflect the will of the majority of the people even during the present crisis. The proposed approach contains essential safeguards to ensure that Members' preferences are fully and accurately recorded; as you emphasized in your recent statement, Members designated to submit voting cards on behalf of other elected Representatives may only act pursuant to the direct, express instruction of the elected Representative, retaining no discretion in carrying out the ministerial function they play in the modified voting process. As ever, Members remain subject to all the disciplinary powers the House possesses to ensure the appropriate exercise of their duties.

In short, with limited reforms that maximize Members' ability to represent the wishes of their constituents, while minimizing disruption and confusion in House operations, Congress can succeed in preserving the essential constitutional function of the legislative branch even amidst an unprecedented pandemic. It is a critically important initiative in these extraordinary times.

As ever, I thank you for your efforts, and for the opportunity to share my views.

Sincerely,

DEBORAH N. PEARLSTEIN,
Professor of Law.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, about the process, let me just say, I hear from my friends. They like to talk about the 230 years of tradition as though the House has never made any changes to the way it operates in these last 230 years. That is just simply not true. So many of our most basic functions have changed drastically since the first Congress, from the way we vote to the way we count a quorum.

If a legislative body does not have the ability to respond to the challenges it faces, then how can it survive and how can it be functional?

The challenge we are facing today is not permanent. I could argue that the

House has made several more sweeping and permanent changes than this before. For one, the way we vote today looks nothing like how our predecessors voted in 1789. Now we cast our votes in the Chamber by electronic device.

Our predecessors recognized that the House needed to advance with technology. For decades, they called on the House to implement a more efficient and advanced voting system. They were afraid we would seem archaic compared to foreign and State governments. Does that sound familiar?

Right now, we are watching as legislatures in our States take responsible action to respond to this pandemic by implementing remote voting procedures and as parliaments around the world advance to meet this challenge head-on. What are we doing? We are struggling to even come up with an agreement that we need to do something—something. Anything.

But voting electronically is not the only change we have made in response to technological advancements. Now, our floor proceedings are broadcast on C-SPAN. Members grappled with questions of how broadcasting the House would fundamentally change this body, but the desire for accountability and transparency won the day.

Change is not always bad. And, of course, there were safeguards attached to this that preserved the integrity of the House: Proceedings cannot be tampered with and cannot be used for political reasons and so on.

Other changes we made over the years include the provisional quorum after 9/11. And that is not the only time we made changes to our quorum requirements.

Other changes were deciding when a quorum is required. For decades, Members raised points of order that a quorum is not present during debates. The House has even expanded the Speaker's ability to adjust the numbers of the whole House to account for those living, incapacitated, or resigned.

How we count a quorum today is not the same as how we counted a quorum in the first Congress. We have made changes to our quorum rules as recent as 15 years ago.

Here is the deal: What we are facing today doesn't have to prevent us from legislating. We should not be afraid to adapt and respond to these challenges and to do so in a safe manner. If anything, we have 230 years of precedent of us adapting to the changing world around us. There is nothing wrong with that.

But we don't have decades to make these changes. We need to make them now, because we are in the midst of a pandemic. Hopefully, we are seeing the end of it, but according to this administration's own CDC, we may see a surge in COVID-19 cases in the fall. We may be in a more difficult situation. We need to be prepared.

So no one is suggesting any permanent rules changes here. Everything

that we are putting forth is temporary and will be tied to the duration of this pandemic. Full stop.

Let me just say this, finally. Proxy voting is constitutional. The experts have said so. We aren't going to stop the work of the people's House so that another branch of government can weigh in on our internal proceedings.

I get it. My Republican friends have another agenda. They would prefer that we do not get work done during this difficult time. It is in, I think, their political interests, I guess they have decided, to slow the work down of Congress.

Well, do you know what? The American people want us to work in times that are normal and in times like this when we are in the middle of a pandemic. And so I would urge my colleagues to reject the motion of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle and instead vote to get our work done.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1530

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

Madam Speaker, I wanted to ask my chairman, when he was referencing Republicans who just want to slow this place down and don't want to get any work done, if he would except me and my colleague from Virginia from that characterization? Because I certainly know that it doesn't apply, and I would like to know that my chairman knows that it doesn't apply as well.

When the chairman just stated that the reason that Republicans are opposed to proxy voting has nothing to do with—

Mr. MCGOVERN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODALL. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, let me put it this way: I think there are certain Members of your conference who are interested in slowing the work of this democratic majority down. And I think that the constitutional arguments are certainly on our side on this, and I think that there is another agenda, quite frankly, that is being pursued by some. I am not going to attribute that to you or anybody else.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman.

Madam Speaker, if the constitutional arguments are so clear, we should be able to get this out of the district court in very short order, presumptively with the decision that my chairman would like.

Madam Speaker, I want to ask my friend from Virginia again—what I have seen from Mr. GRIFFITH, Madam Speaker, is someone who has fought on behalf of the institution, not on behalf of Republicans, not on behalf of Democrats. Without throwing my friend under the bus, he has been in the minority of my conference as often as he has been in the majority, fighting to do

the right thing because he thought we were on the wrong path. And he was saying: You know what? You may think this is politically expedient today, but you are going to regret this. And the decisions we make aren't about politics, they are about people. They are about the institution.

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

Mr. GRIFFITH. Madam Speaker, I would reiterate and thank the gentleman for his kind comments. He is absolutely right. I come here today not as a Republican or a Democrat. I come here as an American, and I have no agenda today except to defend the Constitution.

And while the courts may ultimately determine that my friends on the other side of the aisle are right, I believe they are sorely wrong, Madam Speaker. Sorely wrong. Because we are not just talking about voting from afar, and while I would have problems with that as well, I will tell you it is more critical than that because the Constitution calls on us to meet, to assemble, and to have a quorum.

The Founding Fathers debated whether or not that quorum should be a smaller-than-50-percent amount. And they determined that was not right because then it would tilt power into the hands of those that live closer to the Capitol, like Mr. BEYER, who apparently is carrying at least nine proxies. It tilts powers into those people's hands and away from the States that are further away, like Colorado and California.

Madam Speaker, I would submit to you that there is a reason that in 231 years this has never come up, even though they could have written a letter. As I said before, they could have easily written a letter. They could have written a letter, and said: Hey, I can't get there right now, give my vote to my friend. They didn't do it.

They could have said: Hey, for purposes of a quorum, count me from afar by letter. They knew how to write. Messages were traded all the time. But, instead, they went to wherever the Capitol was at the time, whether it be in Philadelphia, whether it be in Washington, D.C., at a hotel, and they did the people's business. They did not cede that authority to anyone else. They kept it for themselves. And that is what the Constitution calls for. And you know what, as I said before, they never did it. They never thought they should. They never thought they could.

Madam Speaker, I have to tell you, we go all the way back to the Declaration of Independence, and Caesar Rodney got on his horse while deathly ill with cancer, suffering from asthma and the gout, to ride to Philadelphia to cast the deciding vote for his State of Delaware because he needed to be there live in order to do it. He needed to be at the Capitol. He needed to be at the meeting place of this country, even in its infancy, to cast the vote, no matter what. And he rode through a storm.

And so we continue to have the policy—because it was the Founding Fathers' wish, and because it is the right thing to do—that if you are going to count as a quorum, you meet in the Capitol. You may designate a different place for that Capitol. We might designate it in Colorado, if need be.

But wherever the Capitol is designated, this body must come together, representing the people from the various States of this Union. And, we, each individual, shall cast our vote, not 10 votes here by one and 8 votes there by another, but one by one, each district as determined in the decennial census shall cast their vote on each and every measure. When we don't do that, we don't do our job. When we don't do our job, we cast a doubt on every action we take.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I don't even know what the heck the gentleman from Virginia is talking about. We debated this. Nobody is ceding their power to anybody here. We had this debate. Read the resolution.

Members who cannot be here are very much engaged and are directing their wishes very directly, like they would by casting the vote here. So I don't even know what the heck we are talking about here, but I guess it is a good talking point on their side, but it just doesn't reflect reality.

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

Ms. PELOSI. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I thank him for his leadership of the Rules Committee and for bringing us together so that we can present this FISA bill on the floor today.

Madam Speaker, when we come to Congress, we all take an oath of office. We raise our right hand to protect and defend the Constitution of the United States. Protecting that, we are protecting the American people.

Central to that defense is how we do protect and defend, it is about our values, which are part of our strength. It is about the health, education, and well-being of our people, our children, our future, which is part of our strength. Our military might is part of our strength. And our intelligence is very much a part of our strength in order to provide force protection for our men and women in uniform when they go out there to protect and defend our country. Force protection.

When I first started on the Intelligence Committee in the early mid-90s, a long time ago, I would soon then rise to be the ranking member, and I take great pride in that ex officio all these years since then. When I started way back when, it was about force protection; intelligence to protect our forces to anticipate any initiation of hostilities, and also, when engaged, to have the intelligence to protect them.

Since then, the whole world has changed with technology, and all the rest, in that period of time. So our intelligence has had to change as well. And one of the ways it has, has necessitated us having a FISA bill, the USA FREEDOM Reauthorization Act.

In the House some weeks ago we passed a bill, honchoed by our two distinguished chairs, the chair of the Judiciary Committee, Mr. NADLER from New York; and the chair of the Intelligence Committee, Mr. SCHIFF from California, two committees of jurisdiction. It had strong bipartisan support. It went over to the Senate. In my view, it was vastly improved in the Senate, and it had 80 votes.

Our bill was bipartisan. Their bill was bipartisan, too: 80 votes in the United States Senate for the Senate bill, which was amended by the Leahy/Lee Amendment—very, very protective of the balance that we have to have between security and privacy, security and civil liberties. This is the balance that we have to strike.

In my years on Intelligence, I was focused a lot on the civil liberties part of it, establishing a board, et cetera, to ensure that whatever we did, that balance with our civil liberties was central and important to it.

As Benjamin Franklin said: Security and liberties, you can't have one without the other. They go together, security and liberty.

And so now today, this Rules Committee is presenting that bill, the USA FREEDOM Reauthorization Act coming back from the Senate. Again, our bill in the House originally was 278 to 136. It was strongly bipartisan, with 126 Republicans voting for it. This bill coming back from the Senate, as I said, had 80 votes over there.

So with an intelligence bill, with a FISA bill, nobody is ever really that happy. I never was. And you always want more or less, as the case may be, but the fact is—and I say this in all humility, because I don't pretend to know more than my colleagues—but in all humility, we have to have a bill. If we don't have a bill, then our liberties, our civil liberties are less protected.

Some people say: I don't care, just let them extend this and extend that. No. There is real value in both the House bill that we passed and then exceptionally so in what the Senate passed. There are those that would not like us to have a bill. Some of them in the judiciary, the Department of Justice, just say: Don't have a bill, just give us all the leeway in the world not to have to protect any liberties. But we can't have that.

We take an oath to protect and defend the Constitution of the United States and all the liberties contained therein as we protect the American people.

So if anybody thinks, well, no, in order to have a bill, we have to have a rule. So I thank you, Mr. Chairman, for bringing this rule to the floor, which enables us to pass a bill. This legislation increases the power of the Privacy

and Civil Liberties Oversight Board to pursue its mission to protect Americans' privacy.

After 9/11 this Congress considered the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004, establishing the Privacy and Civil Liberties Board. That was one of my top priorities all those years ago. And the Board has done critical work in assessing the privacy and civil liberties impact of the government's collection activities, including under various provisions of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act.

So, again, this has to be a high priority for us. It was a higher priority in the act that was passed that could get passed in the Senate.

So, again, I am going to submit my statement for the RECORD that I talk about here. But FISA is a critical pillar of America's national security, which Congress has updated and improved over the last years to ensure that America's privacies and civil liberties are expected.

Are we ever satisfied? Of course not. Of course not. But legislation is just exactly that. Legislation. Our attempt to come together to protect and defend in a way that has already passed the Senate can go directly to the President for his signature, and I hope that that will be the case today.

Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman again for bringing this rule to the floor. I urge all of our colleagues to vote for this important rule that enables us to do important things for the American people. With that, I urge an "aye" vote.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the USA FREEDOM Reauthorization Act, a strong, bipartisan bill to reauthorize critical FISA provisions.

In March, our Members worked day and night to craft legislation that strikes a strong, careful balance between security and privacy. We thank Chairman NADLER and Chairman SCHIFF for their leadership and the expertise they bring on this vital national security issue.

We were proud to have passed that bill on an overwhelmingly bipartisan 278–136 basis, including with the support of 126 of our Republican colleagues.

Last week, the Senate considered the House-passed FISA bill and amended it to further expand the robust *amicus curiae* provisions in the original House bill. The bill then passed also on an overwhelmingly bipartisan basis, 80–16, supported by nearly every Republican Senator.

Yet, now, some Members on the other side of the aisle are considering changing their minds and flipping their position, in order to score political points with the President.

As should be clear, political gamesmanship has no place in our national security. Reauthorizing FISA—and doing so in a timely manner—is a matter of keeping the American people safe.

Indeed, FISA is a critical pillar of America's national security, which Congress has updated and improved over the years to ensure that Americans' privacy and civil liberties are respected.

After 9/11, as revelations emerged that the Bush Administration had engaged in warrant-

less electronic surveillance of the public, Congress strengthened and updated the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act.

Our action helped end this unacceptable practice and ensure that all electronic surveillance of Americans complies with the law.

Since then, the law has been further updated, including through the FISA Amendments Act of 2008 and the USA FREEDOM ACT of 2015.

The bill that the House passed in March took additional steps to strengthen FISA, which are preserved in the Senate-amended bill: placing new limitations on surveillance authorities while ensuring that our intelligence and law enforcement have the tools necessary to keep Americans safe; ending the NSA's call detail records initiative, which the government has confirmed that it no longer uses; strengthening the integrity of the FISA process by increasing transparency and accountability; and expanding involvement of the court-appointed *amicus curiae* in FISA cases—which was expanded in the Senate bill.

We are proud that this legislation increases the power of the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board (PCLOB) to pursue its mission to protect Americans' privacy.

After 9/11, as Congress considered the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004, establishing the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board was one of my top priorities.

The Board has done critical work in assessing the privacy and civil liberties impact of the government's collection activities, including under various provisions of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act.

As Members of Congress, we take an oath to support and defend the Constitution, and to protect the American people.

This legislation honors that oath, as it also honors the patriotic contributions of the men and women of the intelligence and law enforcement communities and the privacy of the American people.

I urge Members to remember their oath and to once again support this critical legislation to keep the American people safe.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. Madam Speaker, I thank the Speaker for her words. We do come to a place where we sometimes are satisfied. In this case we had a bipartisan group that was continuing to work to do even more of those good things that the gentlewoman laid out.

They had an amendment that they had drafted together in a bipartisan way. That amendment was not made in order on this floor. I agree with the gentlewoman, we should never be satisfied. In this case, we have decided to be satisfied with the Senate language instead of trying to improve it with the House work product, and I deeply regret that.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY.)

Mr. ROY. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity here to visit about what we are dealing with today with respect to proxy voting with respect to the previous question. And I notice that the gentleman from Massachusetts—and, first of all, and our prayers go out for the tragedy that you

are dealing with in Massachusetts, at a significant clip worse than we are in Texas, obviously, regionally very difficult.

But what we are trying to deal with here right now is trying to protect the Constitution of the United States. And this is not something that is about slowing down the work of this body. I am delighted to work with my colleague, DEAN PHILLIPS from Minnesota. Right now, together, we are all working on legislation to try to improve the PPP, and I am delighted to do that as the cosponsor of that legislation. I am not here to slow down what we need to be doing to help work for the people of the United States, I can assure you.

I am here because the Constitution matters. In the various staff reports that talked about the options for us to deal with this, I would remind you that our Democratic colleagues acknowledge the constitutional questions that arise from proxy voting.

□ 1545

Let's be clear to the American people that we are not talking about remote voting. I, too, like the gentleman from Virginia, have very serious constitutional reservations about remote voting, but let's have that debate. Let's have a thorough debate about that. But we are talking about proxy voting.

For those people who are watching this back at home, understand what that means. That means that a Member of this body who has been delegated to them the responsibility from their constituents to vote for them, to argue for them, to be on this body representing them, is taking that solemn duty and handing it to another, and in some cases, 5 or 10 Members handing it to another.

That undermines our body. It dilutes the representation of our constituent. It dilutes those of us as Members and the power and importance that is entrusted to us to represent our constituents.

This is what is at stake, and this is what we are talking about, and this is why we have filed litigation.

I would rather that we address this in this body, but in talking to the Parliamentarian, I was advised there was nothing we could do, that when the House voted 10, 12 days ago—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ROY. Madam Speaker, I was advised that we could do nothing in this body to address the constitutional infirmity of literally transferring our constitutionally vested authority to represent our constituents to another. Therefore, I was told, and I believe that is the case, we have to go to the courts, the Article III courts, to express our concern that this is constitutionally infirm.

This is not about setting our own rules. This is about directly opposing

the structure of the Constitution in which we represent our constituents.

Keep in mind that at the time of our founding in 1793, in the heat of yellow fever, 5,000 Philadelphians died out of a population of 50,000. That is 10 percent. That would be 180,000 or 160,000 today. Yet, what happened? James Madison, George Washington, and Thomas Jefferson were all working to figure out how this body could continue to meet in person. They didn't adopt proxy voting. They figured out how to work to meet.

There is a letter sent from James Madison to George Washington on October 24, 1793, talking about this very issue, that in a pandemic, this body should meet.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ROY. Madam Speaker, this body should continue to meet. That letter from James Madison, the father of the Constitution, to the father of our country, George Washington, expressly lays out what he is talking about to try to protect our duty to meet as a body, the requirement of physical presence, the requirement that we meet together, to look each other in the eye to do our duty to represent our constituents.

This is not about slowing down the work of this body. This is about doing our duty to uphold the Constitution and finding a way to navigate through the difficulties of the current moment.

We got through yellow fever. We got through world wars. We got through the Spanish flu. We got through a Civil War. And we managed to figure out how to do our job. Our Founders got through smallpox. I would implore my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, let us not adopt this proxy voting in which we turn over our solemn duty to another Member. Let us work together to find out how to get through this in a way that respects the Constitution. That is why we are here.

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

Nobody is turning over their solemn duty to another Member of Congress, and if my friend would read the proposal which passed the House, if he had paid attention to the debate that we had, he wouldn't be mischaracterizing what, in fact, we are doing here.

Nobody is turning over their solemn power to anybody. Members have to participate directly just like they would on the House floor. They have to pay attention to the proceedings. They cannot give their votes in advance. On a previous question, people have to respond just like they would in real time as if they were here on the floor.

So, this is just not true. It is not accurate.

Again, we have had this debate. The House has spoken, and we are moving forward with remote voting by proxy today.

By the way, we didn't get through the pandemic of 1918 in the way the gentleman just kind of characterized. In fact, that was an example of why we need to do something because, during that time, we weren't meeting. During that time, a bill actually to try to get more doctors to rural areas to help people get through it couldn't get passed in the House, and a lot of people died as a result of it.

So, I don't look at the Spanish flu of 1918 as somehow a model that we ought to employ now. That is an example of how this institution failed, and people died as a result of it.

We are now in another pandemic. Hopefully, this is short-lived. Hopefully, the President is right that, tomorrow, everything will be perfect. But we are also being told that, actually, things could get worse in the fall. That is what happened during the Spanish flu, by the way. The fall was worse.

We need to be prepared, and that is what we are going to do. We are going to do the people's business, and the people who can get here, they can get here. If they can't, for whatever reason, because flights have been canceled because they are living in areas where there has been a terrible surge in COVID-19, we will adjust accordingly.

Again, this is temporary, and it is not meant to displace the way we do business here on a regular basis, and it is totally constitutional. Constitutional scholar after constitutional scholar has validated that, so I would say to the gentleman that I reject the way he has characterized what we have done here because it is just not accurate. It is not accurate.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the majority leader of this House.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding.

I am going to argue, and I want to talk about this rule and the bill to which it applies, but I will take a minute, not much more, perhaps a little more than that, to talk about what apparently the Republicans want to talk about: proxy voting.

I will tell my friend that not a single one of my constituents, not one, voted for me so I would vote in this machine. Not one. Not one of them voted for me to vote in that machine. What they want me to do is vote to represent them, and they really didn't care how I did that as long as it was accurate.

Very frankly, I think that side of the aisle is promoting form over substance. Of course, the gentleman mentioned Philadelphia, September 1787, the miracle at Philadelphia. You remember the debate as Member after Member got up and said we cannot use Teams; we cannot use our cell phones; we cannot use Webex. Remember that debate? They said you can't use any of that, and you certainly can't use a rotary telephone. You heard them say that. You can't do that. You need to be in

this room. Well, that room was in Philadelphia. Or you needed to be in this room. Well, that room is in New York.

My friends, you have magnified form over substance. Our constituents voted for us to vote their interests, and there are many ways we can do that.

They had not the technology. That is why they couldn't schedule a vote in 48 hours, because the horses did not fly. Form over substance.

You don't want us to meet. And the man who would be king does not want us to meet. I get that. Because you do not like the substance, whether it is the Affordable Care Act, whether it is trying to help renters and mortgage people, whether it is trying to help people in line. I get it. You don't want us to meet.

But we have an obligation and a duty to the American people to do so, to make sure that the man who would be king is not king because our Constitution, the people who met in that Philadelphia room, they had had enough of kings. They wanted to have people who would represent them. And they didn't care whether they voted on this machine, that machine, that machine, or, very frankly, as you are sitting in the aisle and you can't get by and you ask your friend: "Put it in the slot for me, will you?"

I am not going to ask you to raise your hand if you have ever done that. But that was virtual voting. But it reflected your view, my view, representing my constituents and your constituents.

Now, let me speak about this rule and this bill because I am appalled, chagrined, disappointed at what is happening. We worked very hard to deal with a very difficult subject, Mr. BLUNT and I from the House and Senator Bond and Senator Rockefeller. Ms. PELOSI was the Speaker of the House, and I was the majority leader of the House. It was 2008, and we were trying to deal with extending the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act to keep our people and our country safe.

Probably not very many of us on this floor know more about the Intelligence Committee than our Speaker. She is the longest serving member of the Intelligence Committee ever.

Mr. NUNES and Mr. SCHIFF, they work together. Mr. NADLER and his ranking member work together. Just about 2½ months ago, we came to this floor, and we were all present. I don't mean we had 100 percent of membership, but we were mostly present. We debated that bill, and we voted on that bill.

We did what the American people so pined for us doing. We voted together as Americans; 67.7 percent of the Republicans voted aye, and 66.9 percent of the Democrats voted aye. And America said amen. That is what they want us to do, reason together and do for the American people and our country what is best for our people and our country.

We sent that bill to the United States Senate; 126 Republicans and 152

Democrats voting together. Two-thirds of the House sent that bill to the United States Senate.

I talked to Mr. SCHIFF and I talked to Mr. NADLER, and they said this House bill has the support of the United States Senate. I talked to leaders—I won't name them—in the United States Senate who were surprised that the Senate did not pass the House bill but sent an extension because they didn't really vote on the House bill. They sent it after we had left. We didn't pass that, and the Intelligence Committee made do.

So, the Senate did, in fact, take up the bill. What did they do? Two people who spoke, Mr. BURGESS and Mr. WOODALL, who voted with the majority, with the two-thirds of Republicans who said this is a good bill, this is a good bill for our country, for America's security, and America's safety—as did Mr. MCCARTHY; as did Mr. SCALISE; as did Mr. THORBERRY, the ranking member of the Armed Services Committee; as did Mr. ROGERS, the ranking member on the Homeland Security Committee; as did Ms. CHENEY, your Conference chair; as did Mr. COLE, the ranking member of the Rules Committee; and 120 other Republicans.

□ 1600

Now, there were, of course, as is not surprising, differences. This is, as the Speaker said, a very controversial bill. It is always a controversial bill.

My friend, Mr. MCGOVERN, and I, who vote together most of the time, are going to vote differently on this bill. I am going to vote for it. He believes there are not enough protections in here. But there are more protections in here than when those named voted for it and 80 Members of the United States Senate voted for it, including 48 Republicans.

Now, what was different when they voted on it and 48 Republicans in the United States Senate voted for it? There had not been a snap of the fingers, "Vote 'no'"; not an order from on high, "Vote 'no'"; not a President who has been beating the drum and, frankly, his supporters have been beating the drum that somehow the law enforcement community—the FBI, the CIA, the other this and that and the other law enforcement agencies—broke the Constitution.

This President shows less respect for law enforcement than any President I have seen at the Federal level. So he said, "Vote 'no.'"

My friend with whom I work, the majority leader, called me the other night and said: You ought to pull the bill—the minority leader.

You know why I do that? Because we were all in the majority when we passed this bill. It wasn't a majority-minority bill; it was an American bill.

My friend, the minority leader, said: Pull this bill.

Now, I won't go into the rest of the conversation because we have private conversations about where we are going to go and what we need to do.

The only thing that has changed, Madam Speaker, is that Donald Trump has said "Vote 'no'" to 126 people who voted with 152 Democrats for America.

By the way, the people who are voting "no" also voted for America. They voted for civil liberties, which we honor.

We can respect every person who voted because they voted out of conviction, not out of party loyalty, not out of a "Yes, sir." They voted their conscience, they voted their conviction.

I wish this Chamber were full, but we have to be distanced. I hope some of my colleagues are listening on both sides of the aisle.

This bill is like every bill, not perfect, but as the Speaker said, it must pass. Why? To protect America.

We need to continue to keep making it better. My friend from Massachusetts will make sure that we focus on that, and I honor him for it.

So I ask my friends: Vote your convictions. Remember how critical you were of a candidate for President who said, "I first voted for it and then I voted against it," how critical you were. But your flailing around to find a rationalization for your change of vote is sad.

Madam Speaker, vote "yes" on the rule and on the bill. Vote for your country.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. WOODALL. I thank you for that admonition, Madam Chair.

Madam Speaker, there is only one person on our side of the aisle who can clear up all of that confusion in 1 minute. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), our leader.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Madam Speaker, I thank the majority leader for his comments. It reminds me of the days when I was the majority leader and he was minority whip and we used to be able to have colloquies. I yearn for those days again.

But let me respond to much of what the majority leader has said. I respect the gentleman greatly, but I just think he is wrong.

When I walked in the room, the gentleman said we did not want to meet. He knows that is not true.

Simply look at the board today, how many Republicans are here and how many Democrats. We will give the gentleman an easy answer to that question of who wants to meet.

Or why not look to simply a month ago. Only one side put a plan out of how to bring Congress back.

We don't have a schedule. We don't know when we are supposed to come. One day they say "yes," the next day they say "no."

I think it is very clear which side wants to meet. It is very clear, and based upon 231 years of history.

For those Members not in the Chamber and sitting in their office watching on television, they ought to pay atten-

tion to this very next vote. They are going to do something that no Member has ever been allowed to do before. They are going to change history, but not for the better.

While millions of Americans are going to be tuned in to their television to watch us put people in space, we are going to watch more than 70 Members on the Democrat side stay home and say they could not make it, but they still want a paycheck.

We just listened to the majority leader question the Republicans on whether they want to meet.

I watch my home State of California. Now we get to go to church, now we can get our hair cut today, but in Congress, what do we get? We get no accountability.

You see, the one thing the majority leader said that is true is that people vote for us. Yes, they do. They vote for us, expecting us to vote for them. They do not expect us to give that vote to somebody from another State.

Our Constitution, our country expects us to convene, just as history has shown every time before in any crisis we have.

I heard the majority leader question, not going through the Speaker, but one of our own Members on a speech that he gave just a few minutes before, Congressman CHIP ROY, about whether he wanted to meet. Well, let's look at some facts.

We are called back here to vote on a bill authored by CHIP ROY, the Congressman, to help small businesses, but his name will no longer be on it. The only reason we are going to get a vote on it is because the Speaker had to pledge to somebody to vote for the \$3 trillion bill that we would vote on.

Once we found out everybody loved the bill, lo and behold, we can't let a Republican have their name on the bill, so we have changed the bill number. We didn't change the bill, but took his name off of it. He is no longer the main author of the bill, even though it was his idea. It is something the Members can be proud of on the other side. They played politics well that day.

CHIP ROY will tell me, though, he doesn't care who gets the credit; he just wants to help small businesses.

I look forward to seeing the Member who took his name try to campaign on that. That is a lot of character on the other side, by far. I hope they are proud of that, because I don't think anybody in the country is.

Now, let's just look at some facts.

I respect the chairman of the Rules Committee. I read his reports. Even in April, he wrote a report about proxy voting, and he questioned the constitutionality of it. I don't know if the Constitution changed between then and now, but I don't believe it has.

Let's look at exactly the facts of what we have.

Now, I think many Members will say in their own States that things are getting better. I know in my home State, we can go to church; yes, we can get

our hair cut; restaurants are opening up. But 2 weeks ago, people would probably argue it was a little worse.

At that time, only 12 Democrats couldn't make it here to vote for their \$3 trillion bill. Now there are more than 70 who are supposedly signing something to say they physically can't make it here now. I wonder if any of them are having a fundraiser today.

Let's go through the facts.

The Constitution requires in-person assembly.

If we hang our hat on the notion that the House can make their own rules, then why don't we make a rule that Republicans can't vote? Why don't we make a rule that women can't vote? We can make the rules, but we can't make unconstitutional rules.

The Constitution deals with this and tells us we should assemble. Yes, that is why, on August 14, after this building burned in 1812, the War of 1812–1814, they still convened. It wasn't here, but it was in a hotel.

Some might think, oh, modern history allows us to do this. Well, do you know what modern history allows people to do? If the Member can't vote on the proxy, this rule allows the staff to do it. That is literally what the rule says.

If the other side doesn't have it, I will put it in the RECORD right here. I will underline it, and I will provide it to the other side. If they want to read it out loud, they are more than welcome.

If a Member cannot provide electronically, a staff is allowed to put the vote across.

That is what is written. That is what was passed.

Even one proxy vote dilutes the voting power of every Member.

We have an unbelievable country. The people lend their power and voice to Members of Congress, be it a Congresswoman or Congressman, and they hold us accountable every 2 years.

We are going to have people on this floor voting for more than five Members from five different States.

In California alone, the largest delegation, more than half of the Democrats stayed home. I will guarantee they all cashed their check this month. That means 19 million people in California will not have their voice heard. Maybe somebody from Connecticut will vote for them.

More than 70 Members will vote by proxy. That is 49 million Americans who did not count because we gave it to somebody else. The other side should be proud of that.

Proxy votes have never been allowed to count towards a quorum, but what are we going to do on this rule? There will be more bodies voting "no" than voting "yes," but the other side is going to win because they have got a vote in the pocket.

The Democrat plan permits a staffer to vote by proxy on behalf of a Member who is unavailable. That is totally true. It is in the rules right here, and I will provide it to the other side. Let me

read it into the RECORD since they have a hard time reading:

If a Member is unavailable to email or send a text message, a staff member may transmit the instructions at the direction of the Member.

Is that a staff member? Does that say anywhere in there that only a Member can vote?

I have not yielded my time, but I have read these words.

A Member can vote by proxy while attending a political fundraiser under this plan. A Member could be at a fundraiser watching on television and say: Well, let me pause for one moment. I didn't want to go back to D.C., even though you asked me to, but I need to put my vote in. It is okay. I will get somebody from another State to do it.

The McGovern regulations state that Members can only vote using proxy voting if they are physically unable to make it to the Capitol.

I don't know what happened in the last 2 weeks when only 12 could not make it, but now there are more than 70. I am concerned for them. It must be something very serious.

All Members had nearly 2 weeks' notice ahead for this vote; 2 weeks we had to plan.

For 231 years, Members found a way to get to D.C.

If this rule or bill passes, it will only be because of proxy votes that will make up the difference.

So my friend over there thinks someone is going to vote differently. Yeah, they are.

Even on the Senate side, they have told us: Whatever you are passing here under these rules is not constitutional.

If we can make this type of rule, we could make anything: People with glasses can't vote—unheard of.

□ 1615

Yes, we raised a lawsuit. Yes, we believe in a previous question, that people should vote "no" on this.

It is a violation of the Constitution. It is a dereliction of the duty of elected officials. It will silence the voice of people, the same constituents that you took the oath to represent.

I think of all the things this country had challenges with. Never did this body not find it was essential to meet. Never did they question to change the rule to empower one over another. But they have done just that. They have done just that.

If you are a Member of Congress, if you are home, sitting there because you cannot make it, and you think you are going to send your message to your staffer to send it in, you might want to change because maybe McGovern will change the rules now.

When you were sworn in, you held up your hand to uphold the Constitution. This is your moment. This is your time. Read Article I, Section 4, Section 5, and Section 6. We even compel people to go gather you to bring you to these Chambers.

What is interesting to me is that the other side is willing to endanger our

Constitution just to empower more power to the majority itself.

It will be interesting to see those who go back to their constituents and say, I will represent you because I can just phone it in. I deserve to be re-elected because I passed us off to another Member to vote for you.

It is interesting to find that maybe when you raised your hand, maybe when you thought the Constitution changed, it hasn't.

So, yes, just as the majority leader said, he wants you to look into your heart to how you are going to vote. Do that.

I hope we all come back to this floor and we all look up. I am not sure how the vote will go. Will you have a little P by the name that says a proxy?

Will we be able to tell by proxy that somebody from another State voted for you so the rest of the country can see?

How will you tell the country today that is opening up more, that is sending astronauts to space, that you want to close Congress further, and you want to deny their voice one last time?

This is not about opening a campus. This is about restoring the voice to the American public that we have done for 231 years. And for you to ever question who wants to meet, let the public just see the scoreboard at the end of the day.

I think it is easy to answer that question, not by voice, but simply by your feet, who is willing to show and who is willing to work for them.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. According to the rules, Members shall address their remarks to the Chair, and the Chair will strongly admonish all Members to do so.

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

I have been here for a while now, and I have never quite heard anything like that; I mean, blatant mischaracterization of what the facts are.

The gentleman suggested, not once, but several times, that the rules allow staff members to vote for other Members in this Chamber. That is just not true. I mean, no matter how you want to look at it, it is just not true. But the gentleman repeated that falsehood over and over and over and over again.

I asked him to yield so I could read the end of the sentence that he didn't want to finish, which is: "And that Member must confirm the instruction by telephone to the Member serving as proxy before the vote may be cast on their behalf."

The gentleman knows that that is not true but, yet, here he comes to the floor and he repeats over and over again something that, in the written instructions, in the guidelines that he was referring to, says the opposite.

I mean, are things that broken here that we cannot even agree on the basic facts?

I get it. You don't like what we are doing here, that's fine. But let's not

misinterpret and twist and distort what we are trying to do here.

Yeah, the gentleman had a plan. We actually delayed moving forward on trying to change the rules to operate remotely because the gentleman said that he was willing to work with us to try to figure out whether we could come to some sort of accommodation.

And you know what his plan was? His plan was we all come back, and all the Members in this Chamber get prioritized, over all of our constituents, and we get tested every time we come back, so that we can operate here safely.

So my doctors, and my nurses, and my first responders, and those who work in our grocery stores, and those who work in homeless shelters and in food pantries, who can't get tested, we are all so special, according to the minority leader, that we should be prioritized and go to the top of the list. And that was part of his plan.

Forget about it. I don't know about your constituents, but my constituents would find that totally unacceptable, and it represents a tone-deafness that I haven't heard in a long time here.

When he talks about no accountability in this process, I don't even know what the hell he is talking about, I really don't.

And again, the idea that somehow staff could vote for Members? That is absolutely not true. Absolutely not true.

I don't even know how to respond to what the gentleman just said. It makes you understand why so many people are cynical when they look at this Chamber and they see the exchanges that go on here.

I get it; we have disagreements on issues. We have disagreements on whether we should move forward on with FISA or not. I have disagreements with my own leadership on that. Those are honest disagreements, but they are based on conviction. They are based on fact.

You can disagree with whether or not we should be able to operate remotely during extraordinary times like pandemics. I get it. We can argue about the constitutionality. I think we are on strong constitutional grounds. You can argue the opposite point of view.

But to makes things up, to come down here just to twist what we have done here, it is just unacceptable. It is unacceptable. We all ought to be better than that.

We are trying to figure out a way to operate during a very difficult time in our country where, probably today, over 100,000 people will have lost their lives.

And notwithstanding the President of the United States trying to downplay that and say, no big deal, you know, it is not much of anything.

It is a big deal. I have lost valued members of my community to this disease, and I know you have as well.

So we are trying to get through this and, hopefully, this is short-lived and,

hopefully, we can get back to business as normal as quickly as possible. But if this comes back in the fall, we need to be prepared.

So, under this proposal, if you want to be here you can come here and we can operate in person. But as we are all finding out, that is difficult, even in committee hearings.

The Rules Committee is the smallest committee in the House, and we can't even meet in the Rules Committee room. We are meeting in the Ways and Means Committee room or the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee room, which are among the biggest committee rooms in the House because we are all trying to follow the advice of the Attending Physician.

So we can debate whether this is the best way to move forward or not. That is fine. But let's not make things up.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, you have heard the thundering defense of the constitutionality of a constitutionally questionable proxy voting procedure. That is what our motion is in the previous question.

My friend from Massachusetts is absolutely certain that every constitutional scholar in the land is on board and believes it is absolutely fine, which is good news for those of us who want the district court to decide, because the constitutionality can be sorted out in the courts in no time flat.

If it is this settled of a question, we are saying just give it a couple of days. Let the court have an opinion. Let's go ahead and sort this out. If it is a non-judicial issue, then we will learn that. If it is so clear that it is okay, why won't we allow time for the court to take a look?

My friend from Massachusetts says we have had this debate and the House has spoken. That is undeniably true. Now, to be fair, it spoke in a bipartisan way against this; in a partisan way in favor of proxy voting; in a bipartisan way against proxy voting.

Yes, the House has spoken, and, in a bipartisan way, we have serious concerns that we would like to be addressed. If we defeat the previous question, they will be. It is not going to slow down the underlying bill. It is not going to slow down any other important issues on the House floor today. It simply delays proxy voting that has never before happened in this Chamber until the courts rule on its constitutionality.

Madam Speaker, the underlying provision is an extension of our Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act measures. This is something, as the majority leader said, that we have done in a bipartisan way time and time again. I have been a part of that bipartisan coalition.

Today, we have a Senate bill in front of us, and a bipartisan House amendment that improves that bill.

What you didn't hear from the majority leader, what you didn't hear from the Speaker, is that the Rules Committee did not allow that bipartisan amendment; and we have now a take-it-or-leave-it piece of legislation from the United States Senate. I get it; that happens to us sometimes, but it doesn't have to happen to us today.

We have a bipartisan option, a bipartisan choice. We, collectively, if we pass this rule, will choose to ignore that opportunity, an opportunity that, in a bipartisan way, we agree both protects national security and protects civil liberties better than the underlying bill.

Madam Speaker, I don't know how many of my colleagues decided to show up for the vote today. We will soon find out. Each one who is voting by proxy is going to have to go through you and the Member they have designated.

The two issues before us are serious issues, and they are threatened by the underlying constitutional issue of the manner in which we will vote, as will every single vote we take until this measure is litigated.

Let's litigate first. Let's not throw all of this important work into question. If my friend from Massachusetts is right and it is crystal clear legally, we will find out in no time flat.

But if my friend from Massachusetts is wrong, then we will prevent the next round of litigation that calls into question every single bill this House acts on between now and then.

I want to close, Madam Speaker, by saying I don't question my friend from Massachusetts' love of this institution or his understanding and knowledge of the Constitution. He is in a tough spot as the Rules Committee chairman. We have a crisis in front of us. It was his job to move something forward.

The report he wrote earlier this year reflected his wisdom. The measure this House passed reflected his wisdom. He has got a very difficult job, and that is why you hear the very passionate defense he is making of what will become known as the McGovern language.

But let it not be said by any Member of this Chamber that his intent is anything other than serving this country and serving this House. He is in a very difficult spot, but I know that his heart and his intellect are 100 percent with the people of this country and in service to this institution. I regret that we are on different sides of this particular issue.

Vote "no" on the previous question. Defeat it. Add this litigation timeout. If we can't do that, then I need my colleagues to defeat the rule. Defeat the rule, and let's take a better bite at this decision with the bipartisan amendments that we have before us.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Let me thank my colleague from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL). This is his last

term and, believe it or not, I am going to miss him. He is a spirited debater.

But I want to say, and I say this sincerely, I appreciate his advocacy for his point of view. I usually disagree with it, but I know it is based on principle and conviction, and he sticks to the facts. He doesn't come to the floor and make things up. He actually sticks to the facts. We have disagreements on those facts, and that is the way debate should be. It should be based on what is real, what are the facts.

Madam Speaker, as you heard today, this is a difficult issue, the underlying legislation that we are dealing with with regard to FISA. It is one that cuts across party lines, and many Members have strong opinions.

As I said earlier, I opposed the original PATRIOT Act and subsequent reauthorizations. I appreciate the work of many of my colleagues in getting reforms included in the underlying bill that are badly needed. I think we need to do much more to truly respect all Americans' fundamental right to privacy.

□ 1630

I think it is a false choice to suggest that either we can fight terrorism and wrongdoing or uphold the right to privacy.

There has been a lot of debate on both sides of the Capitol, and the President has weighed in recently. The Attorney General has suggested that the President should veto this bill not because the Attorney General wants more reforms like the ones that the Senate put in or the ones that have been suggested. It is quite the opposite. The Attorney General doesn't want any more checks and balances put in place.

As I said earlier, that scares me because I don't trust him. I just don't.

Now, the House will have a chance to work its will. My vote on the underlying bill will be "no." But I respect many of my colleagues who feel strongly that we ought to move forward and approve the bill that originated in this House then went to the Senate where additions were made in the Senate, and now it is back to the House. So, this has been a process that has not been short-circuited in any way, shape, or form.

But I think that given the fact that the Senate passed this with 80 percent of the Senate voting in favor of it—again, I would have voted "no" if I were in the Senate. But 80 percent of them voted in favor of it. Madam Speaker, you can't get 80 percent of the Senate to agree on lunch, yet they voted affirmatively on this.

We voted in the House. Two-thirds of this Chamber, Democrats and Republicans, voted "yes." I voted "no." But the idea that somehow there isn't strong support to move forward I think is not justified by the facts.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the rule so we can move forward.

I would again differ with my friends on the previous question. I think what

we did to try to accommodate the reality that we are faced with during this COVID-19 crisis was responsible and deliberative. We attempted to work in a bipartisan way.

In fact, many of the parts of this proposal reflect Republican suggestions. I regret that we did not come to a conclusion that we all could agree on, but as I said before, the minority leader's insistence that somehow we all be prioritized in terms of testing was a nonstarter. His insistence that he had veto power over everything and that he would use that veto power so we couldn't operate remotely was also a nonstarter.

We need to do our work, and we need to do it in a way where all Members during this pandemic can participate.

The material previously referred to by Mr. WOODALL is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 981

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 4. H. Res. 965 shall have no force or effect until such time as the ongoing litigation into the constitutionality of proxy voting is complete.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. WOODALL. 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 are postponed.

UYGHUR HUMAN RIGHTS POLICY ACT OF 2020

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 3744) to condemn gross human rights violations of ethnic Turkic Muslims in Xinjiang, and calling for an end to arbitrary detention, torture, and harassment of these communities inside and outside China, 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 California (Mr. SHERMAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 413, nays 1, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 110]

YEAS—413

Adams	Amash	Babin
Aderholt	Amodei	Bacon
Aguilar	Armstrong	Baird
Allen	Arrington	Balderson
Allred	Axne	Banks

Barr	Espallat	Langevin
Barragán	Estes	Larsen (WA)
Bass	Evans	Larson (CT)
Beatty	Ferguson	Latta
Bera	Finkenauer	Lawrence
Bergman	Fitzpatrick	Lawson (FL)
Beyer	Fleischmann	Lee (CA)
Biggs	Fletcher	Lee (NV)
Bilirakis	Fortenberry	Lesko
Bishop (GA)	Foster	Levin (CA)
Bishop (NC)	Foxx (NC)	Levin (MI)
Bishop (UT)	Frankel	Lewis
Blumenauer	Fudge	Lieu, Ted
Blunt Rochester	Fulcher	Lipinski
Bonamici	Gaetz	Loebsack
Bost	Gallagher	Lofgren
Boyle, Brendan F.	Gallego	Long
Brady	Garamendi	Loudermilk
Brindisi	Garcia (CA)	Lowenthal
Brooks (AL)	Garcia (IL)	Lowe
Brown (MD)	Garcia (TX)	Lucas
Brownley (CA)	Gianforte	Luetkemeyer
Buck	Gibbs	Lujan
Bucshon	Gohmert	Luria
Budd	Golden	Lynch
Burchett	Gomez	Malinowski
Burgess	Gonzalez (OH)	Maloney,
Bustos	Gonzalez (TX)	Carolyn B.
Butterfield	Gooden	Maloney, Sean
Byrne	Gosar	Marshall
Calvert	Gottheimer	Matsui
Carbajal	Granger	McAdams
Cárdenas	Graves (GA)	McBath
Carson (IN)	Graves (LA)	McCarthy
Carter (GA)	Graves (MO)	McCaul
Cartwright	Green (TN)	McClintock
Case	Green, Al (TX)	McCollum
Casten (IL)	Griffith	McEachin
Castor (FL)	Grijalva	McGovern
Castro (TX)	Grothman	McKinley
Chabot	Guest	McNerney
Cheney	Guthrie	Meeks
Chu, Judy	Haaland	Meng
Ciulline	Hagedorn	Meuser
Cisneros	Harder (CA)	Mfume
Clark (MA)	Harris	Miller
Clarke (NY)	Hartzler	Mitchell
Clay	Hastings	Moolenaar
Cleaver	Hayes	Mooney (WV)
Cline	Heck	Moore
Cloud	Hern, Kevin	Morelle
Clyburn	Herrera Beutler	Moulton
Cohen	Hice (GA)	Mucarsel-Powell
Cole	Higgins (LA)	Mullin
Collins (GA)	Higgins (NY)	Murphy (FL)
Comer	Hill (AR)	Murphy (NC)
Conaway	Himes	Nadler
Connolly	Holding	Napolitano
Cook	Horn, Kendra S.	Neal
Cooper	Houlahan	Neguse
Correa	Hoyer	Newhouse
Costa	Hudson	Norcross
Courtney	Huffman	Norman
Cox (CA)	Huizenga	Nunes
Craig	Hurd (TX)	O'Halleran
Crawford	Jackson Lee	Ocasio-Cortez
Crenshaw	Jayapal	Olson
Crist	Jeffries	Omar
Crow	Johnson (GA)	Palazzo
Cuellar	Johnson (LA)	Pallone
Cunningham	Johnson (OH)	Palmer
Curtis	Johnson (SD)	Panetta
Davids (KS)	Johnson (TX)	Pappas
Davidson (OH)	Jordan	Pascrell
Davis (CA)	Joyce (OH)	Payne
Davis, Danny K.	Joyce (PA)	Pelosi
Davis, Rodney	Kaptur	Pence
Dean	Katko	Perlmutter
DeFazio	Keating	Perry
DeGette	Keller	Peters
DeLauro	Kelly (IL)	Peterson
DelBene	Kelly (MS)	Phillips
Delgado	Kelly (PA)	Pingree
Demings	Kennedy	Pocan
DeSaulnier	Khanna	Porter
DesJarlais	Kildee	Pressley
Deutch	Kilmer	Price (NC)
Diaz-Balart	Kim	Quigley
Dingell	Kind	Raskin
Doggett	King (IA)	Reed
Doyle, Michael F.	King (NY)	Reschenthaler
Duncan	Kinzinger	Rice (NY)
Dunn	Kirkpatrick	Rice (SC)
Emmer	Krishnamoorthi	Richmond
Engel	Kuster (NH)	Riggleman
Escobar	Kustoff (TN)	Roby
Eshoo	LaMalfa	Rodgers (WA)
	Lamb	Roe, David P.
	Lamborn	Rogers (AL)

Rogers (KY) Smith (NE) Underwood
 Rose (NY) Smith (NJ) Upton
 Rose, John W. Smith (WA) Van Drew
 Rouda Smucker Vargas
 Rouzer Soto Veasey
 Roy Spanberger Vela
 Roybal-Allard Spano Velázquez
 Ruiz Speier Visclosky
 Ruppertsberger Stanton Wagner
 Rush Stauber Walberg
 Rutherford Stefanik Walden
 Ryan Steil Walker
 Sánchez Steube Wasserman
 Sarbanes Stevens Schwartz
 Scalise Stewart Waters
 Scanlon Stivers Watkins
 Schakowsky Suozzi Watson Coleman
 Schiff Swallow (CA) Weber (TX)
 Schneider Takano Webster (FL)
 Schrader Taylor Welch
 Schrier Thompson (CA) Wenstrup
 Schweikert Thompson (MS) Westerman
 Scott (VA) Thompson (PA) Wexton
 Scott, Austin Thornberry Wild
 Scott, David Tiffany Williams
 Sensenbrenner Timmons Wilson (FL)
 Serrano Tipton Wilson (SC)
 Sewell (AL) Titus Wittman
 Shalala Tlaib Womack
 Sherman Tonko Woodall
 Sherrill Torres (CA) Wright
 Shimkus Torres Small Yarmuth
 Simpson (NM) Trahan Yoho
 Sires Trone Zeldin
 Slotkin Turner

NAYS—1

Massie

NOT VOTING—17

Abraham Hollingsworth Posey
 Brooks (IN) Horsford Rooney (FL)
 Buchanan LaHood Walorski
 Carter (TX) Marchant Waltz
 Flores Mast Young
 Gabbard McHenry

□ 1744

Messrs. BILIRAKIS, GAETZ, and PALMER changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. YOUNG. Madam Speaker, I was unable to vote on May 27, 2020. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye” on rollcall No. 110 on passage of S. 3744.

Mr. ABRAHAM. Madam Speaker, on Wednesday, May 27, I was unavoidably detained on rollcall vote No. 110. Had I been present to vote, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall vote No. 110.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 965, 116TH CONGRESS

Barragán (Gallego) DeSaulnier Hastings
 Bass (Cicilline) Deutch (Rice) (Wasserman
 Bera (Aguilar) (NY)) Heck (Kilmer)
 Blumenauer Doggett (Raskin) Huffman (Kildee)
 (Beyer) Escobar (Garcia) Jayapal (Raskin)
 Bonamici (TX)) Johnson (TX)
 (Raskin) Eshoo (Jeffries)
 Brownley (CA) (Thompson) Khanna
 (Kuster (NH)) (CA)) (Sherman)
 Cárdenas Foster (Beyer) Kirkpatrick
 (Sánchez) Frankel (Kuster) (Stanton)
 Chu, Judy (NH)) Lawrence
 (Takano) Garamendi (Kildee)
 Cisneros (Sherman) Lawson (FL)
 (Houlahan) Gonzalez (TX) (Evans)
 Cohen (Beyer) (Cuellar) Levin (MI)
 Crist (Murphy) Grijalva (Clay) (Raskin)
 (FL)) Harder (CA) Levin (CA)
 Davis (CA) (Wild) (Haaland) Lewis (Kildee)

Lieu, Ted (Beyer) Payne
 Lipinski (Cooper) (Wasserman
 Lofgren (Boyle) Schultze)
 (Brendan F.) Peters (Rice
 Lowenthal (NY))
 (Beyer) Pingree (Kuster
 (NH))
 Maloney, Pocan (Raskin)
 Carolyn B. Porter (Wexton)
 (Rose (NY)) Price (NC)
 McEachin (Butterfield)
 (Wexton) Roybal-Allard
 (Sánchez)
 McNeerney Ruiz (Aguilar)
 (Raskin) Rush
 Moore (Beyer) (Underwood)
 Mucarsel-Powell Schneider
 (Wasserman) (Houlahan)
 Schultz
 Napolitano (Schradler)
 (Correa) (O'Halleran)

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF THE SENATE AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 6172, USA FREEDOM RE-AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2020

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 981) providing for consideration of the Senate amendments to the bill (H.R. 6172) to amend the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 to prohibit the production of certain business records, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered. The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 232, nays 182, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 111]

YEAS—232

Adams Crist Hays
 Aguilar Crow Heck
 Allred Cuellar Higgins (NY)
 Axne Cunningham Himes
 Barragán Davids (KS) Horn, Kendra S.
 Bass Davis (CA) Horsford
 Beatty Davis, Danny K. Houlahan
 Bera Dean Hoyer
 Beyer DeFazio Huffman
 Bishop (GA) DeGette Jackson Lee
 Blumenauer DeLauro Jayapal
 Blunt Rochester DelBene Jeffries
 Bonamici Delgado Johnson (GA)
 Boyle, Brendan Demings Johnson (TX)
 F. DeSaulnier
 Brindisi Deutch Kaptur
 Brown (MD) Dingell Keating
 Brownley (CA) Doggett Kelly (IL)
 Bustos Doyle, Michael Kennedy
 Butterfield F. Khanna
 Carbajal Engel Kildee
 Cárdenas Escobar Kilmer
 Carson (IN) Eshoo Kim
 Cartwright Espallat Kind
 Case Evans Krishnamoorthi
 Casten (IL) Finkenauer Kuster (NH)
 Castor (FL) Fletcher Lamb
 Castro (TX) Fletcher Langevin
 Chu, Judy Frankel Larsen (WA)
 Cicilline Fudge Larson (CT)
 Cisneros Gabbard Lawrence
 Clark (MA) Gallego Lawson (FL)
 Clarke (NY) Garamendi Lee (CA)
 Clay Garcia (IL) Lee (NV)
 Cleaver Garcia (TX) Levin (CA)
 Clyburn Golden Levin (MI)
 Cohen Gomez Lewis
 Connolly Gonzalez (TX) Lieu, Ted
 Cooper Gottheimer Lipinski
 Correa Green, Al (TX) Loeback
 Costa Grijalva Lofgren
 Courtney Haaland Lowenthal
 Cox (CA) Harder (CA) Lowey
 Craig Hastings Luján

Luria Peters Slotkin
 Lynch Peterson Smith (WA)
 Malinowski Phillips Soto
 Maloney, Pingree Spanberger
 Carolyn B. Pocan Speier
 Maloney, Sean Porter Stanton
 Matsui Pressley Stevens
 McAdams Price (NC) Suozzi
 McBath Quigley Swalwell (CA)
 McCollum Raskin Takano
 McEachin Rice (NY) Thompson (CA)
 McGovern Richmond Thompson (MS)
 McNeerney Rose (NY) Titus
 Meeks Rouda Tlaib
 Meng Roybal-Allard Tonko
 Ruiz Torres (CA)
 Mftume Ruppertsberger Torres Small
 Moore Rush (NM)
 Morelle Ryan Trahan
 Moulton Sánchez Trone
 Mucarsel-Powell Sarbanes Underwood
 Murphy (FL) Scanlon Vargas
 Nadler Schakowsky Veasey
 Napolitano Schiff Vela
 Neal Schneider Velázquez
 Neguse Schrader Visclosky
 Norcross Schrier Wasserman
 O'Halleran Ocasio-Cortez Schultz
 Omar Scott, David Waters
 Pallone Serrano Watson Coleman
 Panetta Sewell (AL) Welch
 Pappas Shalala Wexton
 Pascarell Sherman Wild
 Payne Sherrill Wilson (FL)
 Perlmutter Sires Yarmuth

NAYS—182

Aderholt Gooden Palazzo
 Allen Gosar Palmer
 Amash Granger Pence
 Amodei Graves (GA) Perry
 Armstrong Graves (LA) Reed
 Arrington Graves (MO) Reschenthaler
 Babin Green (TN) Rice (SC)
 Bacon Griffith Rigglesman
 Baird Grothman Roby
 Balderson Guest Rodgers (WA)
 Banks Guthrie Roe, David P.
 Barr Hagedorn Rogers (AL)
 Bergman Harris Rogers (KY)
 Biggs Hartzler Rose, John W.
 Bilirakis Hern, Kevin Rouzer
 Bishop (NC) Herrera Beutler
 Bishop (UT) Hice (GA) Roy
 Bost Higgins (LA) Rutherford
 Brady Hill (AR) Scalise
 Brooks (AL) Hudson Schweikert
 Buck Huizenga Scott, Austin
 Bucshon Hurd (TX) Sensenbrenner
 Budd Johnson (LA) Shimkus
 Burchett Johnson (OH) Simpson
 Burgess Johnson (SD) Smith (MO)
 Byrne Jordan Smith (NE)
 Calvert Joyce (OH) Smith (NJ)
 Carter (GA) Joyce (PA) Smucker
 Chabot Katko Spano
 Cheney Keller Stauber
 Cline Kelly (MS) Stefanik
 Cloud Kelly (PA) Steil
 Cole King (IA) Steube
 Collins (GA) King (NY) Stewart
 Comer Kinzinger Stivers
 Conaway Kustoff (TN) Taylor
 Cook LaMalfa Thompson (PA)
 Crawford Lamborn Thornberry
 Crenshaw Latta Tiffany
 Curtis Lesko Timmons
 Davidson (OH) Long Tipton
 Davis, Rodney Loudermilk Turner
 DesJarlais Lucas Upton
 Diaz-Balart Luetkemeyer Van Drew
 Duncan Marshall Wagner
 Dunn Marshall Walberg
 Emmer McCarthy Walden
 Estes McCaul Walker
 Ferguson McClintock Watkins
 Fitzpatrick McKinley Weber (TX)
 Fleischmann Meuser Webster (FL)
 Fortenberry Miller Wenstrup
 Foxx (NC) Mitchell Westerman
 Fulcher Mooleenaar Williams
 Gaetz Mooney (WV) Wittman
 Gallagher Mullin Womack
 Garcia (CA) Murphy (NC) Woodall
 Gianforte Newhouse Wright
 Gibbs Norman Yoho
 Gohmert Nunes Zeldin
 Gonzalez (OH) Olson

NOT VOTING—16

Abraham Hollingsworth Rooney (FL)
 Brooks (IN) LaHood Walorski
 Buchanan Marchant Waltz
 Carter (TX) Mast Young
 Flores McHenry
 Holding Posey

□ 1857

Mr. MULLIN changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. GRIJALVA and Ms. GABBARD changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. POSEY. Mr. Speaker, on May 27, 2020, two American Astronauts were scheduled to make history as our nation returns to human space flight. Due to the historic nature of this event in my District at Kennedy Space Center, I missed two votes. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 110 and “nay” on rollcall No. 111.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 965, 116TH CONGRESS

Barragan (Gallego)	Hastings (Wasserman)	Napolitano (Correa)
Bass (Cicilline)	Schultz	Payne
Bera (Aguilar)	Heck (Kilmer)	(Wasserman)
Blumenauer (Beyer)	Horsford (Kildee)	Schultz
Bonamici (Raskin)	Huffman (Kildee)	Peters (Rice)
Brownley (CA)	Jayapal (Raskin)	(NY)
(Kuster (NH))	Johnson (TX)	Pingree (Kuster)
Cárdenas (Sánchez)	(Jeffries)	(NH)
Chu, Judy (Takano)	Khanna (Sherman)	Pocan (Raskin)
Cisneros (Houlihan)	(Sánchez)	Porter (Wexton)
Cohen (Beyer)	Kirkpatrick (Stanton)	Price (NC)
Crist (Murphy (FL))	Lawrence (Kildee)	(Butterfield)
Davis (CA) (Wild)	(Kildee)	Roybal-Allard (Sánchez)
DeSaulnier (Matsui)	Lawson (FL)	Ruiz (Aguilar)
Deutch (Rice (NY))	(Evans)	Rush
Doggett (Raskin)	Levin (MI)	(Underwood)
Escobar (Garcia (TX))	(Raskin)	Schneider (Houlihan)
Eshoo (Thompson (CA))	Levin (CA)	Schrader (Houlihan)
Foster (Beyer)	Lewis (Kildee)	(O'Halleran)
Frankel (Kuster (NH))	Lieu, Ted (Beyer)	Schrier (Kilmer)
Garamendi (Sherman)	Lipinski (Cooper)	Serrano (Meng)
Gonzalez (TX)	Lofgren (Boyle, Brendan F.)	Soto (Wasserman)
(Cuellar)	Lowenthal (Beyer)	Schultz
Grijalva (Clay)	(Thompson (CA))	Speier (Scanlon)
Harder (CA) (Haaland)	Maloney, Carolyn B. (Rose (NY))	Tlaib (Dingell)
	McEachin (Wexton)	Tonko (Meng)
	McNerney (Raskin)	Vargas (Keating)
	Moore (Beyer)	Veasey (Beyer)
	Mucarsel-Powell (Wasserman)	Vela (Gallego)
	Schultz	Watson Coleman (Pallone)
		Welch
		(McGovern)
		Wilson (FL)
		(Hayes)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CARSON of Indiana). The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. WOODALL. 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.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 228, nays 189, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 112]

YEAS—228

Adams	Allred	Barragan
Aguilar	Axne	Bass

Beatty	Haaland	Pappas
Bera	Harder (CA)	Pascarell
Beyer	Hastings	Payne
Bishop (GA)	Hayes	Pelosi
Blumenauer	Heck	Perlmutter
Blunt Rochester	Higgins (NY)	Peters
Bonamici	Himes	Peterson
Boyle, Brendan F.	Horn, Kendra S.	Phillips
Brindisi	Horsford	Pingree
Brown (MD)	Houlihan	Pocan
Brownley (CA)	Hoyer	Porter
Bustos	Huffman	Pressley
Butterfield	Jackson Lee	Price (NC)
Carbajal	Jayapal	Quigley
Jeffries	Raskin	Raskin
Cárdenas	Johnson (GA)	Rice (NY)
Carson (IN)	Johnson (TX)	Richmond
Cartwright	Kaptur	Rose (NY)
Case	Keating	Rouda
Casten (IL)	Kelly (IL)	Roybal-Allard
Castor (FL)	Kennedy	Ruiz
Castro (TX)	Khanna	Ruppersberger
Chu, Judy	Kildee	Rush
Cicilline	Kilmer	Ryan
Cisneros	Kim	Sánchez
Clark (MA)	Kind	Sarbanes
Clarke (NY)	Kirkpatrick	Scanlon
Clay	Krishnamoorthi	Schakowsky
Cleaver	Kuster (NH)	Schiff
Clyburn	Lamb	Schneider
Cohen	Langevin	Schrader
Connolly	Larsen (WA)	Schrier
Cooper	Larson (CT)	Scott (VA)
Correa	Lawrence	Scott, David
Costa	Lawson (FL)	Serrano
Courtney	Lee (CA)	Sewell (AL)
Cox (CA)	Lee (NV)	Shalala
Craig	Levin (CA)	Sherman
Crist	Levin (MI)	Sherrill
Crow	Lewis	Sires
Cuellar	Lieu, Ted	Slotkin
Cunningham	Lipinski	Smith (WA)
Davids (KS)	Loebsock	Soto
Davis (CA)	Lowenthal	Spanberger
Davis, Danny K.	Lowe	Speier
Dean	Lujan	Stanton
DeGette	Luria	Stevens
DeLauro	Lynch	Suozzi
DelBene	Maloney, Carolyn B.	Swalwell (CA)
Delgado	Maloney, Sean	Takano
Demings	Matsui	Thompson (CA)
DeSaulnier	McAdams	Thompson (MS)
Deutch	McBath	Titus
Dingell	McCollum	Tlaib
Doggett	McEachin	Tonko
Doyle, Michael F.	McGovern	Torres (CA)
Engel	McNerney	Torres Small (NM)
Escobar	Meeks	Trahan
Eshoo	Meng	Trone
Espallat	Mfume	Underwood
Evans	Moore	Vargas
Finkenauer	Morelle	Veasey
Fletcher	Moulton	Vela
Foster	Mucarsel-Powell	Velázquez
Frankel	Murphy (FL)	Visclosky
Fudge	Nadler	Wasserman
Gallego	Napolitano	Schultz
Garamendi	Neal	Waters
Garcia (IL)	Neguse	Watson Coleman
Garcia (TX)	Norcross	Welch
Gomez	O'Halleran	Wexton
Gonzalez (TX)	Ocasio-Cortez	Wild
Gottheimer	Omar	Wilson (FL)
Green, Al (TX)	Pallone	Yarmuth
Grijalva	Panetta	

NAYS—189

Aderholt	Bucshon	DeFazio
Allen	Budd	DesJarlais
Amash	Burchett	Diaz-Balart
Amodei	Burgess	Duncan
Armstrong	Byrne	Dunn
Arrington	Calvert	Emmer
Babin	Carter (GA)	Estes
Bacon	Chabot	Ferguson
Baird	Cheney	Fitzpatrick
Balderson	Cline	Fleischmann
Banks	Cloud	Fortenberry
Barr	Cole	Fox (NC)
Bergman	Collins (GA)	Fulcher
Biggs	Comer	Gabbard
Bilirakis	Conaway	Gaetz
Bishop (NC)	Cook	Gallagher
Bishop (UT)	Crawford	Garcia (CA)
Bost	Crenshaw	Gianforte
Brady	Curtis	Gibbs
Brooks (AL)	Davidson (OH)	Gohmert
Buck	Davis, Rodney	Golden

Gonzalez (OH)	Loudermilk	Scott, Austin
Gooden	Lucas	Sensenbrenner
Gosar	Luetkemeyer	Shimkus
Graves (GA)	Malinowski	Simpson
Graves (LA)	Marshall	Smith (MO)
Graves (MO)	Massie	Smith (NE)
Green (TN)	Mast	Smith (NJ)
Griffith	McCarthy	Smucker
Grothman	McCaul	Spano
Guest	McClintock	Staubert
Guthrie	McKinley	Stefanik
Hagedorn	Meuser	Steil
Harris	Miller	Steube
Hartzler	Mitchell	Stewart
Hern, Kevin	Moolenaar	Stivers
Herrera Beutler	Mooney (WV)	Taylor
Hice (CA)	Mullin	Thompson (PA)
Higgins (LA)	Murphy (NC)	Thornberry
Hill (AR)	Newhouse	Tiffany
Hudson	Norman	Timmons
Huizenga	Nunes	Tipton
Hurd (TX)	Olson	Turner
Johnson (LA)	Palazzo	Upton
Johnson (OH)	Palmer	Van Drew
Johnson (SD)	Pence	Wagner
Jordan	Perry	Walberg
Joyce (OH)	Posey	Walden
Joyce (PA)	Reed	Walker
Katko	Reschenthaler	Waltz
Keller	Rice (SC)	Watkins
Kelly (MS)	Riggelman	Weber (TX)
Kelly (PA)	Roby	Webster (FL)
King (IA)	Rodgers (WA)	Wenstrup
King (NY)	Roe, David P.	Westerman
Kinziger	Rogers (AL)	Williams
Kustoff (TN)	Rogers (KY)	Wilson (SC)
LaMalfa	Rose, John W.	Wittman
Lamborn	Rouzer	Womack
Latta	Roy	Woodall
Lesko	Rutherford	Wright
Lofgren	Scalise	Yoho
Long	Schweikert	Zeldin

NOT VOTING—14

Abraham	Granger	McHenry
Brooks (IN)	Holding	Rooney (FL)
Buchanan	Hollingsworth	Walorski
Carter (TX)	LaHood	Young
Flores	Marchant	

□ 2005

Messrs. FULCHER and POSEY changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the resolution 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

Barragan (Gallego)	Frankel (Kuster (NH))	Lieu, Ted (Beyer)
Bass (Cicilline)	Garamendi (Sherman)	Lipinski (Cooper)
Bera (Aguilar)	Gonzalez (TX)	Lofgren (Boyle, Brendan F.)
Blumenauer (Beyer)	(Cuellar)	Lowenthal (Beyer)
Bonamici (Raskin)	Grijalva (Clay)	Lowey (Meng)
Brownley (CA)	Harder (CA)	Maloney,
(Kuster (NH))	(Haaland)	Carolyn B. (Rose (NY))
Cárdenas (Sánchez)	Hastings (Wasserman)	McEachin (Wexton)
Chu, Judy (Takano)	Heck (Kilmer)	McNerney (Raskin)
Cisneros	Horsford (Kildee)	Moore (Beyer)
(Houlihan)	Huffman (Kildee)	Mucarsel-Powell (Wasserman)
Cohen (Beyer)	Jayapal (Raskin)	Schultz
Crist (Murphy (FL))	Johnson (TX)	Napolitano (Correa)
Davis (CA) (Wild)	(Jeffries)	Payne (Wasserman)
DeSaulnier (Matsui)	Khanna (Sherman)	Schultz
Deutch	Kirkpatrick (Stanton)	(Kildee)
Doggett (Raskin)	Lawrence (Kildee)	Peters (Rice (NY))
Escobar (Garcia (TX))	(Evans)	Pingree (Kuster (NH))
Eshoo (Thompson (CA))	Levin (MI)	Pocan (Raskin)
Foster (Beyer)	(Raskin)	Porter (Wexton)
	Levin (CA)	Price (NC)
	(Kildee)	(Butterfield)
	Lewis (Kildee)	

Roybal-Allard (Sánchez)	Schrier (Kilmer)	Vela (Gallego)
Ruiz (Aguilar)	Serrano (Meng)	Watson Coleman (Pallone)
Rush (Underwood)	Schultz	Welch (McGovern)
Schneider (Houlihan)	Speier (Scanlon)	Wilson (FL) (Hayes)
Schrader (O'Halleran)	Tlaib (Dingell)	
	Tonko (Meng)	
	Vargas (Keating)	
	Veasey (Beyer)	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on additional motions to suspend the rules on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The House will resume proceedings on postponed questions at a later time.

LAW ENFORCEMENT SUICIDE DATA COLLECTION ACT

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 2746) to require the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation to provide information on suicide rates in law enforcement, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 2746

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 "Law Enforcement Suicide Data Collection Act".

SEC. 2. INFORMATION ON SUICIDE IN LAW ENFORCEMENT.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General, acting through the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, shall establish, for the purpose of preventing future law enforcement suicides and promoting understanding of suicide in law enforcement, the Law Enforcement Officers Suicide Data Collection Program, under which law enforcement agencies may submit to the Director information on suicides and attempted suicides within such law enforcement agencies, including information on—

(1) the circumstances and events that occurred before each suicide or attempted suicide;

(2) the general location of each suicide or attempted suicide;

(3) the demographic information of each law enforcement officer who commits or attempts suicide;

(4) the occupational category, including criminal investigator, corrections officer, line of duty officer, 911 dispatch operator, of each law enforcement officer who commits or attempts suicide; and

(5) the method used in each suicide or attempted suicide.

(b) POLICIES.—The Federal Bureau of Investigation shall work with the Confidentiality and Data Access Committee of the Federal Committee on Statistical Methodology to develop publication policies to manage the risk of identity disclosure based upon the best practices identified by other Federal statistical programs.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Attorney General, acting through the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, shall submit to Congress

and publish on the website of the Federal Bureau of Investigation a report containing the information submitted to the Director pursuant to subsection (a).

(d) CONFIDENTIALITY.—The report described under subsection (c) may not include any personally identifiable information of a law enforcement officer who commits or attempts suicide.

(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(1) the term "law enforcement agency" means a Federal, State, Tribal, or local agency engaged in the prevention, detection, or investigation, prosecution, or adjudication of any violation of the criminal laws of the United States, a State, Tribal, or a political subdivision of a State;

(2) the term "law enforcement officer" means any current or former officer (including a correctional officer), agent, or employee of the United States, a State, Indian Tribe, or a political subdivision of a State authorized by law to engage in or supervise the prevention, detection, investigation, or prosecution of any violation of the criminal laws of the United States, a State, Indian Tribe, or a political subdivision of a State; and

(3) the term "State" means each of the several States, the District of Columbia, and any commonwealth, territory, or possession of the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. TITUS). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. RESCENTIALER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of S. 2746, the Law Enforcement Suicide Data Collection Act, which requires the FBI to establish a data collection program that gathers data on law enforcement and former law enforcement suicides at the local, State, and Federal levels.

We consider this bill today in response to a growing epidemic of law enforcement suicides in America. Tragically, more than 227 U.S. law enforcement officers took their own lives last year, an increase of more than 50 deaths from the year before.

While law enforcement officers are tasked with the responsibility of protecting our communities and responding to often dangerous emergency situations, the number who have died as a result of suicide has, in recent years, exceeded the numbers of officers lost in the line of duty.

My community has been particularly affected by this issue. Last year, the New York Police Department lost nine officers in a deeply troubling string of

suicides. With long, late hours, regular traumatic experiences, life-threatening situations, and work in constant proximity to firearms, law enforcement officers are at an increased risk for mental illness such as post-traumatic stress disorder, depression, and anxiety.

A number of reports over past decades indicate that that law enforcement officers have an increased risk of suicide when compared to the general public. While suicide is currently the leading cause of death for law enforcement officers, the nearly 18,000 law enforcement agencies in this country lack a unified reporting mechanism for collecting data on these tragedies.

□ 2015

Without the proper information and statistics, law enforcement agencies and local, State, and Federal leaders are hindered in their ability to educate, prevent, and respond to this epidemic of suicides.

This bill directs the FBI to establish the Law Enforcement Officers Suicide Data Collection Program to prevent future suicides and to promote the understanding of suicide in law enforcement by collecting information from Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies.

Data allowed to be collected pursuant to this bill includes details relating to both suicides and attempted suicides, including the circumstances and location of each event, as well as demographic information of each law enforcement officer and the method used in each incident.

It is imperative that the law enforcement community, mental health professionals, Congress, and the American people better understand the extent of, and the reasons for, this crisis.

The bill, therefore, also requires public reporting of the FBI's findings so that Congress and others can best support State and local agencies that are grappling with the day-to-day consequences of officer suicide.

Madam Speaker, I am grateful for the bipartisan effort to address this important issue. In the House, our colleague, Representative MIKE QUIGLEY, authored H.R. 3735, the companion to this Senate-passed bill. I commend him, and I commend the bill's Senate sponsor, Senator CATHERINE CORTEZ MASTO, for their tireless work on behalf of law enforcement officers and their loved ones.

Madam Speaker, I support this bill. I urge my colleagues to do the same, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of S. 2746, the Law Enforcement Suicide Data Collection Act.

Last year, Congress passed and the President signed into law the STOIC Act, a bill that I introduced with my good friend, Congresswoman MAD-ELEINE DEAN. That bill improves mental health treatment for our Nation's law enforcement officers.

Today, we are once again taking action to address the disturbingly high suicide rate among our police officers. The Law Enforcement Suicide Data Collection Act, which I am a very proud cosponsor of, would require the Federal Government to track suicides within the law enforcement community.

According to Blue HELP, which is a nonprofit working to reduce stigmas attached to mental health for those in the law enforcement community, a record number of current or former police officers died by suicide last year; 228 current or former officers died by suicide in 2019, compared with 172 in 2018.

Since Blue HELP began collecting data over 4 years ago, more law enforcement officers have died by suicide than all other line-of-duty deaths combined. Organizations like Blue HELP do the best they can to track these tragic instances of law enforcement suicide. However, there is no comprehensive government effort to track attempted suicides and suicides in the law enforcement community.

Line-of-duty deaths are tracked through the FBI's Law Enforcement Officers Killed and Assaulted Program. This program aims to provide potentially lifesaving information to law enforcement agencies with a focus on preventing future incidents. Suicide should similarly be tracked so we can implement more effective suicide prevention programs, in turn saving more lives.

S. 2746 requires the FBI Director to establish the Law Enforcement Officers Suicide Data Collection Program to collect data on law enforcement and former law enforcement suicides at the local, State, and Federal levels. Participating law enforcement agencies will report suicide information to the FBI Director. The FBI Director will then submit a report to Congress and publish the report online to share this vital information on suicides and attempted suicides in law enforcement.

Madam Speaker, 2 weeks ago, we recognized National Law Enforcement Week. While we may be too late in taking up this legislation for Police Week, it is never too late to help the brave men and women who protect our communities. I thank Representatives STEUBE, QUIGLEY, and DEAN, as well as Senators BLUNT, HAWLEY, CORTEZ MASTO, and COONS, for introducing this legislation.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting S. 2746, the Law Enforcement Suicide Data Collection Act, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, in this time of great national crisis, we are all even more dependent on our law enforcement personnel, on our first responders, on the heroes that we honored by the title of the bill we passed a couple of weeks ago, the HEROES Act.

It is unfortunate, obviously, that the stress that some of these heroes undergo, the stress that our police officers undergo, leads to a greater suicide rate. Especially in this time of crisis, we can expect that only to increase. It is imperative that we do whatever we can to safeguard the lives of those we depend on, to safeguard the lives of the heroes that we all need.

Madam Speaker, it is unfortunate that we do not have a national database with which to inform proper actions to help deal with this problem and save lives. That is why we are supporting this bill today, to solve this problem, to eliminate this void, so that we can better inform ourselves, the country, all the different agencies in the country, and State, Federal, and local agencies as to what actions might be taken to mitigate this threat to the lives of those we depend on.

Madam Speaker, I very much urge the passage of this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RESCENTIALER. Madam Speaker, I have no speakers at this time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. QUIGLEY).

Mr. QUIGLEY. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me the time.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the Law Enforcement Suicide Data Collection Act, a Senate companion to bipartisan legislation that I authored and introduced to address the mental health needs of law enforcement officers across the country.

Every day, our officers put their lives on the line to protect our communities. They work long shifts and respond to dangerous calls in order to keep crime off our streets and keep our citizens safe. This critical work does not come without a cost. Law enforcement officers often experience post-traumatic stress from their work environment.

According to multiple studies, officers are more than twice as likely to die by suicide than in line-of-duty-related homicides or accidents. Suicide has become the number one cause of deaths for Federal, State, and local law enforcement officers around the country. In fact, in my hometown of Chicago, the officer suicide rate is 60 percent higher than the national average.

Despite these sobering statistics, there is no Federal Government program to track the number of officers who attempt suicide or lose their lives to suicide every year. My legislation creates a data collection program within the FBI to track law enforcement suicides at the local, State, and Federal levels.

By providing accurate and detailed information, this bill would help police departments implement more effective suicide prevention and post-prevention programs. These intervention programs will save lives.

It is our turn to bring the brave men and women who fight for us the care they need and deserve.

Madam Speaker, I am grateful to Chairman NADLER for his support of this important mission and for prioritizing this piece of legislation and bringing it to the House floor. I thank the committee staff and Hannah from my own staff for her extraordinary work on this measure.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to support the Law Enforcement Suicide Data Collection bill today.

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

Mr. RESCENTIALER. Madam Speaker, I am prepared to close, and I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, I again urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on S. 2746, the Law Enforcement Suicide Data Collection Act, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, we appreciate the service of our law enforcement officers who face unique challenges and risks in protecting us every day. Today, we take an important step to recognize the psychological toll that serving in such an inherently dangerous job can take on law enforcement officers and work to combat the tragic epidemic of suicides among their ranks.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting the Law Enforcement Suicide Data Collection Act so that we may be better able to address this crisis and save lives.

Throughout our country, the vast majority of police officers execute their jobs with dignity, honor, and respect for the citizens they serve and protect, but it would be remiss if I did not take note of the alarming and appalling incidents involving individuals in law enforcement in the last few weeks. These include the death of Breonna Taylor in Kentucky and George Floyd in Minnesota, both at the hands of law enforcement officers, and the disturbing circumstances surrounding the death of Ahmaud Arbery in Georgia.

We must bring all those responsible to justice and work to improve accountability between law enforcement officers and the communities they serve.

While we appreciate all of our law enforcement officers, we can't hide from America's history of racism and its deadly consequences. We see it in the disproportionate rate of COVID deaths, in our country's rates of mass incarceration, and, yes, in the treatment of African Americans by a few of our police officers.

The ugly truth is clear: Black Americans often live under different rules. It is up to all of us to change them.

Working with my colleagues on the Committee on the Judiciary and with Members of Congress from all across the country, I will continue to fight to do so.

But the bill before us today is a necessary and worthy bill, recognizing the honorable and selfless service that the vast majority of our police officers provide, and trying to deal with the high suicide rates that the stresses of this job that they do to protect us cause.

We should pass this bill so we can start getting a handle on this problem to preserve the lives of the vast majority of our police officers who serve us honorably and without whom we would be adrift.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote for this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, as a member of the Law Enforcement Caucus and a senior member of the Committees on the Judiciary and Homeland Security, I rise in support of S. 2746, the "Law Enforcement Suicide Data Collection Act," which requires the FBI to open a voluntary data collection program to track suicides and attempted suicides within local, tribal, state and federal law enforcement.

Information collected and maintained by the FBI will not include any personally identifiable information.

The legislation also directs the FBI Director to submit an annual report on the data to Congress and publish the report on the FBI website.

This program would serve as the principal data collection tool on suicides and attempted suicides within law enforcement across the country.

It is altogether fitting and proper that we do this to commemorate National Police Week, which occurred earlier this month.

Madam Speaker, this legislation reminds us of the enormous strain law enforcement personnel necessarily endure daily as they try to do their best to keep our communities safe and healthy.

By providing accurate and detailed information on these suicides and attempted suicides, more effective prevention programs could be implemented to save lives.

I urge all members to Join me in voting for S. 2746, the Law Enforcement Suicide Data Collection Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 2746.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PUBLIC SAFETY OFFICER PANDEMIC RESPONSE ACT OF 2020

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 6509) to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to provide public safety officer death and disability benefits for certain public safety officers who contract COVID-19, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 6509

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 "Public Safety Officer Pandemic Response Act of 2020".

SEC. 2. DEATH AND DISABILITY BENEFITS FOR PUBLIC SAFETY OFFICERS IMPACTED BY COVID-19.

Section 1201 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10281) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(o) For purposes of this part:

“(1) COVID-19 (or complications therefrom) shall be presumed to constitute a personal injury within the meaning of subsection (a), sustained in the line of duty by a public safety officer and directly and proximately resulting in death, in the case of a public safety officer who was diagnosed with, who received a positive test for, or for whom evidence indicated that the officer was infected with, COVID-19, unless such officer was not on duty during the 45-day period prior to being diagnosed with or having positive test for COVID-19.

“(2) The Attorney General shall accept claims, including supplemental claims, under this section from an individual who—

“(A) was serving as a public safety officer and was injured or disabled in the line of duty as a result of the terrorist attacks on the United States that occurred on September 11, 2001, or in the aftermath of such attacks developed a condition described in section 3312(a) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300mm-22(a)); and

“(B) was diagnosed with COVID-19 during the period described in paragraph (3), which, in combination with the injury or disability described in subparagraph (A), permanently and totally disabled or directly and proximately resulted in the death of the individual.

In assessing a claim under this paragraph, the presumption of causation described in paragraph (1) shall apply.

“(3) The presumption described in paragraph (1) and standard in subsection (p) shall apply with respect to a diagnosis of COVID-19 (or complications therefrom) beginning on January 20, 2020, and ending on January 20, 2022.

“(4) The term ‘COVID-19’ means a disease caused by severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2).

“(p) In determining whether the personal injury under subsection (b) resulting from COVID-19 (or complications therefrom) was a catastrophic injury, the Attorney General’s inquiry shall apply the presumption in subsection (o) and be limited to whether the individual is permanently prevented from performing any gainful work as a public safety officer.”.

SEC. 3. 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" or 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 rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. RESCHENTHALER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include any extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 6509, the Public Safety Officer Pandemic Response Act. I introduced this bill on April 14 in response to the escalating and deadly threat of the COVID-19 virus to our public safety officers, and I am pleased that the House is considering it today.

H.R. 6509 expands the Public Safety Officers’ Benefits program, known as the PSOB program, to ensure that public safety officers who contract COVID-19 in the line of duty are eligible for benefits under the program should they become disabled or should they die from the virus.

Madam Speaker, this bill would accomplish three critical objectives.

First, it establishes that a diagnosis, a positive test, or evidence of COVID-19 infection shall be presumed to constitute a personal injury in the line of duty for the purposes of eligibility for the PSOB program, unless the officer was not on duty in the relevant time period.

Second, it ensures that officers who were injured or disabled in the line of duty in relation to the attacks of September 11, 2001, and whose injuries in combination with a COVID-19 illness rendered them disabled or caused their death will receive benefits under the PSOB program.

□ 2030

And, third, it establishes that the COVID-19-related disability standard is based on whether a PSOB claimant is permanently prevented from performing any gainful work as a public safety officer on account of a COVID-19 diagnosis.

Because of the demands placed on public safety officers during this crisis, it is important that Congress enact all of these elements.

In seeking to protect and serve their communities in their various roles, public safety officers willingly undertake risks of harm on a daily basis. Because of this, we have established the PSOB program to provide disability and death benefits for them when they are disabled or die due to line-of-duty injuries.

During the current crisis of COVID-19 contagion, the risks to public safety officers go well beyond the dangers first responders ordinarily experience. Police officers, firefighters, and EMTs are often the first responders that those with COVID-19 encounter.

Current estimates are that nearly 40 percent of COVID-19 carriers are

asymptomatic. Therefore, for first responders, even ordinary encounters with members of the community become potentially life-threatening events.

On top of this, a lack of availability of appropriate personal protective equipment has unnecessarily exposed thousands of officers to COVID-19. Despite the additional risks they take on, public safety officers continue to faithfully execute their jobs and protect us all.

H.R. 6509 acknowledges this by clarifying and expanding certain aspects of how the existing PSOB program for officers who contract COVID-19 is applied.

If an officer was on duty during this crisis and contracts this disease, his or her illness should be considered a line-of-duty injury. And officers who are disabled due to COVID-19 should be eligible for disability benefits under a less stringent standard, given the added risks they undertook during this crisis, particularly because many officers have not been given appropriate equipment to mitigate their risk.

We must also address another unique and tragic circumstance. I have long been a champion of the public safety officers who provided their service in responding to the deadly 9/11 attacks on our country. In fact, this bill is modeled on legislation that Congress enacted just days after 9/11, which I authored, to ensure that public safety officers who were injured or killed in the line of duty because of 9/11 received the benefits they deserved.

Many first responders lost their lives that day; and in the days and weeks following the attacks, thousands of public safety officers rushed in to help the injured and to seek the remains of those who perished.

Numerous studies have sadly shown that, as a result of these attacks, these public safety officers were exposed to a slew of toxic chemicals and dust that directly inhibit lung capacity. Therefore, 9/11 public safety officers are uniquely vulnerable to COVID-19, which attacks a person's ability to breathe effectively.

H.R. 6509 acknowledges that the service of public safety officers during and after 9/11 continues to put them at a higher risk of disability or death. This bill allows those officers who were injured or disabled in the line of duty in relation to 9/11 and whose injuries, in combination with COVID-19 illness, rendered them disabled or caused their death to apply for benefits under the PSOB program.

To date, Congress has upheld its promise to 9/11 first responders who, on account of their injuries on 9/11, have been tragically succumbing to cancers and other diseases. Today, we will do so again.

I note that the Sergeants Benevolent Association of the New York City Police Department wrote to me yesterday expressing strong support for this bill and citing the importance of including

provisions addressing the 9/11 issue in this legislation.

We have also received letters of support for this bill from the Fraternal Order of Police and the National Association of Police Organizations.

I include all of these letters in the RECORD.

SERGEANTS BENEVOLENT ASSOCIATION, POLICE DEPARTMENT, CITY OF NEW YORK,

New York, NY, May 26, 2020.

Hon. JERROLD NADLER,
*Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing on behalf of the more 13,000 members of the Sergeants Benevolent Association of the New York City Police Department to advise you of our strong support for H.R. 6509, the "Public Safety Officer Pandemic Response Act." This important legislation will establish a much needed presumption to enable the Public Safety Officers' Benefits (PSOB) Program to process death and disability benefits for our frontline law enforcement officers, firefighters, and EMTs exposed to COVID-19.

Nearly nineteen years ago, thousands of first responders in New York and across the country were exposed to a deadly cocktail of toxins at the sites of the worst terrorist attack in American history. To date, exposure to those toxins has claimed the lives of more police officers than died on 9/11 itself. While today we fully recognize the toll suffered by the rescue and recovery personnel in the months after 9/11, that was not always the case. And it required nearly all of the past nineteen years to fully secure health and compensation benefits for impacted first responders. The lessons of the 9/11 health crisis are the historical context for which you, the SBA, and others are seeking to address both the actual short-term and potential long-term consequences of the COVID-19 pandemic on public safety officers. We are unfortunately experiencing the short-term impact of this disease on the ranks of law enforcement, which has already claimed the lives of more than 100 officers, including six from the NYPD. But we do not yet know the long-term effects COVID-19 will present to those exposed to it.

While the PSOB Program currently covers deaths and disabilities from "infectious disease," providing evidence that a disease was contracted in the line of duty is not always straightforward. In this current pandemic, making the connection between an officer's death or disability from COVID-19 and one specific exposure to a carrier of the disease is likely impossible. H.R. 6509 addresses this issue by establishing a full presumptive standard for COVID-19-related death and disability claims for PSOB benefits. It will also create a similar presumptive standard for those officers who are suffering from 9/11 health conditions and are at significantly higher risk from this disease. In so doing, the "Public Safety Officer Pandemic Response Act" affords Congress the opportunity to be proactive in its response to the threat COVID-19 poses to the public safety community and ensures that our nation's heroes are not subjected to another lengthy battle to obtain the benefits they are entitled to.

On behalf of the membership of the SBA, thank you for your leadership on this legislation and your legacy of supporting positive enhancements to the PSOB Program. Please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

ED MULLINS,
President.

NATIONAL FRATERNAL ORDER
OF POLICE,

Washington, DC, May 27, 2020.

Hon. NANCY P. PELOSI,
*Speaker of the House,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*
Hon. KEVIN O. MCCARTHY,
*Minority Leader,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER AND REPRESENTATIVE MCCARTHY: I am writing on behalf of the members of the Fraternal Order of Police to advise you of our strong support for H.R. 6509, the "Public Safety Officer Pandemic Response Act," and to urge the House to pass it.

We knew at the beginning of the COVID-19 pandemic that law enforcement officers on the front lines combating this pandemic would be increasingly vulnerable to contracting the virus. As we had feared, the virus has claimed the lives of many, and now includes a growing number of law enforcement officers. As of today, 112 law enforcement officers have died from COVID-19 related illnesses.

The Public Safety Officers' Benefits (PSOB) program provides that the surviving family members of a public safety officer who contracts an infectious disease in the line of duty and dies as a result of its contraction are eligible for the PSOB's death benefit. With the help of the President and the Attorney General, the Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA) announced on 9 April that a death benefit claim for a COVID-19 related death will be found by the BJA to have contracted the disease in the line of duty in most cases. This was a vitally important issue for our members on the front lines during this pandemic and this legislation would expand and codify this presumption.

In addition to the presumption for death benefit claims, H.R. 6509 would ensure that public safety officers who contract COVID-19 in the line of duty are eligible for benefits should they become disabled from the novel coronavirus. It would establish new standards for disability claims related to COVID-19 by defining "catastrophic injury" in cases where the injured officer was "permanently prevented from performing any gainful work as a public safety officer." At a time of heightened risk from this pandemic, we believe this is necessary to ensure that these officers and their families, who are not able to "stay at home" during this crisis, will be taken care of in the event they are disabled and unable to continue to serve as law enforcement officers.

The legislation also recognizes the unique vulnerability of officers who were injured or disabled in the line of duty in relation to the attacks of September 11, 2001, and whose injuries—in combination with a line-of-duty COVID-19 illness—rendered them disabled or caused their death will be eligible to receive the death or disability benefits under the PSOB program.

On behalf of the more than 351,000 members of the Fraternal Order of Police, I urge the House to pass this measure and send it to the Senate. If I can be of any further assistance, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

PATRICK YOES,
National President.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF POLICE
ORGANIZATIONS, INC.,
Alexandria, VA, May 26, 2020.

Hon. JERROLD NADLER,
*Chair, Committee on the Judiciary,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR CHAIRMAN NADLER: On behalf of the National Association of Police Organizations (NAPO), representing over 241,000 law enforcement officers across the United States,

I am writing to you to express our strong support for the Public Safety Officer Pandemic Response Act of 2020 (H.R. 6509).

The PSOB Program was designed to offer peace of mind to men and women seeking careers in public safety and to make a strong statement about the value that American Society places on the contributions of those who serve their communities in potentially dangerous circumstances, such as the current coronavirus pandemic. Officers have been protecting our communities with insufficient personal protective equipment (PPE), putting themselves at high risk of exposure to this very communicable disease.

While the PSOB Program does cover line of duty deaths and disabilities due to infectious diseases, we feel strongly that COVID-19 is unique and presents its own challenges in proving line of duty exposure. While with most other infectious diseases, it is easy to pinpoint the source and details surrounding the exposure, but this situation is more difficult with the new coronavirus and its asymptomatic spread. Every day, we are learning more about COVID-19. First, it was believed it could only be spread by close human contact. Now, experts know that it can also be spread through the air. Individuals can be carriers of COVID-19 without being symptomatic. Our officers have found themselves in an extraordinary and dangerous situation over which they have very little control.

The Public Safety Officer Pandemic Response Act would establish that COVID-19 shall be presumed to have been contracted as a result of the officer's service for the purposes of PSOB death and disability benefits. It would create a specific standard for COVID-19-related disability this is based on whether a PSOB claimant is permanently prevented from performing any gainful work as a public safety officer due to their COVID-19 diagnosis. Finally, it would recognize the physical toll 9/11 related illnesses have had on first responders by covering under the PSOB Program those public safety officers whose 9/11 related illness are compounded by a COVID-19 diagnosis and lead to their death or disability.

For these reasons, NAPO wholeheartedly supports the Public Safety Officer Pandemic Response Act and we call on the House of Representatives to pass this important legislation. If we can provide any additional information or assistance, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. JOHNSON,
Executive Director.

Mr. NADLER. I also want to note that, as we work to support our first responders today, we must also support other essential workers who are on the front lines of this pandemic, like those in the food and healthcare industries who are putting their lives at risk each day during this crisis.

We should ensure that all those who are making the ultimate sacrifice for their communities, for us, are properly compensated. That work begins today with supporting our public safety officers with this bill.

I thank my colleagues, Representative MAX ROSE from New York and Representative BILL PASCRELL from New Jersey, for their support of this measure from its inception. And I ask my colleagues in the House to join me in supporting this bill so that we can pass it today.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, America's law enforcement officers, firefighters, and other first responders are on the front lines of the fight against the coronavirus. Over 100 public safety officers tragically lost their lives due to COVID-19, and that number will inevitably continue to rise.

During this challenging time, it is critical that we ensure our officers and their loved ones can utilize the Department of Justice's Public Safety Officers' Benefits program.

The PSOB program was created to aid officers killed or totally disabled on the job. The program reviews over 1,000 claims submitted every year and provides one-time payments of roughly \$365,000 for officers who lost their lives or who were totally disabled in the line of duty. The program also provides monthly education benefits to the children of these officers.

While nothing can ever replace a loved one, this program gives our first responders peace of mind, knowing that their families will be taken care of should the worst happen.

However, to receive benefits under current law, first responders must prove they contracted COVID-19 while on duty. Both Republicans and Democrats agree: Congress must amend the PSOB program to create a presumption allowing officers and their families to receive assistance without facing this burdensome requirement.

Unfortunately, the majority in the House is delaying these important benefits. The Senate passed S. 3607, the bipartisan Safeguarding America's First Responders Act of 2020, and they did this about 2 weeks ago.

If House Democrats were actually serious about getting these benefits to public safety officers, we would pass the Senate bill today and send it to the President to sign into law. Instead, House Democrats are again engaging in political games, rejecting the Senate's bill and taking up the House's bill, which includes several problematic provisions that the Senate will simply not agree to.

I am very disappointed that the Democrat majority would rather play partisan politics than provide immediate assistance to brave, selfless men and women who are protecting our communities. However, I agree with the primary intent of this legislation, and I strongly support our Nation's dedication to public safety officers.

A few days ago, we honored those who made the ultimate sacrifice while serving our country in the armed services. It is only right that we take care of first responders, who are also making sacrifices every day for this great country.

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 New Jersey (Mr.

PASCRELL), one of the authors of this legislation.

Mr. PASCRELL. Madam Speaker, I rise for our first responders who are risking their lives and the lives of their families. They go to work every day to fight this virus. They need our help.

I am proud to join Chairman NADLER, Congressman MAX ROSE, and others in support of the Public Safety Officer Pandemic Response Act. Our bill will guarantee first responders receive Public Safety Officer Benefits if the worst comes to pass, because there have been many delays. We need clarity so that there is no anxiety about this.

In my district, the Ninth District of New Jersey, we tragically lost two first responders to COVID-19 in the line of duty.

Israel Tolentino, a firefighter from Passaic, New Jersey, was 33 years old. It was Israel's lifelong dream to be a firefighter. He made the ultimate sacrifice for our community fighting this pandemic. He leaves behind his wife and two young children.

And we have lost Frank Scorpo, a police officer from my hometown of Paterson. I knew the family. He was only 34. He was a beloved member of the force. He leaves behind his wife and two sons, ages 4 and 6 months.

Another person I want to recognize, who understands and is sensitive to this, for all the years he served here, is PETER KING of New York. He never, never missed an opportunity to stand up for law enforcement and their families.

These men are heroes, Scorpo and Tolentino. My heart and your heart bleeds for our fallen first responders. This bill ensures their families have some peace of mind that their benefits will be implemented.

This legislation was part, as you know, of the landmark HEROES Act, which was passed a week and a half ago. We are passing it again to underscore its critical importance.

We owe a huge debt of gratitude to all first responders across New Jersey and around the country. We cannot make it to the other side of this mess without them. I thank them for their service, and God bless all of them.

Thank you to law enforcement and fire service organizations who helped draft this legislation. I know they stand strong for their membership.

I want to recognize Senator CORY BOOKER and Senator CHUCK GRASSLEY for working to protect our first responders. I know they are serious about creating this presumption.

I have served as the co-chair of law enforcement in the Congress for over 16 years. These are our men, these are our women in uniform. We must get this done. We cannot delay.

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Madam Speaker, we have no further speakers at this time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROSE), another sponsor of the bill.

Mr. ROSE of New York. Madam Speaker, I thank Chairman NADLER for his leadership and thank him for working with me on this effort. I also thank Congressman PASCRELL for his extraordinary leadership in this regard.

I stand in strong support of our bill, the Public Safety Officer Pandemic Response Act, because when this pandemic came to the United States, one thing that was never, ever in doubt was that our first responders would put on their uniforms and they would risk their lives to keep us safe.

It was never in doubt because whenever there has been a crisis, whether it came to my city or to our country, they have always rushed to be our first line of defense. On 9/11, they rushed into the towers. During Hurricane Sandy, they braved a superstorm. And now, during the pandemic, they are on the front lines against an invisible enemy that has claimed more than 100,000 lives nationwide.

Think of the toll this pandemic has taken on our Nation's heroes. Think of all those who have gone months without seeing their kids, their spouses, their own parents. Think of those who have gotten sick. Think of those who have lost their lives.

The very least that Congress can do right now is give our police officers, our EMTs, our corrections officers, our firefighters, our public safety officers the peace of mind that, if the worst shall happen, we will be there for them and their families.

□ 2045

When this bill becomes law—and it will become law—the family of an officer who was catastrophically injured or lost their life will not have to jump through hoops or prove that it was because of the coronavirus. They won't have to spend 10 years litigating, trying to convince the government that their sacrifice actually meant something.

Today, we are not cutting red tape; we are stopping the red tape from happening in the first place. This effort has bipartisan support. And, nonetheless—and only in Washington, D.C., is this possible—it has yet to cross the finish line. Our officers cannot afford to wait, cannot afford to wait for politics. We can't use our cops and our firefighters as political pawns.

My city has lost nearly a dozen FDNY heroes, over 40 NYPD officers, and so many more of our brave officers across the United States of America.

Every Member of Congress loves to take pictures with our first responders. We love to thank them. We love to rely on them. They protect our families when we go to Washington, D.C. Well, today is the day we see who is willing to do more than offer them pretty words on Facebook. Who is willing to do more than take a selfie?

Today, we see who is willing to help our first responders, like they wouldn't hesitate to be there for us. God bless you and God bless the United States of

America. Let's be there for our first responders.

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

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to offer strong support for the Public Safety Officer Pandemic Response Act and to just take a little journey down memory lane.

Just 2 days ago we honored the fallen that have sacrificed their lives for this Nation for our freedom. We could not help many of us who held Memorial Day ceremonies for the fallen and to acknowledge their families who at that time, as well, acknowledge the nearing 100,000 mark of those who died from COVID-19.

As a Member of the United States Congress here during 9/11, right here in this Capitol, watching the billowing smoke from the Pentagon, hearing about the Trade Center, and of course, about the plane that no one could find that wound up in Pennsylvania, in all of those instances, first responders rushed to the scene. They were on the front lines.

I remember that; heroic actions. But at the same time, I remember, as a Member of the Homeland Security Committee, the long and arduous journey, the suffering that these individuals had to go through to receive ultimate compensation, even just a few months ago, or about a year ago, reminded of the first responders that were in the Judiciary Committee pleading again for compensation through the 9/11 bill.

I believe that where we are today is the right direction to get in front of and to help those who are still on the front lines, firefighters and techs, law enforcement officers in a variety of service, they are still there, many of whom started with COVID-19 without the right PPEs, as many of them will tell you. Some who have already lost their lives. Many that continue to suffer with the remnants or the effects of COVID-19.

Madam Speaker, I want to thank the sponsors and thank the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, Mr. NADLER. I want to thank Mr. PASCRELL and Mr. ROSE for all of the efforts to get in front, to say that the Nation does care. Because right now, Madam Speaker, as we are on this floor, there are emergency workers rushing to someone's home to be able to take them to a medical facility to save their lives, or they may be in an emergency room right now. So COVID-19 has not ended. That is why we are wearing masks. COVID-19 has taken 100,000 lives with no end in sight.

So I rise in support to be able to provide these lifesaving front-liners the safety net that they need, and the compensation that they need, in order for us to say more than a thank you, but to acknowledge and honor them for their service.

Let us hope that we can, as a Nation, follow the instructions of social distancing, testing, wearing masks, that we can overcome this. But all the time that we are taking that journey, we will be looking to these first responders to be on the first line.

Madam Speaker, I thank you for the time, and I ask our colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, I am disappointed that we are not taking up the bipartisan Senate-passed POS bill that had a clean fix to this issue. So I do want to say, I am disappointed that we are not running the Senate bill, which again, was bipartisan.

But I do want to say, I support our Nation's first responders, and I truly believe it is vital that they receive the benefits they have earned. So I urge my colleagues to support our Nation's public service officers.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, the COVID-19 crisis in this country has taken many lives and impacted every community. In our national response, there are many areas in which we know we must do better and do more to address the public health emergency and the economic impact on our people.

This bill, which expands an existing program in several important ways will help address the tragic circumstances of public safety officers who are disabled by or die from this virus. It is one piece of the overall effort, but an important one.

Madam Speaker, I, therefore, ask my colleagues to join me in supporting passage of H.R. 6509 today.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 6509, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess for a period of less than 15 minutes.

Accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 54 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 2109

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro

tempore (Ms. TITUS) at 9 o'clock and 9 minutes p.m.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess for a period of less than 15 minutes.

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

□ 2124

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. TITUS) at 9 o'clock and 24 minutes p.m.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess for a period of less than 15 minutes.

Accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 24 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 2137

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. TITUS) at 9 o'clock and 37 minutes p.m.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 4(b) of House Resolution 967, the House stands adjourned until 9 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon (at 9 o'clock and 39 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 28, 2020, at 9 a.m.

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, for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that H.R. 6509, the Public Safety Officer Pandemic Response Act of 2020, as amended, would have no significant effect on the deficit, and therefore, the budgetary effects of such bill are estimated as zero.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

4361. A letter from the Director, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting the Bureau's interpretive rule — Application of Certain Provisions in the TILA-RESPA Integrated Disclosure Rule and Regulation Z Right of Rescission Rules in Light of the COVID-19 Pandemic received May 8, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public

Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

4362. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's 2019 Merger Decisions Report, pursuant to Sec. 18(c)(9) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act; to the Committee on Financial Services.

4363. A letter from the Director — Office of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's interim final rule — Regulatory Capital Rule: Paycheck Protection Program Lending Facility and Paycheck Protection Program Loans; Correction (RIN: 3064-AF49) received May 8, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

4364. A letter from the Executive Director, Office of Minority and Women Inclusion, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, transmitting the Office's fiscal year 2019 Annual Report to Congress, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 5452(e); Public Law 111-203, Sec. 342(e); (124 Stat. 1543); to the Committee on Financial Services.

4365. A letter from the Program Specialist, Chief Counsel's Office, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's interim final rule — Short-Term Investment Funds [Docket No.: OCC-2020-0012] (RIN: 1557-AE84) received May 5, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

4366. A letter from the General Counsel, Investigations, Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Review Board, transmitting the Board's final rule — Accidental Release Reporting [Agency Docket Number: CSB-2019-0004] (RIN: 3301-AA00) received May 12, 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.

4367. A letter from the Department of the Treasury, Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modernization of the Labeling and Advertising Regulations for Wine, Distilled Spirits, and Malt Beverages [Docket No.: TTB-2018-0007; T.D. TTB-158; Ref: Notice Nos. 176 and 176A] (RIN: 1513-AB54) received May 1, 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.

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:

Mr. GRIJALVA: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 306. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study of the site of the Kettle Creek Battlefield in Wilkes County, Georgia, and adjacent property, and for other purposes, with amendments. (Rept. 116-424). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GRIJALVA: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 3349. A bill to authorize the Daughters of the Republic of Texas to establish the Republic of Texas Legation Memorial as a commemorative work in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, with an amendment (Rept. 116-425). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MCGOVERN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 981. Resolution providing

for consideration of the Senate amendments to the bill (H.R. 6172) to amend the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 to prohibit the production of certain business records, and for other purposes (Rept. 116-426). 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 Mr. CLYBURN (for himself and Mr. UPTON):

H.R. 7022. A bill to direct the Federal Communications Commission to take certain actions to accelerate the Rural Digital Opportunity Fund Phase I auction, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. TRAHAN (for herself, Mr. MCKINLEY, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. ROSE of New York, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. HAALAND, Mr. RYAN, Mr. TRONE, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. SLOTKIN, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. LOEBACK, Mr. WELCH, Mr. MORELLE, Ms. ESCOBAR, Ms. FINKENAUER, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. BRINDISI, and Ms. MCCOLLUM):

H.R. 7023. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to implement a program that provides financial assistance to sports facilities, museums, and community theaters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. BARRAGAN (for herself, Ms. TLAI, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. NORTON, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. SCHA-KOWSKY, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. CASE, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. ROUDA, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. BONAMICI, and Ms. LEE of California):

H.R. 7024. A bill to direct the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to establish a program to award grants to eligible entities to purchase, and as applicable install, zero emissions port equipment and technology, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BUCHSHON:

H.R. 7025. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize grants to certain public health laboratories to assist such laboratories in meeting the cost of acquiring high-throughput diagnostic equipment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. DEGETTE (for herself and Mr. BUCHSHON):

H.R. 7026. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize grants for acquiring equipment and supplies capable of performing same-day clinical laboratory diagnostic testing in a point-of-care setting, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. BONAMICI, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. STEVENS, Ms. FINKENAUER, Mrs. HAYES, Ms. HAALAND, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. POCAN, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. FRANKEL, Ms. FUDGE, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. SABLON, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. WILSON of Florida,

Mr. TAKANO, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. NORCROSS, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. MORELLE, Ms. WILD, Mrs. MCBATH, Ms. SHALALA, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Ms. OMAR, Mr. TRONE, Mrs. TRAHAN, and Mr. CASTRO of Texas):

H.R. 7027. A bill making additional supplemental appropriations for disaster relief requirements for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations, 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. ENGEL (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. DEUTCH, and Mr. ROSE of New York):

H.R. 7028. A bill to establish a national commission on United States counterterrorism policy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio (for himself and Ms. FUDGE):

H.R. 7029. A bill to facilitate the re-opening of schools through study of children's role in transmitting SARS-CoV-2, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HAGEDORN (for himself and Mr. EMMER):

H.R. 7030. A bill to provide emergency assistance to covered producers for market-ready swine losses due to the COVID-19 pandemic, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JOYCE of Ohio (for himself, Ms. FUDGE, and Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio):

H.R. 7031. A bill to extend public safety officer death benefits to public safety officers whose death is caused by COVID-19, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILMER (for himself, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 7032. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish a tax credit for training services received by individuals who are unemployed as a result of the coronavirus pandemic; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee:

H.R. 7033. A bill to secure the research enterprise of the United States from the Chinese Communist Party, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Science, Space, and Technology, Education and Labor, and Foreign Affairs, 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 Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York (for herself, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. CONNOLLY, and Mr. SARBANES):

H.R. 7034. A bill to modify the deadline for completing the 2020 decennial census of population and related tabulations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform, 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 Ms. MENG (for herself and Mr. UPTON):

H.R. 7035. A bill to amend the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 to provide for emergency supplemental funding under local agriculture market program for COVID-19 losses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. NEGUSE (for himself, Mr. NADLER, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. JORDAN, and Mr. SENSENBRENNER):

H.R. 7036. A bill to amend the Antitrust Criminal Penalty Enhancement and Reform Act of 2004 to repeal the sunset provision; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POSEY:

H.R. 7037. A bill to provide for quality assurance of COVID-19 reimbursements and reporting; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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. ROSE of New York:

H.R. 7038. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to include additional eligible uses of revenue from tolls, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. SPANO:

H.R. 7039. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 210 North Missouri Avenue in Lakeland, Florida, as the "Officer Paul Dunn Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. SPANO:

H.R. 7040. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2800 Lakeland Hills Boulevard in Lakeland, Florida, as the "Officer Ken Foley Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. WELCH (for himself, Mr. CONNOLLY, and Mr. LYNCH):

H.R. 7041. A bill to provide that any termination of a director of a national research institute or national center of the National Institutes of Health be on the basis of malfeasance, neglect of office, or incapacity only; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

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 Mr. CLYBURN:

H.R. 7022.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mrs. TRAHAN:

H.R. 7023.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. BARRAGÁN:

H.R. 7024.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. BUCSHON:

H.R. 7025.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Ms. DEGETTE:

H.R. 7026.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 7027.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. ENGEL:

H.R. 7028.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution.

By Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio:

H.R. 7029.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 18

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 in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. HAGEDORN:

H.R. 7030.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article I, Section 8, the Necessary and Proper Clause. Congress shall have power to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers and all Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. JOYCE of Ohio:

H.R. 7031.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1, 3, and 18.

By Mr. KILMER:

H.R. 7032.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee:

H.R. 7033.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article I, Section 8, the Necessary and Proper Clause. Congress shall have power to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing powers and all Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 7034.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. MENG:

H.R. 7035.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the US Constitution [page H10170]

By Mr. NEGUSE:

H.R. 7036.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. POSEY:

H.R. 7037.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8. 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 in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. ROSE of New York:

H.R. 7038.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution

"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. SPANO:

H.R. 7039.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. SPANO:

H.R. 7040.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. WELCH:

H.R. 7041.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have 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 in any Department or Officer thereof..

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 155: Mr. TIMMONS and Mr. MARSHALL.
H.R. 372: Mr. LAWSON of Florida and Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 444: Ms. TITUS.

H.R. 845: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 906: Mr. RASKIN, Ms. CRAIG, Mr. WOODALL, Mr. BURCHETT, Mr. BERGMAN, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. KIM, and Mr. WALDEN.

H.R. 1634: Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. SOTO, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 1636: Ms. DELAURO, Ms. NAPOLITANO, Mr. KIM, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. DEAN, Ms. SCANLON, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. FRANKEL, Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. ESCOBAR, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. CORREA, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. HAALAND, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. POCAN, Ms. MENG, Mrs. AXNE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GARAMENDI, and Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 1961: Mr. RASKIN, Mr. MORELLE, Mr. ROUDA, and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 2261: Mrs. MCBATH.

H.R. 2293: Mrs. AXNE.

H.R. 2431: Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico.

H.R. 2501: Ms. BARRAGÁN and Mrs. MCBATH.

H.R. 2521: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 2584: Mr. COX of California.

H.R. 2859: Mr. MCKINLEY and Mr. SMITH of Missouri.

H.R. 2867: Mr. SCHNEIDER.

H.R. 3645: Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 4039: Mr. CRENSHAW.

H.R. 4041: Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 4104: Ms. MOORE, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. FINKENAUER, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. LOWENTHAL, and Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 4189: Mr. YOHO, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. CURTIS, and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 4296: Mr. MORELLE.

H.R. 4309: Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. RASKIN, and Mr. TRONE.

H.R. 4621: Mr. HARDER of California and Mr. CÁRDENAS.

H.R. 4705: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

H.R. 4864: Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 4906: Mr. AGUILAR and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.

H.R. 5046: Mr. COLE, Mr. TRONE, and Ms. CHENEY.

H.R. 5297: Mr. BYRNE.

H.R. 5312: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 5435: Mr. TAKANO and Mr. RASKIN.

H.R. 5531: Ms. OMAR.

H.R. 5775: Ms. OMAR.

H.R. 5857: Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, and Mr. QUIGLEY.

H.R. 5892: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 5986: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 5998: Mr. RASKIN.

H.R. 6049: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 6139: Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 6148: Ms. JAYAPAL.

H.R. 6168: Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. HAALAND, and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 6204: Mr. DEUTCH.

H.R. 6209: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 6229: Mr. BROWN of Maryland.

H.R. 6304: Mrs. AXNE, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. PAPPAS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, and Mr. CROW.

H.R. 6338: Mr. YOHO.

H.R. 6364: Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. HECK, Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL, Mrs. BEATTY, and Mr. BACON.

H.R. 6365: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 6390: Mrs. AXNE, Mr. KENNEDY, and Ms. HAALAND.

H.R. 6400: Mr. CÁRDENAS.

H.R. 6445: Ms. SCANLON.

H.R. 6474: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 6485: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

H.R. 6487: Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Ms. SPANBERGER, and Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY.

H.R. 6509: Mrs. MCBATH and Mr. RYAN.

H.R. 6540: Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. BALDERSON, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. BABIN, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. CRAWFORD, and Mr. WENSTRUP.

H.R. 6556: Mr. MCKINLEY.

H.R. 6558: Mr. RICHMOND and Ms. GARCIA of Texas.

H.R. 6559: Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. MCKINLEY, and Mr. DESAULNIER.

H.R. 6560: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 6574: Mrs. MURPHY of Florida.

H.R. 6582: Mr. FOSTER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. POCAN, and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 6611: Mr. WATKINS.

H.R. 6620: Mr. TRONE.

H.R. 6646: Ms. WILD and Mrs. TRAHAN.

H.R. 6654: Mr. RASKIN.

H.R. 6699: Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 6714: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 6728: Mr. WATKINS.

H.R. 6737: Mr. COMER.

H.R. 6742: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. STEUBE, and Mr. GARCÍA of California.

H.R. 6774: Ms. SCANLON, Mr. ROSE of New York, Ms. OMAR, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mrs. HAYES, Ms. WILD, and Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 6782: Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. CISNEROS, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. SPEIER, and Ms. BONAMICI.

H.R. 6802: Mr. SPANO, Mr. KELLER, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. BANKS, Mr. PERRY, Mr. DUNN, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. PENCE, and Mr. CARTER of Texas.

H.R. 6805: Mr. COMER and Mr. GOSAR.

H.R. 6814: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi and Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 6823: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.

H.R. 6829: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 6863: Mr. COOK, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. EMMER.

H.R. 6866: Ms. NORTON, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. CASE, and Ms. PORTER.

H.R. 6870: Mr. STIVERS.

H.R. 6871: Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. PORTER, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, and Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 6886: Mr. BURCHETT and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 6894: Mr. LAWSON of Florida.

H.R. 6897: Mr. KIND and Ms. KELLY of Illinois.

H.R. 6904: Mr. CÁRDENAS.

H.R. 6909: Ms. HAALAND, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H.R. 6931: Mr. HARDER of California.

H.R. 6933: Mr. YOUNG and Mr. SOTO.

H.R. 6934: Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee and Mrs. WAGNER.

H.R. 6954: Mr. AMODEI and Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 6955: Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 6956: Ms. PINGREE.

H.R. 6958: Ms. NORTON and Mr. HAGEDORN.

H.R. 6962: Ms. DEGETTE.

H.R. 6965: Ms. PORTER, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. PINGREE, and Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 6976: Mr. STEUBE.

H.R. 6980: Ms. FRANKEL, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. LYNCH, Mrs. HAYES, and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 6982: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.

H.R. 6988: Mr. SMUCKER.

H.R. 6999: Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. TRONE, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 7010: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. STAUBER, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. BACON, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. ALLRED, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. CASE, Mr. BALDERSON, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. BURCHETT, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Ms. WILD, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. AXNE, Mr. MALINOWSKI, Mr. CISNEROS, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. PETERS, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. SLOTKIN, Ms. FINKENAUER, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. MCADAMS, Mr. COHEN, Ms. SHERRILL, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. COSTA, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. ROSE of New York, Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mrs. LURIA, Ms. CRAIG, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. KATKO, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. NORMAN, and Mr. WEBER of Texas.

H.R. 7012: Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 7016: Mr. ROUDA, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Mr. COURTNEY.

H.R. 7018: Mr. CICILLINE.

H. Res. 374: Mr. GUTHRIE.

H. Res. 493: Mr. GOHMERT.

H. Res. 835: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H. Res. 917: Mr. ABRAHAM.

H. Res. 944: Mr. KELLER.

H. Res. 952: Ms. SÁNCHEZ and Mr. POCAN.

H. Res. 975: Ms. WILD and Mr. CLEAVER.

H. Res. 979: Mr. TIMMONS and Mr. BANKS.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII, petitions and papers were laid on the clerk's desk and referred as follows:

98. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the City of Miami Florida, relative to Resolution R-20-0115, urging the Federal Government and the State of Florida, both at all necessary and appropriate levels, (a) to base all future aid regarding COVID-19 to be distributed directly to each municipality based upon the number of positive cases of COVID-19 in each municipality and not based upon population and (b) specifically to allow aid to be provided to municipalities with populations of less than 500,000 residents for past, present, and future direct and indirect costs and expenses; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

99. Also, a petition of the Town Board of the of Town of Yorktown, NY, relative to

May 27, 2020

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE

H2323

calling upon the President of the United States Donald J. Trump; Nancy Pelosi, Speaker of the House of Representatives; Mitch McConnell, Majority Leader of the United States Senate; United States Congressional Representatives Nita Lowey and Sean Patrick Maloney; and United States Senators Charles Schumer and Kirsten Gilli-

brand to support federal funding related to the coronavirus pandemic that is directly delivered to all municipalities, regardless of population size; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

100. Also, a petition of the Legislature of Erie County, NY, relative to INTRO. 9-11(2020), requesting that the Congress and

President Donald Trump amend the CARES Act to allow local governments to utilize the federal financial assistance to cover revenue shortfalls created by the COVID-19 crisis; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.