



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 166

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MAY 28, 2020

No. 100

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,

May 28, 2020.

I hereby appoint the Honorable ANDRÉ CARSON to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

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

Throughout the country, people mourn those whom they have lost; people lament the loss of businesses, of normalcy.

100,000 have now died of COVID-19. They were Democrats and Republicans. They lived in urban areas, and now, more and more, in rural areas. They were the descendants of men and women who were colonists, or Founding Fathers, and immigrants who had recently become citizens. They were disproportionately people of color, but not only of color, and of every religion and culture in this Nation.

When, O Lord, will we come to understand that we are all in this together, that if we do not stand together, we risk falling together? Heal the divisions within our body politic, within this Chamber, so that Your healing power, through our actions and goodwill, can be manifest in our United States.

May everything done this day, and in the days and weeks to come, be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. LAMALFA 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 five requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

BLACK LIVES MATTER

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

Mr. KENNEDY. "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

Tell me, where was the right to life for Breonna Taylor, who was killed in her own bed by police and her boyfriend arrested for trying to protect her?

Where is the liberty for Ahmaud Arbery, killed for going for a jog, or Eric Garner, killed while begging for

his breath, or George Floyd, killed while under the knee of an officer uttering those same words, "I can't breathe"?

Where is the pursuit of happiness for Christian Cooper, who couldn't go bird watching without having the cops called on him?

Where is the equality in a nation where we proclaim that Black lives matter, yet we see our own neighbors' humanity stolen and still fail to provide justice?

250 years after our Nation wrote those words, those rights are not unalienable. If you are Black in America today, they do not exist.

All of us, any of us—with power and privilege—are accountable. We owe them better.

INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE NEEDS TO GET IT TOGETHER

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

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, last I knew, 20 million American had not received their stimulus checks.

In the 3 months since the CARES Act, I have been patient; South Dakotans have been patient as they wait for help some of them truly need.

Mr. Speaker, my patience has run low, especially since Americans are also waiting months for their tax returns.

Ben, from Marshall County, filed his in February. He is \$400 short on rent. He has been counting on his tax return. It is his money. But the IRS has not returned his phone calls, and they have not returned the phone calls or emails of congressional offices.

Workers in hospitals and in factories and in packing plants and in banks are working overtime to meet the needs of this Nation. I do not see that same

□ 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.

H2325

dedication from the leadership of the IRS, and it is past time, Mr. Speaker, for them to get it together.

TIME TO GIVE AMERICA HOPE

(Mrs. MCBATH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MCBATH. Mr. Speaker, this is not the time to back down.

In my home State of Georgia, hard-working Georgians have been laid off, small businesses have had to close, and families are worried about the health and well-being of their loved ones.

Americans everywhere are counting on us to help them get through this crisis as safely as possible. This is what we are sent to Washington to do: to protect and to uplift our communities in a time such as this.

We must work together, Republicans and Democrats, to make a difference in the lives of those we represent when they need us most.

This is the time to give America hope.

This is the time to govern with our hearts, and not partisan politics, because we can get through this pandemic together, stronger and more unified than before.

REMEMBERING SAM JOHNSON

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in sadness today, acknowledging the news I received late last night of the loss of our former colleague from Texas, Mr. Sam Johnson, a great American.

I had the pleasure of knowing him personally. His story is amazing of his life serving our country. Of course, he is known as being a Vietnam POW, held 7 years in what is known as the Hanoi Hilton.

He wrote a book about his exploits, including that part, called "Captive Warriors: A Vietnam POW's Story." I would highly recommend everybody get that and then pass it along.

My sweetest memory of him is Leader MCCARTHY invited a group of about 10 of us Members to go have dinner with him one night and just sit and listen to this man talk about his life, not only the negative of being a POW, but what we always saw here in his positive, upbeat spirit all the time.

This guy was a true cool guy. He was a Thunderbird aerobatic team member and also later directed the Air Force Fighter Weapons School, which is known as the Top Gun version of the Air Force.

This was an all-around great American. We will miss him badly.

THE NEED FOR PERSONAL PROTECTIVE EQUIPMENT

(Ms. SCANLON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, we have lost over 100,000 lives to this pandemic—that we know of—and people on the front lines are still waiting for the PPE they need to protect themselves and our communities.

Every single day, healthcare providers, States, and first responders tell us that they are being forced to compete for high-priced supplies, if they can find any at all. They are told to keep a 90-day supply for the fall surge, when it is a miracle if they have enough supplies for 2 weeks.

Our frontline workers are feeling abandoned by their government. How can we blame them?

The President is claiming victory in a crisis we are still fighting, visiting State after State and saying it is safe to reopen completely when it is not. He has the authority to use the Defense Production Act to increase production of PPE to save lives and chooses not to, while the safety of our frontline workers hangs in the balance.

We have sent countless letters, introduced bills, and passed legislation. We need the President to act. The American people need straight talk, not magical thinking. We need leaders who listen to civil servants when they raise alarms, not fire the messenger.

We can defeat this pandemic if we hear the facts and act on them.

AMERICA'S LIVESTOCK INDUSTRY IN CRISIS

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

Mr. HAGEDORN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because America's livestock industry is in crisis. In southern Minnesota and across the country, this has particularly hit our hog farmers. They are in big trouble. Packing plant disruptions have led to excess hogs and the actual destruction of animals and not even using the meat for the food supply.

The situation is so bad that, this week, I introduced legislation to mitigate losses in this area. I introduced the Livestock Producer Assistance for COVID-19 Damages Act. This bill will expand the USDA's Emergency Assistance for Livestock, Honeybees, and Farm-Raised Catfish Program to cover income losses for farmers and producers who have been unable to market livestock due to packing plant closures.

In Minnesota, our hog operators make a significant contribution to our State's economy. According to a study from the University of Minnesota, current disruptions in the pork supply chain, coupled with the current 15 percent unemployment rate, could result in an estimated loss of \$660 million of economic activity in our State. The researchers also concluded that a 15 percent drop in hog production would lead to an estimated loss of 2,100 Minnesota jobs.

While these statistics are rightfully alarming, this problem is not unique to Minnesota. States like South Dakota, Missouri, North Carolina, Virginia, and Iowa have similar issues. Pork and livestock producers are suffering huge losses, financial and otherwise, and all through no fault of their own.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me in supporting this bill. We must stand with our family farmers and defend the interests of rural communities, the American economy, and our food supply.

INNOVATIVE SOLUTIONS TO HEALTHCARE ISSUES

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

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. Speaker, with so much uncertainty in our future, families shouldn't have the additional burden of worrying about the state of their healthcare. Unfortunately, though, COVID-19 has only further exposed the cracks in our healthcare system and forced us all to face the urgency with which we must work to address them.

As we continue to respond to the public health crisis, I have been working with my colleagues here in the House to find innovative and timely solutions for the problems that COVID-19 continues to exacerbate.

Over the past several months, I have fought for the price of insulin and other drugs to be lowered immediately because families that are struggling need access to lifesaving medication. I fought alongside my colleagues for more supplies for our healthcare workers, for hospitals, and for community healthcare centers.

We can't let up now. We must continue to take steps that address the health disparities that place a significant and dangerous burden on American families.

I would like to join my colleagues and constituents in remembering the lives tragically lost during this pandemic and recommit to working together to help families across our country stay safe.

HONORING JACK "JD" BARNES SHAW

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Jack "JD" Barnes Shaw of Russell, Pennsylvania, for accepting a fully qualified appointment to the United States Naval Academy.

Jack is the son of James and Ruth Shaw and a senior at Agora Cyber Charter School. During his time in school, Jack was very involved with the Boy Scouts, Civil Air Patrol, and fencing.

Over the years, Jack has held many leadership positions, including senior patrol leader in his Boy Scout troop and a Sea Scout National Quarterdeck, a representative on the Sea Scout National Committee. He is an Eagle Scout and has been recognized as the 2018 Northeast Region Sea Scout of the Year.

Jack's dedication and discipline are two traits that will lead to his success at the U.S. Naval Academy. Jack is a proven leader. I wish him the best in this exciting new chapter of his life.

□ 0915

RECOGNIZING JOE JOYCE

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

Mr. ROSE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember all those who we have lost to the coronavirus, and one man in particular who is close to my heart and the hearts of thousands of people in my district.

Joe Joyce may best be known for his bar in Bay Ridge, J.J. Bubbles, but the truth is he served our community much more than cold beer. His generous spirit touched countless lives on both sides of the Verrazzano.

Joe was an Army veteran who served in Vietnam, and after he returned home his service continued. He worked as a phys ed teacher for disabled students on Staten Island, supported the Special Olympics, and would offer up his bar to host fundraisers for any organization who asked. That was one thing that never changed over the 42 years Joe was in business. As soon as you walked into J.J. Bubbles you were family.

Today, we remember and think of Joe's family: his wife, Jane; his children, Eddie, Kristin, Kevin; and his six grandchildren. Joe's loss can be felt all throughout my district, but his gift to all of us was his unique ability to bring people of all stripes together, and that is a gift we need now more than ever.

QUALITY HEALTHCARE FOR VETERANS

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

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of S. 3084, the Competitive Pay for Leaders in Veterans Healthcare Act. This legislation was introduced by my good friend and fellow Kansan, the chairman of the Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs, Senator JERRY MORAN.

Our Nation's veterans deserve the best care possible. We must ensure that the VA can recruit and retain high-quality talented leaders. The Competitive Pay for Leaders in Veterans Healthcare Act is less about the leaders, actually, it is more about the veterans as the quality of their care is the

direct result of the quality of the VA leadership.

Mr. Speaker, that is why I support the Competitive Pay for Leaders in Veterans Healthcare Act and encourage my colleagues to do the same. No one fights harder for our veterans than President Trump. He has always made us a top priority, and I am glad that he and the VA Secretary will support this measure, and I look forward to its passage.

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.

VETERANS' COMPENSATION COST-OF-LIVING ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 2020

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 6168) to increase, effective as of December 1, 2020, the rates of compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for the survivors of certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 6168

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 "Veterans' Compensation Cost-of-Living Adjustment Act of 2020".

SEC. 2. INCREASE IN RATES OF DISABILITY COMPENSATION AND DEPENDENCY AND INDEMNITY COMPENSATION.

(a) RATE ADJUSTMENT.—Effective on December 1, 2020, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall increase, in accordance with subsection (c), the dollar amounts in effect on November 30, 2020, for the payment of disability compensation and dependency and indemnity compensation under the provisions specified in subsection (b).

(b) AMOUNTS TO BE INCREASED.—The dollar amounts to be increased pursuant to subsection (a) are the following:

(1) WARTIME DISABILITY COMPENSATION.—Each of the dollar amounts under section 1114 of title 38, United States Code.

(2) ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION FOR DEPENDENTS.—Each of the dollar amounts under section 1115(1) of such title.

(3) CLOTHING ALLOWANCE.—The dollar amount under section 1162 of such title.

(4) DEPENDENCY AND INDEMNITY COMPENSATION TO SURVIVING SPOUSE.—Each of the dollar amounts under subsections (a) through (d) of section 1311 of such title.

(5) DEPENDENCY AND INDEMNITY COMPENSATION TO CHILDREN.—Each of the dollar amounts under sections 1313(a) and 1314 of such title.

(c) DETERMINATION OF INCREASE.—Each dollar amount described in subsection (b) shall be increased by the same percentage as the

percentage by which benefit amounts payable under title II of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 401 et seq.) are increased effective December 1, 2020, as a result of a determination under section 215(i) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 415(i)).

(d) SPECIAL RULE.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs may adjust administratively, consistent with the increases made under subsection (a), the rates of disability compensation payable to persons under section 10 of Public Law 85–857 (72 Stat. 1263) who have not received compensation under chapter 11 of title 38, United States Code.

SEC. 3. PUBLICATION OF ADJUSTED RATES.

The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall publish in the Federal Register the amounts specified in section 2(b), as increased under that section, not later than the date on which the matters specified in section 215(i)(2)(D) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 415(i)(2)(D)) are required to be published by reason of a determination made under section 215(i) of such Act during fiscal year 2021.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO) and the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DAVID P. ROE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to insert extraneous materials on H.R. 6168.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 6168, the Veterans' Compensation Cost-of-Living Adjustment Act of 2020 increases veterans' disability compensation at the same rate as the annual Social Security increase. This puts a little extra money in the pockets of our disabled veterans and their families to make sure VA benefits keep pace with inflation.

While this increase may be a small one, it is an essential one that veterans and their families rely on us passing each year. In my time as chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, I have had the opportunity to speak to and know many veterans. Many of them highlight this bill as a priority for them and their families.

The cost-of-living adjustment, or COLA, is vital for ensuring that veterans' benefits do not decline due to changes in the economy. For veterans with service-connected disabilities, this annual change is an assurance to them and their families that their benefits will remain consistent. It is a guarantee we make to them and a great source of comfort to many veterans and their families.

As our country deals with the novel coronavirus pandemic, and the severe economic effects it will have, it is more important than ever that we pass this yearly COLA increase so that veterans and their families trust that their benefits will not decline due to inflation.

I want to recognize the work of the Disability Assistance and Memorial Affairs Subcommittee chair, ELAINE LURIA, for introducing H.R. 6168. I wholeheartedly support H.R. 6168, and urge all of my colleagues to do so as well.

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

Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 6168, the Veterans' Compensation Cost-of-Living Adjustment Act of 2020. The bill was introduced by Disability Assistance and Memorial Affairs Subcommittee Chair ELAINE LURIA and Ranking Member MIKE BOST. I appreciate their leadership on this important issue.

The Department of Veterans Affairs provides compensation benefits to help fulfill our obligation to take care of the brave men and women who have been injured during their service to this great Nation.

H.R. 6168 would authorize a cost-of-living increase for veterans and their families next year, if Social Security recipients receive an increase. The annual COLA is necessary to help veterans and families afford their living expenses when prices go up.

Currently, many of our Nation's veterans may have been affected by this pandemic and are worried about how they are going to pay their bills. The last thing that should be on their minds is whether the value of their VA benefits will keep pace with inflation.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage all Members to support H.R. 6168.

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

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Virginia (Mrs. LURIA), my good friend and the chairwoman of the Disability Assistance and Memorial Affairs Subcommittee, the author of H.R. 6168, and a former naval commander.

Mrs. LURIA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in support of my bipartisan bill, H.R. 6168, the Veterans' Compensation Cost-of-Living Adjustment Act of 2020.

During these trying times, I continue to keep our Nation's veterans at the top of my mind as they face unprecedented challenges due to the coronavirus pandemic. This bill will provide the economic relief and pay raise that our veterans have earned.

It is an honor to represent more than 102,000 veterans, the highest total of any district in Virginia, and one of the highest in the country. Our veterans put their lives on the line and deployed far from home to keep America safe. As a 20-year Navy veteran myself, I am proud to bring a bill to the floor that protects the benefits our veterans have earned from their service to our country.

H.R. 6168 provides cost-of-living increases for wartime disability compensation, compensation for depend-

ents, clothing allowance, dependency and indemnities compensation for spouses, and dependency and indemnity compensation for surviving children.

Congress must honor our commitment to those American heroes who served in harm's way so that we could live in peace at home. As we continue to fight this pandemic, I ask that we all keep in mind those who have kept us safe at home and abroad.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 6168, and join me and Ranking Member MIKE BOST in protecting the earned benefits for our Nation's veterans.

Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close. I appreciate the Members, Mrs. LURIA and Mr. BOST, bringing this important bill up. We pass it every year. I encourage all of my colleagues to support this bill.

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

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I, too, urge all of my colleagues to join me in passing H.R. 6168.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 6168.

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.

MAJOR MEDICAL FACILITY AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2020

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 3414) to authorize major medical facility projects for the Department of Veterans Affairs for fiscal year 2020, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 3414

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 "Major Medical Facility Authorization Act of 2020".

SEC. 2. AUTHORIZATION OF MAJOR MEDICAL FACILITY PROJECTS OF DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2020.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs may carry out the following major medical facility projects in fiscal year 2020 at the locations specified and in an amount for each project not to exceed the amount specified for such location:

(1) Construction of an outpatient clinic and national cemetery in Alameda, California, in an amount not to exceed \$113,332,000.

(2) Realignment and closure of the Livermore Campus in Livermore, California, in an amount not to exceed \$311,730,000.

(3) Construction of a new medical facility in Louisville, Kentucky, in an amount not to exceed \$860,000,000.

(4) Construction relating to flood recovery of the medical center in Manhattan, New

York, in an amount not to exceed \$372,600,000.

(5) Construction of a spinal cord injury building with a community living center, including a parking garage, in San Diego, California, in an amount not to exceed \$230,840,000.

(6) Completion of construction of a medical facility project, including a parking garage, in San Juan, Puerto Rico, in an amount not to exceed \$307,000,000.

(7) Construction of a new critical care center in West Los Angeles, California, in an amount not to exceed \$75,790,000.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs for fiscal year 2020 or the year in which funds are appropriated for the Construction, Major Projects account, \$2,271,292,000 for the projects authorized in subsection (a).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO) and the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DAVID P. ROE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to insert extraneous material on S. 3414.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 3414, the Major Medical Facility Authorization Act of 2020.

Each year the Department of Veterans Affairs submits an annual budget request to Congress, and then it is our job to authorize and appropriate the funding that VA needs to care for America's veterans and their families.

Within that larger funding request is VA's request for funds to replace and modernize its medical facilities. This year's major construction requests total \$2.27 billion, and will build a new critical care center in West Los Angeles, California; complete construction of a medical facility project in San Juan, Puerto Rico; construct a spinal cord injury center with a community living center in San Diego, California; complete flood recovery construction at the medical center in Manhattan, New York; and fully fund the medical facility replacement project in Louisville, Kentucky; as well as construct an outpatient clinic and a national cemetery in Alameda, California; and finally, realign the Livermore, California campus.

Mr. Speaker, with a major construction need that totals more than \$15 billion, this authorization takes needed steps to reduce the backlog of major construction projects.

It is no secret that VA's infrastructure is old. The average age of its facilities is 60. The Secretary of the VA himself, Secretary Wilkie, emphasized this point by making the statement: There are several VA facilities that Abraham Lincoln would recognize.

Even with outdated facilities, the Annals of Internal Medicine found in a 2018 report that VA provides better care than private options in most cases. That is right. VA provides better care, even though they are working from outdated facilities. What would those findings look like if VA was competing with a modern infrastructure?

Mr. Speaker, not only does VA provide better care, veterans want to use VA-delivered healthcare. A survey conducted by the Veterans of Foreign Wars found that 92 percent of veterans who participated in the survey responded that fixing VA facilities was the best way to improve VA's delivery of healthcare to veterans.

Ninety percent of respondents who use VA stated they would recommend VA healthcare to another veteran.

It is clear that veterans, given the option, want to preserve the VA healthcare system and feel that it is a quality option for veterans to receive care.

Mr. Speaker, that is why I support S. 3414. I thank Senator MORAN, the chairman of the Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for prioritizing and passing this legislation.

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

□ 0930

Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 3414, the VA Major Medical Facility Authorization Act. This bill is sponsored by my good friends on the other side of the Capitol, Chairman JERRY MORAN and Ranking Member JON TESTER of the Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

This bill would authorize the construction of the Department of Veterans Affairs major medical facility projects in Kentucky, California, New York, and Puerto Rico. The COVID-19 pandemic has shown us the value of the VA healthcare system in serving not just our Nation's veterans, which is the Department's foremost responsibility, but also in supporting all Americans during times of crisis.

The seven projects that would be authorized in this legislation have been requested by the administration in VA's most recent budget submission. They would increase access to high-quality care and services to veterans of all ages and eras. It would also ensure that VA is better able to fulfill the Department's important service training, research, and emergency response missions.

Mr. Speaker, to associate myself with the chairman's remarks, Abraham Lincoln would recognize the VA medical center in my hometown, which was authorized right after the Civil War and opened in 1903 as an Old Soldiers' Home and now is a first-class VA medical center.

I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I am prepared to close. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers. I urge all of my colleagues to join in supporting this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I encourage all of my colleagues to vote "yes" on passage of this important legislation, S. 3414, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 3414.

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.

MODIFYING PAY LIMITATION FOR CERTAIN HIGH-LEVEL EMPLOYEES AND OFFICERS OF DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 3084) to amend title 38, United States Code, to modify the limitation on pay for certain high-level employees and officers of the Department of Veterans Affairs, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 3084

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

SECTION 1. MODIFICATION OF PAY LIMITATION FOR CERTAIN HIGH-LEVEL EMPLOYEES AND OFFICERS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

(a) MODIFICATION.—Section 7404(d) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by inserting "and except for individuals appointed under sections 7401(4) and 7306 of this title," after "section 7457 of this title,".

(b) WAIVERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs may waive the limitation described in section 7404(d) of such title, as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act, on the amount of basic pay payable to individuals appointed under section 7401(4) or 7306 of such title for basic pay payable during the period—

(A) beginning on November 1, 2010; and

(B) ending on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) FORM.—The Secretary shall prescribe the form for requesting a waiver under paragraph (1).

(3) TREATMENT OF WAIVER.—A decision not to grant a waiver under paragraph (1) shall not be treated as an adverse action and is not subject to further appeal, third-party review, or judicial review.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO) and the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DAVID P. ROE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members

may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to insert extraneous material on S. 3084, as amended.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 3084, as amended, a bill to modify the limitation on pay for certain high-level employees and officers of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

This legislation retroactively authorizes VA to waive a limitation for basic pay for SES-equivalent employees employed at VA dating back to November 1, 2010. These are senior-level clinicians who oversee critical VA medical operations at the VA Central Office and in Veterans Integrated Service Networks.

Due to a conflicting interpretation of the law, these senior-level employees were overpaid by VA for almost 10 years. VA did not notify Congress that it had been interpreting the pay cap in its statute as not applying to these employees until this year.

Mr. Speaker, the Office of Management and Budget and Office of Personnel Management have said this is an issue that affects approximately 40 senior VA employees, some of whom play critical support roles in VA's response to the global COVID-19 pandemic.

Now, without this legislative fix, these employees, through no fault of their own, will be liable for a salary overpayment, plus any benefits tied to the salary, to include employee and agency retirement fund contributions.

While VA could request a waiver of this debt on behalf of the employees under the law, a waiver will not completely address the negative financial effects these employees will experience. Their retirement and Thrift Savings Plan matching debt cannot be corrected.

Mr. Speaker, VA has been making up the difference between the \$156,000 cap and the rate of pay that has been received by the affected employees with bonuses, which do not count toward employee and agency retirement fund contributions and other Federal benefits.

Since VA has faced significant challenges hiring qualified healthcare leaders in the past, removing any remaining barriers to ensuring VA can recruit and retain senior clinicians is crucial.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support S. 3084, as amended, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 3084, as amended. This bill is sponsored by Chairman JERRY MORAN and Ranking Member JON TESTER of the Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and I am grateful for them for introducing it.

S. 3084, as amended, would correct an error in existing law that impedes employees serving in Senior Executive Service-equivalent positions in the Department of Veterans Health Administration from receiving their full salaries. Congress passed legislation in 2010 to ensure that the individuals in those positions would be appropriately compensated for their work.

However, VA discovered a technical error in that legislation just last year that, unless corrected, would result in those hardworking men and women instead having their salaries significantly reduced. It would also result in VA having to issue and collect debts for current and former employees who served in these high-level positions over the last decade. That is certainly not what Congress intended.

The VA employees who are impacted by this issue are serving in mission-critical positions across the VA healthcare system. Many of them have been working around the clock, leading VA's response to the COVID-19 pandemic. They are responsible for ensuring that veterans and VA employees are safe and well cared for and that VA is able to fulfill the Department's fourth mission obligation to support the national response to this crisis.

They and their colleagues have performed incredibly lifesaving work during the pandemic. I commend them for their efforts, which I know will continue to be critical in the weeks and months ahead. Making them whole by passing this bill today is the least we can do for them in return.

I am glad to be back at work in our Nation's Capitol, as our constituents always intended for us to be, and to support this bill today as a small token of appreciation to the VA leaders who are steering the Department through the crisis on behalf of our Nation's veterans and families.

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

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I am prepared to close. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time. I have no further speakers, and I am prepared to close.

I would like to start, since Monday was Memorial Day, to associate myself with the remarks of Mr. LAMALFA from California about Sam Johnson, one of our colleagues.

Sam Johnson is one of the reasons I am so proud to have served in this body. Sam was one of the most incredible human beings I have ever met. He spent over 40 months in solitary confinement, chained to a concrete floor. This man came back to this country as a Wounded Warrior, but he did not let that stop him. He went ahead and had a very fulfilling life and really affected many of us in ways Sam will never know.

I can remember seeing Sam on this floor. Sam was so beat up in his captivity that he would take his voting

card and have to step up, raise up on his toes to put his card—I would get tears in my eyes watching him—put his card in that voting machine over there to cast his vote.

We owe Sam and many veterans like him who have given the ultimate sacrifice to this great country a debt that we can never pay back.

I served at the same time that Sam did. I was in the 2nd Infantry Division in Korea but I did not serve in Vietnam, and I can't thank those men and women enough.

To my colleagues, my brothers and sisters, welcome home.

Mr. Speaker, before I yield back, I would like to take a moment to thank Chairman TAKANO and the leadership on both sides of the aisle for bringing these three important bills to the floor today. Our actions show that, like many other Americans, we can continue to do our jobs and our part to reopen the country and our economy in a safe and productive way.

While I am pleased that we are debating these bills today, I am disappointed that H.R. 3504, the Ryan Kules and Paul Benne Specially Adaptive Housing Improvement Act of 2019, was not included on today's agenda. H.R. 3504 is a bipartisan bill introduced by Representatives GUS BILIRAKIS and MIKE LEVIN that would make important improvements to the specially adaptive housing program that helps severely injured veterans adapt their homes.

The bill would also require important changes to the administration of VA work-study benefits and make improvements to the GI Bill.

The bill has already passed the House and has now come back over from the Senate. It represents a four corners bicameral agreement, and the bill is strongly supported by our veterans service organizations.

I hope in the coming days we can pass the bill and send it to President Trump's desk as soon as possible. During this difficult time, we should be doing all we can to help support severely disabled veterans and student veterans.

I thank the chairman. During this time that we have been at home with our constituents and with our families and really confined, we tried to continue to work, and I want to commend the chairman on being able to do this.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I associate myself with the remarks about the memory of our recently departed former Member. Of course, all of our Vietnam veterans who paid the ultimate sacrifice but also those who came back from that service in that war, we all owe a debt of gratitude toward them.

I recall my own uncle, who, unfortunately, committed suicide. I remember coming back from school and learning that he had committed suicide. We

have so many of our Vietnam-era veterans who are extremely vulnerable because they have underlying conditions. I know that many of our veterans have been playing leadership roles among their neighbors to lead their neighbors in responding to COVID-19, the novel coronavirus.

I thank all of those veterans across our country for leading that effort. Coming off of the Memorial Day weekend, it is certainly always a poignant holiday that we observe in recognition of those who made the ultimate sacrifice.

With regard to S. 3084, I urge my colleagues to pass it. It is the right thing to do. We need to do right by the senior leaders of the VA. We need to make sure that we continue to attract the very best to serve our veterans in the service of the Veterans Department.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 3084, 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.

□ 0945

SMALL BUSINESS TRANSPARENCY AND REPORTING FOR THE UNDERBANKED AND TAXPAYERS AT HOME ACT

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 6782) to require the Administrator of the Small Business Administration to submit a report on recipients of assistance under the paycheck protection program and the economic injury disaster loan program, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 6782

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 "Small Business Transparency and Reporting for the Underbanked and Taxpayers at Home Act" or the "TRUTH Act".

SEC. 2. REPORT.

Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Small Business Administration shall make publicly available, in an online format that is sortable and searchable for key words and downloadable (to the extent technically practicable), the following information with respect to the paycheck protection program and the economic injury disaster loan program:

(1) An identification of each recipient of assistance in an amount greater than \$2,000,000 from funds appropriated under the CARES Act (Public Law 116-136) or the Paycheck Protection Program and Health Care Enhancement Act (Public Law 116-139).

(2) An explanation of the decision-making processes under which such funds were disbursed.

(3) The number of employees of each entity that received such assistance.

(4) The date on which such assistance was disbursed.

(5) An identification of each lender or intermediary through which such assistance was disbursed.

(6) The amount of assistance provided to small business concerns owned and controlled by socially and economically disadvantaged individuals (as defined in section 8(d)(3)(C) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 637(d)(3)(C)), small business concern owned and controlled by women (as defined under section 3(n) of such Act (15 U.S.C. 632(n)), and small business concern owned and controlled by veterans (as defined in section 3(q) of such Act (15 U.S.C. 632(q))), from information voluntarily provided by such concerns.

SEC. 3. COMMITMENTS FOR 7(a) LOANS.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the amounts authorized for commitments for general business loans authorized under section 7(a) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(a)) under the heading "BUSINESS LOANS PROGRAM ACCOUNT" under the heading "SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION" under title V of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2020 (Public Law 116-93; 133 Stat. 2475) shall apply with respect to loans made under such section 7(a), other than loans made under paragraph (36) of such section 7(a), on and after the date of enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the measure under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the bill before us today, H.R. 6782, the Small Business Transparency and Reporting for the Underbanked and Taxpayers at Home Act, or the TRUTH Act.

The CARES Act and the Paycheck Protection Program and Health Care Enhancement Act provided over \$725 billion in relief to nonprofits, small businesses, and the independently employed who are struggling to cope with the economic downturn brought about by the spread of COVID-19.

By utilizing the SBA's Economic Injury Disaster Loan Program and creating the Paycheck Protection Program, Congress took swift action to provide a necessary lifeline. And while both programs have saved countless livelihoods, jobs, and businesses, millions more remain left out.

Unfortunately, it won't matter how much money Congress spends to ad-

dress these problems if Congress cannot track where the money is going to verify that it is reaching the families and businesses that need it most.

To that end, my colleagues and I have sent multiple oversight letters to SBA requesting detailed data and information on the implementation of the Paycheck Protection Program and Economic Injury Disaster Loans. To date, we have not received anything more than what SBA has published on their website. This is simply unacceptable.

It is vital that the administration be transparent and good stewards of taxpayers' dollars. I am proud to support the bipartisan effort before us today, led by my esteemed colleagues Mr. PHILLIPS of Minnesota and Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania.

The bill requires SBA to publish an online database of the recipients of PPP and EIDL loans over \$2 million. It would also list the number of employees at each business benefiting from this assistance and the amount of funds provided to underserved businesses.

This is precisely the kind of data Congress needs to ensure that the programs are being administered as intended and, more importantly, to ensure the scarce funds are reaching those communities and businesses that need it most.

Furthermore, the bill includes language that will decouple the 7(a) loan program and Paycheck Protection Program accounts.

Currently, both programs share the same appropriations account, meaning that once the Paycheck Protection Program appropriation lapses, the 7(a) loan program will shut down along with it. It was never congressional intent to tie the future of both programs together, so in order to preserve the sustainability of the 7(a) loan program, it is necessary to decouple the two accounts.

At a time when the future of the small business economy is so uncertain, it is of top importance to ensure the long-term sustainability of the 7(a) loan program. This language achieves that goal.

I applaud the bipartisanship and, more importantly, the commitment to being good stewards of the taxpayers' dollars.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues, Republican and Democrat, to join me in voting for stronger transparency and oversight of the CARES Act programs. Our hardworking small business owners and the American people deserve no less.

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

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

I rise in reluctant opposition to H.R. 6782, the Small Business Transparency and Reporting for the Underbanked and Taxpayers at Home Act, or the TRUTH Act, as amended.

Mr. Speaker, I do want to express my appreciation to Chairwoman

VELÁZQUEZ and her staff for working with me and with my staff on this legislation, as well as many other pieces of legislation in the past.

On this specific bill, we were able to negotiate a couple of changes that made the bill slightly more palatable for those of us on this side of the aisle, and that would have not happened without the chairwoman's leadership, so we do appreciate that.

That said, philosophically, it is exceptionally difficult for me and others on this side of the aisle to accept the bill in its entirety. For instance, I am a firm believer that small businesses are just that, small businesses; and as long as they qualify under the Small Business Act and the SBA size standards, no one small business ought to have to do anything different under the law than any other small business.

In addition to all the burdensome reporting requirements this legislation would impose on small businesses, there are two specific provisions that are difficult for us to support.

First, the bill we have before us attempts to name—and some would say, shame—businesses that are recent PPP loan recipients above \$2 million. And I do appreciate Chairwoman VELÁZQUEZ going from \$250,000 to \$2 million.

These businesses—at least the ones that acted in good faith—followed the law and the guidelines and received their loans based on the best information available at that time, and I do not believe that those businesses should be put on public display for potential shaming.

If they didn't follow the rules, we have remedies for calling them out, such as the SBA's Office of the Inspector General, even the Department of Justice, to seek out waste, fraud, and abuse. Publicly naming them will do little to increase transparency or anything else, for that matter, we believe.

Second, the bill requires, albeit voluntarily, small businesses to disclose whether they are economically disadvantaged, minority owned, women owned, or veteran owned. As I mentioned previously, I believe we ought to be making regulatory burdens fewer and farther between, not imposing more paperwork that doesn't help any business fight this pandemic.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I reluctantly oppose this legislation but again thank the chairwoman for her leadership and willingness to work with us on these bills and on many issues facing America's small businesses moving forward.

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

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PHILLIPS), the sponsor of the bill.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairwoman VELÁZQUEZ for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about truth.

Now, you would think that truth would not be up for debate in this Chamber, yet here we stand literally

debating my bill, the TRUTH Act, which simply injects transparency and accountability into the very largest expenditure of taxpayer money in American history.

That is it. There is no hidden agenda, just a straightforward requirement for the Small Business Administration to publish information about how Federal relief dollars are flowing and where they are going. And that truth should be important to every American: business owners and patrons, bankers and borrowers, Republicans and Democrats.

We cannot accept a situation in which bigger businesses with access to other sources of liquidity are pushing to the front of the line at the expense of those with the greatest need, particularly minority-, women-, and veteran-owned businesses that are struggling the very most during the pandemic.

I won't accept it.

I am on a mission to restore Americans' faith in their government. But trust is earned by action, not by words. So I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting the TRUTH Act, in allowing the American people to see where their money is going and in ensuring that businesses that need relief the most are getting it.

They say that sunlight is the best disinfectant, and we could surely use more of it here.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time. I want to thank the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) on her leadership, and I regret that we cannot support this particular piece of legislation; however, I am certain that we will continue to work together in a bipartisan manner to address the needs of America's small businesses.

I would note, just in response, briefly, to the gentleman's mention that this is called the TRUTH Act, just because something is called the TRUTH Act doesn't necessarily mean that it is the truth, just like something called the Affordable Care Act doesn't necessarily mean it is going to make healthcare more affordable.

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

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, when this body spent trillions of dollars to address the economic downturn brought about by COVID-19, we included a special inspector general to provide oversight over the expenditure of these dollars. Unfortunately, President Trump said the special IG could not issue reports to Congress without Presidential supervision and subsequently removed the acting IG at the Pentagon and chairman of the panel.

So with the erosion of accountability, transparency is needed more than ever. Congress needs to ensure that there is no waste, fraud, or abuse of taxpayers' dollars.

□ 1000

This data collection and transparency bill is a positive step in that direction, providing much-needed transparency and accountability. Knowledge is power and, with this bill, the public will finally have the knowledge on how these programs have been implemented, where the money has gone, who has gotten it and who hasn't.

Not only will this empower the people, it will empower Congress as we continue working to optimize the CARES Act programs.

The bill also clarifies the program accounts for the Paycheck Protection Program and the 7(a) Loan Program are wholly distinct, ensuring that the SBA's flagship lending program will not shut down when the Paycheck Protection Program appropriation lapses.

As the small business economy begins to recover in the coming weeks and months, small businesses need to be able to access affordable capital to rehire workers, restock their shelves, and resume operations. This language ensures the 7(a) program will be an option for them in the next phase of recovery.

I urge my colleagues to support this measure, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 6782, the Small Business Transparency and Reporting for the Underbanked and Taxpayers at Home Act or TRUTH Act, which directs the Small Business Administration (SBA) to explain and justify all disbursements of coronavirus relief funds, ensuring transparency and accountability from this critical agency.

Together, the CARES Act and the Payroll Protection Program and Health Care Enhancement Act together allocated more than \$2 trillion to address the devastating coronavirus pandemic, the most expensive relief package ever authorized by Congress, and the largest outlay of taxpayer funds in all human history.

The stakes simply are too high to allow irresponsible stewardship, and those charged with disbursing coronavirus relief funds must be held to the highest standards and held to account for misfeasance or malfeasance.

Mr. Speaker, it is wholly unacceptable that the SBA has not to date provided full transparency over its administration of the Payroll Protection Program (PPP) and Economic Injury Disaster Loan Program (EIDL).

PPP and EIDL were created by Congress to provide relief for small businesses affected by the pandemic, and more than \$700 billion has been allocated in service of those goals.

However, in too many cases the programs did not function as Congress intended, and large organizations such as the Los Angeles Lakers received funding while many of our smallest and most vulnerable businesses were unable to secure assistance.

In light of this mismanagement, it is imperative that SBA be subject to an exhaustive audit of its handling of PPP and EIDL funding.

The agency has refused to do so voluntarily, requiring Congress to mandate compliance from the agency that exists to serve small business, the backbone of the American economy.

The TRUTH Act would require the SBA to make the following information publicly avail-

able in an online, searchable, sortable, and downloadable format within 30 days of passage:

1. The identity of every recipient of a grant or loan that was funded by the CARES Act or the Payroll Protection Program and Health Care Enhancement Act;

2. An explanation of the SBA's decision-making process;

3. The number of employees at the entity in question;

4. The date when the grant or loan was disbursed;

5. The identification number of the bank or lender that administered the grant or loan; and

6. The amount of assistance provided to small businesses owned by socially and economically disadvantaged individuals, women, and veterans.

Mr. Speaker, the COVID-19 pandemic has challenged us in ways we could have scarcely imagined; it has claimed lives and destroyed livelihoods all across our nation.

We are in this together and we will come out stronger and better.

And we do that by caring for each other and rendering equal, justice and fairness, whether it is in the area of coronavirus testing, distribution of PPE, or economic assistance.

Our small businesses need help and they need the truth, which is why I urge my colleagues to join me in voting to pass H.R. 6782, the TRUTH Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 6782, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3 of House Resolution 965, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question are postponed.

PAYCHECK PROTECTION PROGRAM FLEXIBILITY ACT OF 2020

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 7010) to amend the Small Business Act and the CARES Act to modify certain provisions related to the forgiveness of loans under the paycheck protection program, to allow recipients of loan forgiveness under the paycheck protection program to defer payroll taxes, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 7010

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 "Paycheck Protection Program Flexibility Act of 2020".

SEC. 2. MATURITY FOR LOANS WITH REMAINING BALANCE AFTER APPLICATION OF FORGIVENESS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 7(a)(36)(K)(ii) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(a)(36))

is amended by inserting “minimum maturity of 5 years and a” before “maximum maturity”.

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE; APPLICABILITY.**—The amendment made by this section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act and shall apply to any loan made pursuant to section 7(a)(36) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(a)(36)) on or after such date. Nothing in this Act, the CARES Act (Public Law 116-136), or the Paycheck Protection Program and Health Care Enhancement Act (Public Law 116-139) shall be construed to prohibit lenders and borrowers from mutually agreeing to modify the maturity terms of a covered loan described in subparagraph (K) of such section to conform with requirements of this section.

SEC. 3. AMENDMENTS TO PAYCHECK PROTECTION PROGRAM LOAN FORGIVENESS.

(a) **EXTENSION OF COVERED PERIOD.**—Section 7(a)(36)(A)(iii) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(a)(36)(A)(iii)) is amended by striking “June 30, 2020” and inserting “December 31, 2020”.

(b) **FORGIVENESS.**—Section 1106 of the CARES Act (Public Law 116-136) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking paragraph (3) and inserting the following:

“(3) the term ‘covered period’ means, subject to subsection (1), the period beginning on the date of the origination of a covered loan and ending the earlier of—

“(A) the date that is 24 weeks after such date of origination; or

“(B) December 31, 2020”;

(2) in subsection (d)—

(A) in paragraph (5)(B), by striking “June 30, 2020” each place it appears and inserting “December 31, 2020”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

“(7) **EXEMPTION BASED ON EMPLOYEE AVAILABILITY.**—During the period beginning on February 15, 2020, and ending on December 31, 2020, the amount of loan forgiveness under this section shall be determined without regard to a proportional reduction in the number of full-time equivalent employees if an eligible recipient, in good faith—

“(A) is able to document—

“(i) an inability to rehire individuals who were employees of the eligible recipient on February 15, 2020; and

“(ii) an inability to hire similarly qualified employees for unfilled positions on or before December 31, 2020; or

“(B) is able to document an inability to return to the same level of business activity as such business was operating at before February 15, 2020, due to compliance with requirements established or guidance issued by the Secretary of Health and Human Services, the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, or the Occupational Safety and Health Administration during the period beginning on March 1, 2020, and ending December 31, 2020, related to the maintenance of standards for sanitation, social distancing, or any other worker or customer safety requirement related to COVID-19.

“(8) **LIMITATION ON FORGIVENESS.**—To receive loan forgiveness under this section, an eligible recipient shall use at least 60 percent of the covered loan amount for payroll costs, and may use up to 40 percent of such amount for any payment of interest on any covered mortgage obligation (which shall not include any prepayment of or payment of principal on a covered mortgage obligation), any payment on any covered rent obligation, or any covered utility payment.”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(1) **APPLICATION TO CERTAIN ELIGIBLE RECIPIENTS.**—An eligible recipient that received

a covered loan before the date of enactment of this subsection may elect for the covered period applicable to such covered loan to end on the date that is 8 weeks after the date of the origination of such covered loan.”.

(c) **EXTENSION OF DEFERRAL PERIOD.**—Section 7(a)(36)(M) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(a)(36)(M)) is amended—

(1) in clause (ii)(II), by striking “for a period of not less than 6 months, including payment of principal, interest, and fees, and not more than 1 year.” and inserting the following: “, including payment of principal, interest, and fees, until the date on which the amount of forgiveness determined under section 1106 of the CARES Act is remitted to the lender.”;

(2) in clause (iii), by striking “for a period of not less than 6 months, including payment of principal, interest, and fees, and not more than 1 year.” and inserting the following: “, including payment of principal, interest, and fees, until the date on which the amount of forgiveness determined under section 1106 of the CARES Act is remitted to the lender.”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new clause:

“(v) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—If an eligible recipient fails to apply for forgiveness of a covered loan within 10 months after the last day of the covered period defined in section 1106(a) of the CARES Act, such eligible recipient shall make payments of principal, interest, and fees on such covered loan beginning on the day that is not earlier than the date that is 10 months after the last day of such covered period.”.

(d) **EFFECTIVE DATE; APPLICABILITY.**—The amendments made by this section shall be effective as if included in the CARES Act (Public Law 116-136) and shall apply to any loan made pursuant to section 7(a)(36) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(a)(36)) or section 1109 of the CARES Act.

SEC. 4. DELAY OF PAYMENT OF EMPLOYER PAYROLL TAXES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 2302(a) of the CARES Act (Public Law 116-136) is amended by striking paragraph (3).

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE; APPLICABILITY.**—The amendments made by this section shall be effective as if included in the CARES Act (Public Law 116-136) and shall apply to any loan made pursuant to section 7(a)(36) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(a)(36)) or section 1109 of the CARES Act.

SEC. 5. EMERGENCY DESIGNATION.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—This Act is designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 4(g) of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (2 U.S.C. 933(g)).

(b) **DESIGNATION IN SENATE.**—In the Senate, this Act is designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 4112(a) of H. Con. Res. 71 (115th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2018.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the measure under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of the bipartisan bill before us today, H.R. 7010, the Paycheck Protection Program Flexibility Act of 2020.

We all knew the rollout of the Paycheck Protection Program was going to be rocky, given the size of the program and the speed with which it was stood up.

We are thankful for the staff at SBA for their hard work assisting small businesses during this dire time. This is, undoubtedly, the most enormous undertaking the agency has ever performed. They have done so under difficult circumstances and remarkably quickly.

With that said, my colleagues and I have been hearing from Main Street small businesses that they need changes to make the program work for them.

I think we can all agree the economic crisis brought on by COVID-19 has proven more severe and drawn out than many anticipated. In some cases, State and local governments have extended shutdowns and stay-at-home orders. Many localities are only now allowing small businesses to reopen, very gradually, in phases.

In other instances, small business owners have reported concerns that the economy will not fully recover until there is an affordable, widely accessible COVID-19 vaccine.

Regardless, the extended nature of the economic downturn has made it necessary to enact certain legislative reforms to the program.

First, we need to give borrowers more than 8 weeks to use the funds in order to qualify for loan forgiveness. Borrowers who took out PPP loans early in the program are about to reach the end of their 8-week period governing forgiveness. However, millions of small businesses across the Nation are still facing forced closures.

Those that are reopening are required to do so in an extremely limited manner, with only outdoor dining or curbside-only pickup at retail stores. Those restrictions mean small businesses continue to have a tough road ahead, and they need flexibility in how they use this emergency capital. This provision will give them that.

The bill triples the current 8-week period in which businesses must use funds to be eligible for forgiveness to 24 weeks. That will help ensure businesses have more room to breathe, even in places where reopening of the economy happens more slowly.

Second, we must extend the program through the end of the year. The unpredictable spread of the virus, shortage of widespread testing, and lack of a vaccine mean that we do not know exactly when the small business sector will fully reopen and, when it does, how the “new normal” will look.

The bill addresses a challenge that was created when the first set of guidelines were issued. We have heard you

loud and clear. Today's legislation strikes a balance between protecting workers by guaranteeing loans are used for payroll, with the need to recognize that many independent restaurants face difficulty paying rent and utilities.

The new 60/40 ratio makes certain a business can remain open, weather the crisis, continue employing workers, and keep serving their local communities. Congress must revamp this program to make it more accessible for small employers to weather the uncertainty ahead.

We simply do not know if there will be another wave of infections or additional lockdowns. This bill provides certainty to employers afraid to use their loan proceeds or reluctant to apply to the program by providing much-needed flexibility.

I applaud my colleagues, Mr. PHILLIPS and Mr. ROY, for working together in a bipartisan manner to craft commonsense solutions for America's small businesses. I thank Ranking Member CHABOT for his assistance in crafting this bipartisan measure.

I urge all my colleagues to vote "yes," and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Unlike the previous bill, I am happy to say that I agree with the chairwoman, and I rise in strong support of H.R. 7010, the Paycheck Protection Program Flexibility Act of 2020, as amended.

I would, again, like to thank Chairwoman VELAZQUEZ for conducting this process in such a bipartisan manner. It is more important than ever to maintain our strong bilateral negotiations as we continue to combat the spread of COVID-19 and its devastating, absolutely devastating, effect on our economy, especially our small businesses in that economy.

Over the past 3 months, I have been in contact with literally thousands of small businesses, not only in my hometown of Cincinnati, but across the country. I have joined dozens of conference calls with my congressional colleagues and with their constituents and mine all the way from the State of Washington to the State of Florida, and just about everywhere in between.

There has been broad consensus during those interactions that the PPP program has served as a lifeline for small businesses and their employees, many of whom have been shut down through no fault of their own.

By and large, it would be hard to argue against the fact that the PPP program has, for the most part, been successful. Over 4 million small businesses have received a PPP loan thus far, allowing them to hang on as the COVID-19 pandemic spread across our Nation.

Of course, there have been some shortcomings, some unintended consequences. That will happen when you do 6 months of legislative work in 6

days. That is why we are here today, to fix some of the unintended consequences.

For example, when we crafted the original CARES Act back in March, the covered period was defined as 8 weeks. The true emergency period has evolved over time. This bill begins to address that.

To fix the miscalculation in how long this pandemic would last, this bill extends the 8-week original covered period to 24 weeks and creates an option allowing businesses that want to stay within the original 8-week window to do so. This promotes greater flexibility for small businesses to decide when it is best to start spending their PPP loan.

It is important to remember that this change isn't as simple as moving a few dates around. There are a lot of unintended consequences that we need to account for because more than 4 million loans have already gone through the program in the amount of half a trillion dollars.

First, the original CARES Act allows principal, interest, and fees to be deferred for between 6 and 12 months. The administration adjusted this deferment period to just 6 months through guidance.

This deferment time period needed to be shifted to ensure a business knows its loan forgiveness amount before its deferment period concludes. This bill accomplishes that by extending the deferment window to end once the SBA makes the forgiveness payment to the lender on the borrower's behalf.

Second, the bill amends the 75/25 rule which was inserted into the PPP by the administration through guidance to require 75 percent of the loan to be used on payroll costs and 25 percent to be used on mortgage interest, rent, and utilities. So that is what the previous rule called for, 75/25.

This bill replaced that with a 60/40 split to, again, give small businesses greater flexibility as to how to best utilize their PPP funds.

Third, the bill extends the 2-year maturity of the loan to a 5-year maturity for new loans to help small businesses struggling to make their payments in a weakened economy. Loans already processed remain at the 2-year maturity rate so that there is no retroactivity in this provision.

The bill makes clear that small businesses and lenders are free to negotiate modifications in the maturity terms if they both agree. Again, both have to agree, both the borrower or the small business and the lender.

Fourth, the bill allows businesses that receive PPP loan forgiveness to also receive their employer payroll tax deferment.

And that was a big issue. Many of the small businesses were concerned that they were losing one of the advantages that was in the original PPP program in the CARES Act. So this is back in. They will be able to take that business deduction from their taxes.

Fifth, the bill also codifies the rehire flexibility provision. So as long as a good-faith offer to return to work is provided to a recently laid off worker, the business will satisfy the head count requirements.

This safe harbor provision attempts to address the challenges many small businesses have had getting some employees to return to work with the \$600 Federal unemployment check per week on top of the State unemployment checks which they are also receiving.

Finally, the bill establishes a new safe harbor to account for businesses that are required by civil authority to open only at 50 percent capacity. This ensures that businesses that have no choice but to run at half capacity are not left behind by their counterparts who have the ability to operate fully. So it is a fairness issue.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this much-needed bipartisan bill that provides real solutions to American small businesses facing this very difficult situation.

□ 1015

Mr. Speaker, I again want to thank the chairwoman for working on this on a bipartisan basis.

This flexibility allows America's small businesses to go a long way to addressing many of the concerns that we heard time and time again from small businesses all across the country. They need to have the flexibility to spend the money most efficiently so that the businesses can actually stay afloat, make it through this pandemic, and, most importantly, be able to keep as many of their employees on the payroll so that they are able to support their families as possible.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to support this legislation on both sides of the aisle, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. VELAZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PHILLIPS).

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative VELAZQUEZ; Ranking Member CHABOT; my colleague, Mr. ROY from Texas, who has spent a lot of time in the political foxhole with me from the very beginning of this initiative; and all who have helped get the Paycheck Protection Program Flexibility Act to the floor.

But I want to spend my time today letting my constituents speak for themselves. For more than 43 years, Minnesotans have celebrated birthdays and Little League wins over burgers and cheese curds at Lions Tap, a family-owned restaurant in Eden Prairie, Minnesota, until COVID-19 changed everything. My team spoke with Bert, owner of Lions Tap, and when we asked for feedback about his experience with the Payroll Protection Program, he said this: "We definitely need the PPP. The problem is that because our business is a restaurant, we are not able to open it up fully where we could hire our entire staff back under the conditions of the loan. It is imperative that

we are allowed forgiveness for expenses beyond the original 8-week period. We also need to loosen up the restrictions of nonpayroll expenses beyond the 25 percent. The complexities of balancing staying open or closing will be determined by what the government will be able to change on the PPP in this bill."

Bert is not alone. On a Zoom call last month, a barber who rents a chair in a Brooklyn Park barber salon told me exactly the same thing. I also talked with Mike, who owns a few hotels in Minnesota and is being forced to make lose-lose decisions about how to pay his employees and his mortgage while their rooms sit empty.

Mike said this: "The government stepped in with the Paycheck Protection Program, but it was a one-size-fits-all approach that didn't really help industries like hospitality. We could pay our employees but not our mortgages. The Paycheck Protection Flexibility Act will do for small businesses what the PPP could not."

John from Maple Grove, who owns a handful of beloved wood-fired pizza joints in Minnesota, is also feeling the heat from a lengthening crisis. He told me: "We are very appreciative of the PPP loan we received but would have no way to qualify for any material forgiveness given the impossibility of rehiring our entire workforce while our stores are closed. If the loan is not forgiven, we do not foresee our business returning to any meaningful positive cash flow until a vaccine is developed or the virus impact weakens and would likely not have funds to repay any loan principal in that time."

Justin, who has a small gym in Chanhassen, and Ryan, who owns Frenchies nail salon, are reporting the exact same problems. The outpouring of feedback has been as clear as it has been enormous.

Mr. Speaker, today is not about us. It is not about which side secures the biggest win or who gets the credit. It is about delivering the relief that small business owners across Minnesota and this Nation are asking for. It is about doing our job.

At its core, representation begins with listening, and these stories paint a very clear picture. Our small business owners, the institutions of our Main Streets and the glue of our communities, are asking us to take action to solve problems and to engage in some good old-fashioned teamwork.

I am grateful to my colleague, Mr. CHIP ROY from Texas, for joining me in that very spirit as the coauthor of this bill and to the growing coalition of support that we built around the Paycheck Protection Flexibility Act. This bill will help people in the ways that they need, and we have not a moment to lose.

Mr. Speaker, if you don't want to take my word for it, just listen to the millions of our country's shopkeepers, innovators, entrepreneurs, and small business owners all around the country. Or listen to our 11 million res-

taurant employees. Or just take it from Bert, the owner of Lions Tap, who said that the heartbeat of America is small business, and we need your help to survive.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend and thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PHILLIPS) for working together in a bipartisan manner on this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY).

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairwoman and the ranking member for their leadership. I really want to give a strong statement of support and thanks to my colleague, DEAN PHILLIPS, for the way in which our offices have worked together and in which he and I have worked together on this. I have nothing but positive things to say about him, and I look forward to working on other measures to get, frankly, this body back to the work of the American people and to make Congress work again, to use a phrase that might be interesting. But we need to make Congress work again for the American people.

This is a simple bill. It is a seven-page bill. We need more of that, more single-subject bills that we can wrap our hands around and move through the Chamber in ways that will impact American people's lives without things being decided by a handful of people in back rooms that cost trillions of dollars and have 2,000 and 3,000 pages.

That is a statement, frankly, on both sides of the aisle. We need to find a way to work together, to have simple approaches to do the work of the American people.

This piece of legislation, in particular, is important to me because I represent about 2,300 restaurants and about 53,000 employees who work there in central Texas. It is the most in Texas. It has to be pretty high up nationwide. Austin, Texas, and San Antonio, Texas, both have a great number of live music venues, as they are famously known, and my wife and I have availed ourselves of them over our lives.

In fact, my courtship of my wife began in a lot of these places. Our first date was at Stubb's Bar-B-Q in Austin, Texas, a great institution for a Willie Nelson concert. We were at Threadgill's for our rehearsal dinner in South Austin, Texas, with live music.

I represent the Broken Spoke. I represent Luckenbach, Texas, if you remember the famous song. I represent a number of great restaurants in San Antonio. The Cortez family has a bunch of restaurants in San Antonio. Many of you, if you have been on the River Walk or have been in downtown San Antonio, would have experienced these places. They are a part of the culture of our lives, our fabric of what we do every day when we visit with our families and our communities.

We need to save these great institutions and not just restaurants. I am

talking about the barbershops, the hair salons, the live music venues, and the hotels that are struggling.

I just talked to a hotel operator an hour ago, just before coming down here to the floor, who is struggling and said: Look, I can't make it 8 weeks. I can't stay alive. I don't have enough heads on the pillows. We are working toward reopening.

These are real businesses with real employees and real lives tied up into this who are struggling.

The thing is, the PPP program has been a great success in getting \$650 billion out the door in a matter of weeks to help almost 4 million businesses, as has been noted on the floor, and that is awesome. That is fantastic. We should be proud of that. But as we work to get America open again, we have to be mindful of the fact that times are continuing to move on. These businesses are struggling, and they can't meet some of these restrictions and deadlines.

I will note a little moment of partisanship perhaps, in that I believe the unemployment insurance provision that was adopted is actually the root of the problem because you can't pay people more not to work than to work and then expect businesses to go back and rehire people to meet the requirements we put in the bill to meet and hold people in employment in the businesses. We need to address that. I hope that as a body we will not extend that when it expires in July. This is something I think is fundamentally important.

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

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Texas an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, one thing I want to point out here is that the ranking member and the chair have gone through the provisions in the bill. This is an important vote because we have to do this to help small businesses, but it is an important vote because I think it gets back to the heart of simple legislating and working together to accomplish things.

Let's provide the flexibility for businesses. Let's make sure that we let America open. But let's work together to solve the problems of the American people together, like Mr. PHILLIPS and I did. I am proud to cosponsor this with him.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the Senate will take this up and move it expeditiously so that we can help businesses this week. There is no reason to delay that.

Ms. VELAZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire of the Chair how much time is remaining on each side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from New York has 11½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Ohio has 10 minutes remaining.

Ms. VELAZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. PAPPAS).

Mr. PAPPAS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairwoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, while the Paycheck Protection Program has provided a lifeline to small businesses, fundamental changes must be made to meet the ongoing needs of our Main Street economy.

I am thankful to have heard from hundreds of local business leaders in my district who have helped identify critical shortcomings in the PPP.

RoseAnn in Laconia tells us her restaurant's sales are down 90 percent, and she needs more time than 8 weeks to ramp up safely.

David from Portsmouth says his overhead costs are much higher than the payroll at his new business, and he needs more flexibility in how he can spend down the loan.

Hillary from Goffstown won't begin to make up for lost sales in her wedding business until next year. A longer term will give her a more stable financial footing.

There are millions of stories like these across the country.

I want to thank my colleagues for coming together on a bipartisan basis to understand the need that is out there and helping to meet it with this comprehensive bill that is going to provide a lifeline to our local businesses. The fixes in this Paycheck Protection Flexibility Act will allow our small businesses and their dedicated employees to continue to survive. Let's pass this bipartisan bill today for our workers, for our small businesses, and certainly for our future.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON).

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to particularly thank Mr. PHILLIPS and Mr. ROY for working together on this important legislation.

When the President signed the Paycheck Protection Program nearly 2 months ago, it provided a real lifeline to our small businesses, without a doubt. We have had some pretty rough seas, a typhoon. But at the end of the day, after 8 weeks, Mr. Speaker, if you were a small business and you allocated 75 percent of the money that you received as that loan for employees' salaries, healthcare, et cetera, that loan would become a grant; and the response was overwhelming. A \$250 billion program was exhausted after 10 days.

After we came back and did another job, we doubled down. We gave it another \$310 billion on top of that. Unbelievable.

As much as all of us wanted this nightmare to end by Easter, we are now past Memorial Day, and those small businesses are still not open. Many of them are still shuttered, and they can't possibly meet that 75 percent standard that their lender, their community bank, or their credit union offered them to be able to convert that loan to a grant.

So, without the changes in this bipartisan bill, that program instead will be an anchor that will take them down

to the very bottom. We can't let that happen, no way.

The bipartisan Problem Solvers Caucus endorsed this flexibility bill. It is one that we need to get done. I hope that the Senate can take what we do today and pass it before the end of the week. We need to provide that relief to our small businesses and the millions of employees that it impacts.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. NEGUSE).

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the bills before the House.

In Colorado, our small businesses are struggling under these unprecedented economic circumstances. From the mom-and-pop taverns in Gilpin County and Winter Park; the restaurants in Loveland, Fort Collins, and Boulder; Main Street businesses in Nederland and Breckenridge; and the many Colorado businesses that rely on outdoor recreation and ski season, in particular, they never could have planned for this pandemic. We cannot expect them to weather this crisis alone.

The Payroll Protection Program has provided critical funds to keep many of these businesses afloat and workers employed. But as we have heard from both sides of the aisle today, many fixes are needed, and that is what we are here today to do.

We must ensure that loan forgiveness periods are extended so that small businesses are not on the hook for this money while their doors remain shut. We must extend the program past June 30 as so many of our businesses face increased uncertainty and as our country faces uncertainty about what the future holds in the coming months. We must expand access and transparency and prioritize our veteran-owned and economically disadvantaged businesses.

At the end of the day, we must continue to support our local small businesses because they are the lifeblood of our communities, for the sake of our families, our local economies, and our future.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairwoman for her strong leadership over the course of this pandemic and my freshman colleague, Representative PHILLIPS, for his leadership in bringing this bill forward. I am proud to support it. Let's get this done for small businesses in Colorado and across America.

□ 1030

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES).

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) for his hard work; and I thank the chairwoman, as well, for working together in a bipartisan manner.

But most importantly, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY), my friend, for working together, for identifying the problems with the Paycheck

Protection Program, in helping to perfect this program that is an incredible lifeline to small businesses and, importantly, Mr. Speaker, to the employees.

Millions and millions of businesses, billions of dollars in loans in a program that didn't even exist. Within 1 week, they stood this program up, and within 2 weeks, Mr. Speaker, handed out more money than the SBA had done over the previous 14 years. It is absolutely remarkable what Treasury and SBA have done with this program.

And, as I said, the work that Mr. ROY and Mr. PHILLIPS have done to come together on a bipartisan basis to help to fix, to provide flexibility to businesses, to give them more time, to give them more flexibility on the use of funds, to ensure that these businesses aren't just open for 8 weeks but are truly sustainable businesses that can continue providing employment to millions and millions of Americans for years to come.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to pivot. The other legislation, the TRUTH Act, Mr. Speaker, looking at the comparison of numbers, here we are giving out billions of dollars and millions of loans, looking at the Economic Injury Disaster Loan Program, the EIDL loan program. This program is a complete disaster itself. The program is not getting money out the door. Whoever is running this program needs to be replaced.

Look at the statistics. They brought in an outside contractor to do the advances. The advances are taking off, but the loans, themselves, are not. We are not offering operating expenses and other needed loans to these small businesses.

This bill doesn't fix a single problem that is out there that is delaying, that is preventing this program from actually providing operating expense assistance to these small businesses.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is a complete whiff. I urge that we pull back the TRUTH Act. Rescind it. Let's sit back down again and work together on a bipartisan basis, as we have done on this bill, on the PPP Flex bill, and provide true solutions to where the Economic Injury Disaster Loan Program can help these small businesses, can truly provide a hand up.

Mr. Speaker, I urge rejection of that bill.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GOTTHEIMER).

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairwoman for her excellent leadership. I thank Mr. ROY for his great bipartisan work and my dear friend, colleague, and fellow problem solver, DEAN PHILLIPS, for his remarkable leadership on this important piece of legislation. He did it the way he believes we all should govern, and that is working across the aisle. I am grateful for what he did on the Paycheck Protection Flexibility Act, which was supported by the Problem Solvers Caucus, 50 strong—25 Democrats and 25 Republicans.

Mr. Speaker, I have heard over and over again from businesses in my community in northern New Jersey that they are so grateful for the PPP Loan Forgiveness Program and all of the jobs and businesses it helps protect. But they need more flexibility with the formula and timeframe. They need more time with the loan and more flexibility on how to spend it, from salaries to rent.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud that this bipartisan legislation does exactly that: helps the 131,000 small businesses in New Jersey that have been helped by the PPP Loan Forgiveness Program.

And I am equally grateful for the bipartisan TRUTH Act, which demands more transparency and accountability for every single dollar that is loaned out from the Small Business Administration to our businesses. I am glad that that legislation will pass here later today and that we will know where all the loans have gone.

Mr. Speaker, New Jersey's economy, including all of our small businesses, want to make sure their businesses can stay open at the end of this pandemic. They want to keep their workers. They want to keep giving back to our communities. They want to grow their businesses and give back to our great State. But they need our help. This bill does that, and I am hoping the Senate acts quickly to take it up.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. BURCHETT), a very important member of the Committee on Small Business.

Mr. BURCHETT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to encourage my colleagues to vote in favor of the H.R. 7010, the Paycheck Protection Program Flexibility Act.

America's economic recovery from the coronavirus pandemic depends on getting individuals comfortable with safely going back to workplaces, shops, and restaurants. H.R. 7010 represents a continued commitment to providing economic assistance to America's small businesses while our economy works towards this goal.

Throughout east Tennessee, the Paycheck Protection Program is ensuring employers can pay their workers and cover operating expenses. H.R. 7010 will allow greater flexibility for this relief by extending the PPP loan forgiveness period from 8 to 24 weeks, eliminating duplicative program requirements, and providing small businesses with additional time to pay back loans as they get back on their feet.

Members of the Committee on Small Business have a strong reputation of reaching across the aisle to work together, and I applaud the efforts of Mr. ROY and Mr. PHILLIPS to craft clean legislation that meets the needs of small businesses.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to support this bill that delivers results for America's small businesses during this difficult time. It is great to see Chair-

woman VELÁZQUEZ and the ranking member, and I thank them for their leadership.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairwoman for her leadership with the ranking member, Mr. PHILLIPS and Mr. ROY.

Mr. Speaker, I stand in strong support because 100,000 people are dead. Small businesses are living in the midst of those communities of devastation, but they are trying to keep their doors open so they can help their fellow citizens.

I am grateful that we will allow an extended period of time, 24 weeks, for allowing for forgiveness. I am very grateful we have extended the date, for extending the program to December 31, and, of course, the payment, the loan period to 5 years.

I know the mom-and-pop barbershops and cosmetology shops and nail shops and restaurants; they are crying out to survive. Some of their very workers have died. They are taking care of families. And so to ensure the full access to payroll tax deferment for business tax, that takes PPP loans.

In addition, I support the TRUTH Act because the money that we give must be used right, and transparency on who gets the loans is important.

Mr. Speaker, this further relief for small businesses is well placed because they are the anchor of the economy.

I say to Houston small businesses: We are coming to help you. We will be speaking to you this week.

Mr. Speaker, I support this bill, and we should move this forward as quickly as possible. They are the anchor of the economy of this Nation.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MEUSER).

Mr. MEUSER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio very much.

Mr. Speaker, the Paycheck Protection Program, as we have been hearing, has provided critical support to small businesses across the country during this crisis.

The intent of the PPP was to prevent layoffs, maintain certainty for workers, and help businesses weather the challenges posed by the coronavirus pandemic. Thanks to President Trump's Treasury Department and other leaders in this body, whom I commend, the program's results were in line with the program's intent.

Thanks, as well, to the SBA and many community banks. Over 4.5 million small businesses have been approved for loans through the PPP, and over \$600 billion in loans have been processed.

The PPP has administered over 155,000 loans, totaling \$25 billion in Pennsylvania alone. Nationwide, nearly 65 percent of these loans have been under \$50,000—remarkable to see results of a bill in line with its intent.

However, we all do know—and we have been hearing from our constitu-

ents—that many businesses have not been able to reopen or access the loans amidst many various State government-mandated shutdowns, so additional time and flexibility to use the PPP funds will help them meet payroll and remain in operation as we safely and responsibly reopen our economy.

Today's Paycheck Protection Program Flexibility Act will enact effective reforms which were created with input from small businesses. Again, I strongly commend the bill's sponsors for engaging in this way.

Mr. Speaker, families are the heart of our communities. Small businesses are the backbones of our economy. Our families and our small businesses, with our support, will make it through this crisis and drive the next great American comeback.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge a "yes" vote on this very important bill.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio has 3 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) for her cooperation and Mr. ROY and Mr. PHILLIPS, as well, for working together in a bipartisan manner on this important legislation.

COVID-19, the coronavirus, has had a tremendous impact, an adverse impact on our Nation, particularly on our Nation's economy, particularly on America's small businesses. Many of them, unfortunately, have had to shut down during this time.

When we originally passed the CARES Act, which included the Paycheck Protection Program—or now it has become so popular, now it is PPP. It is known by that by millions of small businesses all across the country.

We didn't know exactly how long the pandemic would last. We still don't know, for that matter. So 8 weeks, for example, was the period of time that determined the payouts and whether the loan would be forgiven or not, whether in fact it would be a grant, whether these small businesses would have to pay it back.

As it turned out, 8 weeks, alone, isn't a sufficient period of time for many small businesses. This legislation extends that to 24 weeks, at the option of the borrower. So this will allow many small businesses all across the country to see what benefits them the most so they can survive, so they can keep their employees employed so they can support their families. So that is an important item that is in this legislation.

In addition, changing the 75/25 rule to 60/40, again, is going to give these businesses the flexibility that they need.

How long do small businesses have to pay it back? Well, those who have already taken out the loans, 2 years. For new loans taken out from here on—and there is over \$100 billion left in the

fund, so there will be many small businesses that still get loans—the period will be 24 weeks. Now, by the time the Senate gets ahold of this, it is always possible that that may be compromised, but at this point, it is 24 weeks in this particular piece of legislation.

But I think one of the important things to remember is that the borrower and the lender can get together and mutually agree, if they want to agree, if they don't necessarily fall into the two categories that I just mentioned. So there is some flexibility for them to negotiate there as well. And there are other items, as we have already discussed.

But the important thing is this will give America's small businesses the flexibility to ensure that they at least have a chance to survive. And I know in my district in Cincinnati, and districts all over the country, their very survival is at issue here.

The PPP program—and it is a lot of money, as was mentioned: \$350 billion and another \$310 billion, so around \$660 billion in this program going out all over the country to these small businesses that are the backbone of the American economy. About half the people who work in America work for one of these small businesses. So this will help them to survive.

Thank goodness the House of Representatives was able to work together in a bipartisan manner to come to this point today where this legislation will likely pass in a few minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I again thank the chairwoman, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I continuously hear from small businesses across the country about the uncertainty they are facing and when they will be able to fully reopen. In the face of that uncertainty, small businesses need flexibility with these loans.

This bill takes an important step in providing that flexibility and making the Paycheck Protection Program work better for the millions of small businesses across the country that are trying to weather this storm. And since we do not know how long this storm will last, we must ensure small businesses are able to take advantage of the program through the end of the calendar year and to use the loan over the course of 24 weeks. This program is now a stronger onramp to full employment for small employers to weather this unprecedented economic and public health crisis.

I commend the Committee on Small Business staff on both sides of the aisle for their dedication and hard work over these last few months. I thank them for their commitment to our Nation's small employers and their workers.

And I thank the ranking member, because we have always, throughout the history of the committee, worked in a

bipartisan manner. I always say, when we deal with small business issues, there is no Democratic or Republican approach. Those are American issues, particularly as they relate to our economy.

Mr. Speaker, in that vein, I also thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PHILLIPS) for the great work that they did and for the bipartisan spirit in which they brought this bill to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge a vote in support of the legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this legislation to provide a critical source of aid to small businesses and nonprofits during the COVID-19 pandemic. While the Paycheck Protection Program was established as an eight-week program, it was clear from the start that the economic impact of the pandemic would last far longer. I am proud that the House addressed this issue by expanding the covered period to 24 weeks in the Heroes Act earlier this month, and I am glad this bill also includes a 24-week extension. The extended timeline will give borrowers the flexibility to spread out the loan proceeds over the full course of the crisis, and in a manner that is best for their small business or nonprofit.

The legislation also takes action to change the harmful "75/25" percent rule that the Small Business Administration established to limit the use of Paycheck Protection Program loan proceeds for nonpayroll expenses to 25 percent. While increasing the current limitation on the use of loan proceeds for nonpayroll expenses from 25 percent to 40 percent will allow many small businesses to apply for the program, I am disappointed that this legislation falls short of the Heroes Act and fails to eliminate the rule. Congress intended for the Paycheck Protection Program to be a critical resource for all small businesses impacted by the pandemic. We must make sure that the program will be there and workable for micro-businesses in high rent areas like New York City. Microbusinesses—such as "mom and pop" shops and corner stores—are the lifeblood of our communities. I will continue working to ensure that the small business assistance programs created in the CARES Act are accessible and viable for the most vulnerable small businesses.

I am also disappointed that this legislation was amended to remove language to retroactively establish a five-year minimum maturity on Paycheck Protection Program loans for amounts not forgiven. While the CARES Act allowed a maximum maturity of up to ten years from when the borrower applied for the loan, the Small Business Administration limited the minimum maturity of the loans to two years just hours before financial institutions began accepting Paycheck Protection Program loans. To address this issue, the Heroes Act established a minimum maturity on PPP loans of five years to enable borrowers to amortize loans over a longer period of time, decreasing their monthly payments on any portion that is not forgiven. While this legislation also establishes a five-year minimum maturity on Paycheck Protection Program loans, it fails to make the change retroactive for the millions that have already received their loans. I will

continue to call for the minimum maturity on Paycheck Protection Program loans to be extended for all Paycheck Protection Program borrowers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 7010, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3 of House Resolution 965, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

□ 1045

SMALL BUSINESS TRANSPARENCY AND REPORTING FOR THE UNDERBANKED AND TAXPAYERS AT HOME ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings will resume on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 6782) to require the Administrator of the Small Business Administration to submit a report on recipients of assistance under the paycheck protection program and the economic injury disaster loan program, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 269, nays 147, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 113]

YEAS—269

Adams	Castro (TX)	Demings
Aguilar	Chu, Judy	DeSaulnier
Allred	Ciциlline	Deutch
Axne	Cisneros	Diaz-Balart
Bacon	Clark (MA)	Dingell
Barragán	Clarke (NY)	Doggett
Bass	Clay	Doyle, Michael
Beatty	Cleaver	F.
Bera	Clyburn	Engel
Beyer	Cohen	Escobar
Bishop (GA)	Connolly	Eshoo
Blumenauer	Cooper	Español
Blunt Rochester	Correa	Evans
Bonamici	Costa	Finkenauer
Boyle, Brendan	Courtney	Fitzpatrick
F.	Cox (CA)	Fletcher
Brindisi	Craig	Fortenberry
Brooks (AL)	Crenshaw	Foster
Brown (MD)	Crist	Frankel
Brownley (CA)	Crow	Fudge
Burchett	Cuellar	Gabbard
Bustos	Cunningham	Gaetz
Butterfield	Davids (KS)	Gallagher
Calvert	Davis (CA)	Gallego
Carbajal	Davis, Danny K.	Garamendi
Cárdenas	Dean	García (IL)
Carson (IN)	DeFazio	García (TX)
Cartwright	DeGette	Golden
Case	DeLauro	Gomez
Casten (IL)	DelBene	Gonzalez (TX)
Castor (FL)	Delgado	Gottheimer

Green, Al (TX) Maloney, Sean
Grijalva Massie
Grothman Matsui
Haaland McAdams
Harder (CA) McBath
Hastings McCaul
Hayes McClintock
Heck McCollum
Herrera Beutler McEachin
Higgins (NY) McGovern
Himes McNeerney
Horn, Kendra S. Meeks
Horsford Meng
Houlahan Mooney (WV)
Hoyer Moore
Huffman Morelle
Huizenga Moulton
Hurd (TX) Mucarsel-Powell
Jackson Lee Murphy (FL)
Jayapal Nadler
Jeffries Napolitano
Johnson (GA) Neal
Johnson (TX) Neguse
Joyce (OH) Newhouse
Kaptur Norcross
Katko O'Halleran
Keating Ocasio-Cortez
Kelly (IL) Omar
Kennedy Pallone
Khanna Panetta
Kildee Pappas
Kilmer Pascarell
Kim Payne
Kind Pelosi
Kinzinger Perlmutter
Kirkpatrick Perry
Krishnamoorthi Peters
Kuster (NH) Peterson
Lamb Phillips
Langevin Pingree
Larsen (WA) Pocan
Larson (CT) Porter
Lawrence Posey
Lawson (FL) Pressley
Lee (CA) Price (NC)
Lee (NV) Quigley
Lee (CA) Raskin
Levin (MI) Reed
Lewis Rice (NY)
Lieu, Ted Richmond
Lipinski Rose (NY)
Loeb sack Rouda
Lofgren Roy
Lowenthal Ruiz
Lowey Ruppertsberger
Lujan Rush
Luria Rutherford
Lynch Ryan
Malinowski Sanchez
Maloney, Sarbanes
Carolyn B. Scanlon

NAYS—147

Aderholt DesJarlais
Allen Duncan
Amash Dunn
Amodei Emmer
Armstrong Estes
Arrington Ferguson
Babin Fleischmann
Baird Flores
Balderson Foxx (NC)
Banks Fulcher
Barr Garcia (CA)
Bergman Gianforte
Biggs Gibbs
Bilirakis Gohmert
Bishop (NC) Gonzalez (OH)
Bishop (UT) Gooden
Bost Gosar
Brady Graves (GA)
Buck Graves (LA)
Bucshon Graves (MO)
Budd Green (TN)
Burgess Griffith
Byrne Guest
Carter (GA) Guthrie
Chabot Hagedorn
Cheney Harris
Cline Hartzler
Cloud Hern, Kevin
Cole Hice (GA)
Collins (GA) Higgins (LA)
Comer Hill (AR)
Conaway Holding
Cook Hudson
Curtis Johnson (LA)
Davidson (OH) Johnson (OH)
Davis, Rodney Johnson (SD)

Schakowsky Schiff
Schneider Schroeder
Schrier Schriener
Schweikert Scott (VA)
Scott, David Scott, David
Serrano Serrano
Simpson Sewell (AL)
Shalala Shalala
Sherman Sherman
Sherrill Sherrill
Sires Sires
Slotkin Slotkin
Smith (NJ) Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA) Smith (WA)
Smucker Smucker
Soto Soto
Spanberger Spanberger
Speier Speier
Stanton Stanton
Stefanik Stefanik
Steil Steil
Steube Steube
Stevens Stevens
Stewart Stewart
Suozi Suozi
Swalwell (CA) Swalwell (CA)
Takano Takano
Thompson (CA) Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS) Thompson (MS)
Titus Titus
Tlaib Tlaib
Tonko Tonko
Torres (CA) Torres (CA)
Torres Small Torres Small
(NM) (NM)
Trahan Trahan
Trone Trone
Underwood Underwood
Upton Upton
Van Drew Van Drew
Vargas Vargas
Veasey Veasey
Vela Vela
Velázquez Velázquez
Visclosky Visclosky
Wagner Wagner
Walden Walden
Wasserman Wasserman
Roy Schultz
Ruiz Schultz
Waters Waters
Watson Coleman Watson Coleman
Welch Welch
Wexton Wexton
Wild Wild
Wilson (FL) Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth Yarmuth

Rodgers (WA) Rodgers (WA)
Roe, David P. Roe, David P.
Rogers (AL) Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY) Rogers (KY)
Rose, John W. Rose, John W.
Rouzer Rouzer
Scalise Scalise
Scott, Austin Scott, Austin
Shimkus Shimkus
Simpson Simpson
Smith (MO) Smith (MO)
Smith (NE) Smith (NE)
Spano Spano

Abraham Abraham
Brooks (IN) Brooks (IN)
Buchanan Buchanan
Carter (TX) Carter (TX)
Crawford Crawford

Stauber Stauber
Stivers Stivers
Taylor Taylor
Thompson (PA) Thompson (PA)
Thornberry Thornberry
Tiffany Tiffany
Timmons Timmons
Tipton Tipton
Turner Turner
Walberg Walberg
Walker Walker
Walorski Walorski
Waltz Waltz

NOT VOTING—15

Granger Granger
Hollingsworth Hollingsworth
LaHood LaHood
Marchant Marchant
McHenry McHenry

Watkins Watkins
Weber (TX) Weber (TX)
Webster (FL) Webster (FL)
Wenstrup Wenstrup
Westerman Westerman
Williams Williams
Wilson (SC) Wilson (SC)
Wittman Wittman
Womack Womack
Woodall Woodall
Wright Wright
Yoho Yoho
Zeldin Zeldin

Mfume Mfume
Rooney (FL) Rooney (FL)
Roybal-Allard Roybal-Allard
Sensenbrenner Sensenbrenner
Young Young

□ 1159

Messrs. DUNCAN, HUDSON, RICE of South Carolina, and WOODALL changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. BACON, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, and Mr. ROY changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So (two-thirds not being in the affirmative) the motion was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. YOUNG. Madam Speaker, I was unable to vote on May 28, 2020. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye” on rollcall No. 113, on passage of H.R. 6782.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 965, 116TH CONGRESS

Barragán (Gallejo)	Hastings (Wasserman)	Mucarsel-Powell (Wasserman)
Bass (Cicilline)	Schultz	Schultz
Bera (Aguilar)	Heck (Kilmer)	Napolitano (Correa)
Blumenauer (Beyer)	Horsford (Kildee)	Payne (Wasserman)
Bonamici (Raskin)	Huffman (Kildee)	Schultz
Jayapal (Raskin)	Johnson (TX)	Peters (Rice)
Jeffries (Jeffries)	Khanna (NY)	Pingree (Kuster)
Kirkpatrick (Sherman)	Kirkpatrick (NH)	Pocan (Raskin)
Gallego (Gallego)	Gallego (Gallego)	Porter (Wexton)
Krishnamoorthi (Brown (MD))	Krishnamoorthi (Brown (MD))	Price (NC)
Lawrence (Kildee)	Lawrence (Kildee)	Ruiz (Aguilar)
Lawson (FL)	Lawson (FL)	Rush (Underwood)
(Evans)	(Evans)	Schneider (Houlihan)
Levin (CA)	Levin (CA)	Schrader (O'Halleran)
Levin (MI)	Levin (MI)	Schrier (Kilmer)
Raskin (Raskin)	Raskin (Raskin)	Serrano (Meng)
Lewis (Kildee)	Lewis (Kildee)	Speier (Scanlon)
Lieu, Ted (Beyer)	Lieu, Ted (Beyer)	Suozi (Panetta)
Lipinski (Cooper)	Lipinski (Cooper)	Tlaib (Dingell)
Lofgren (Boyle)	Lofgren (Boyle)	Tonko (Meng)
Brendan F.)	Brendan F.)	Vargas (Keating)
Lowenthal (Beyer)	Lowenthal (Beyer)	Veasey (Beyer)
Foster (Beyer)	Foster (Beyer)	Vela (Gallego)
Frankel (Kuster (NH))	Frankel (Kuster (NH))	Watson Coleman (Pallone)
Garamendi (Sherman)	Garamendi (Sherman)	Welch (McGovern)
Gonzalez (TX)	Gonzalez (TX)	Wilson (FL)
(Cuellar)	(Cuellar)	(Hayes)
Grijalva (Clay)	Grijalva (Clay)	
Harder (CA)	Harder (CA)	
(Haaland)	(Haaland)	
Moore (Beyer)	Moore (Beyer)	

PAYCHECK PROTECTION PROGRAM FLEXIBILITY ACT OF 2020

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. JACKSON LEE). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings will resume on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 7010) to amend the Small Business Act and the CARES Act to modify certain provi-

sions related to the forgiveness of loans under the paycheck protection program, to allow recipients of loan forgiveness under the paycheck protection program to defer payroll taxes, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 417, nays 1, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 114]

YEAS—417

Adams	Cooper	Green, Al (TX)
Aderholt	Correa	Griffith
Aguilar	Costa	Grijalva
Allen	Courtney	Grothman
Allred	Cox (CA)	Guest
Amash	Craig	Guthrie
Amodei	Crenshaw	Haaland
Armstrong	Crist	Hagedorn
Arrington	Crow	Harder (CA)
Axne	Cuellar	Harris
Babin	Cunningham	Hartzler
Bacon	Curtis	Hastings
Baird	Davids (KS)	Hayes
Balderson	Davidson (OH)	Heck
Banks	Davis (CA)	Hern, Kevin
Barr	Davis, Danny K.	Herrera Beutler
Barragán	Davis, Rodney	Hice (GA)
Bass	Dean	Higgins (LA)
Beatty	DeFazio	Higgins (NY)
Bera	DeGette	Hill (AR)
Bergman	DeLauro	Himes
Beyer	DelBene	Holding
Biggs	Delgado	Horn, Kendra S.
Bilirakis	Demings	Horsford
Bishop (GA)	DeSaulnier	Houlihan
Bishop (NC)	DesJarlais	Hoyer
Bishop (UT)	Deutsch	Hudson
Blumenauer	Diaz-Balart	Huffman
Blunt Rochester	Dingell	Huizenga
Bonamici	Doggett	Hurd (TX)
Bost	Doyle, Michael	Jackson Lee
Boyle, Brendan	F.	Jayapal
F.	Duncan	Jeffries
Brady	Dunn	Johnson (GA)
Brindisi	Emmer	Johnson (LA)
Brooks (AL)	Engel	Johnson (OH)
Brown (MD)	Escobar	Johnson (SD)
Brownley (CA)	Eshoo	Johnson (TX)
Buck	Espallat	Jordan
Bucshon	Estes	Joyce (OH)
Budd	Evans	Joyce (PA)
Burchett	Ferguson	Kaptur
Burgess	Finkenauer	Katko
Bustos	Fitzpatrick	Keating
Butterfield	Fleischmann	Keller
Byrne	Fletcher	Kelly (IL)
Calvert	Kelly	Kelly (MS)
Carbajal	Fortenberry	Kelly (PA)
Cárdenas	Foster	Kennedy
Carson (IN)	Foxx (NC)	Khanna
Carter (GA)	Frankel	Kildee
Cartwright	Fudge	Kilmer
Case	Fulcher	Kim
Casten (IL)	Gabbard	Kind
Castor (FL)	Gaetz	King (IA)
Castro (TX)	Gallagher	King (NY)
Chabot	Gallego	Kinzinger
Cheney	Garamendi	Kirkpatrick
Chu, Judy	Garcia (CA)	Krishnamoorthi
Cicilline	Garcia (IL)	Kuster (NH)
Cisneros	Garcia (TX)	Kustoff (TN)
Clark (MA)	Gianforte	LaMalfa
Clarke (NY)	Gibbs	Lamb
Clay	Gohmert	Lamborn
Cleaver	Golden	Langevin
Cline	Gomez	Larsen (WA)
Cloud	Gonzalez (OH)	Larson (CT)
Clyburn	Gonzalez (TX)	Latta
Cohen	Gooden	Lawrence
Cole	Gosar	Lawson (FL)
Collins (GA)	Gottheimer	Lee (CA)
Comer	Graves (GA)	Lee (NV)
Conaway	Graves (LA)	Lesko
Connolly	Graves (MO)	Levin (CA)
Cook	Green (TN)	Levin (MI)

Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsock
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Luria
Lynch
Mallinowski
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Marshall
Mast
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McKinley
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Meuser
Mfume
Miller
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (NC)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Newhouse
Norcross
Norman
Nunes
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Olson
Omar
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi

Pence
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Posey
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Riggleman
Robby
Rodgers (WA)
Roe, David P.
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose (NY)
Rose, John W.
Rouda
Rouzer
Roy
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Rutherford
Ryan
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scalise
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shalala
Sherman
Sherrill
Shimkus
Simpson
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Smucker
Soto
Spanberger
Spano

Speier
Stanton
Staubert
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stevens
Stewart
Stivers
Suozi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiffany
Timmons
Tipton
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (MS)
Torres Small
(NM)
Trahan
Trone
Turner
Underwood
Upton
Van Drew
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Waltz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watkins
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Wexton
Wild
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Wright
Yarmuth
Yoho
Zeldin

Roll Call Votes No. 113 and No. 114. Had I been present to vote, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 113 and "yea" on rollcall No. 114.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 965, 116TH CONGRESS

Barragán	Hastings	Mucarsel-Powell
(Gallego)	(Wasserman)	(Wasserman)
Bass (Cicilline)	Schultz	Schultz
Bera (Aguilar)	Heck (Kilmer)	Napolitano
Blumenauer	Horsford (Kildee)	(Correa)
(Beyer)	Huffman (Kildee)	Payne
Bonamici	Jayapal (Raskin)	(Wasserman)
(Raskin)	Johnson (TX)	Schultz
Brownley (CA)	(Jeffries)	Peters (Rice)
(Kuster (NH))	Khanna	(NY)
Cárdenas	(Sherman)	Pingree (Kuster)
(Sánchez)	Kirkpatrick	(NH)
Chu, Judy	(Gallego)	Pocan (Raskin)
(Takano)	Krishnamoorthi	Porter (Weston)
Cisneros	(Brown (MD))	Price (NC)
(Houlahan)	Lawrence	(Butterfield)
Cohen (Beyer)	(Kildee)	Roybal-Allard
Crist (Murphy)	Lawson (FL)	(Sánchez)
(FL)	(Evans)	Ruiz (Aguilar)
Davis (CA) (Wild)	Levin (CA)	Rush
DeSaulnier	(Kildee)	(Underwood)
(Matsui)	Levin (MI)	Schneider
Deutch (Rice)	(Raskin)	(Houlahan)
(NY)	Lewis (Kildee)	Schrader
Doggett (Raskin)	Lieu, Ted (Beyer)	(O'Halleran)
Escobar (Garcia)	Lipinski (Cooper)	Schrier (Kilmer)
(TX)	Lofgren (Boyle)	Serrano (Meng)
Eshoo	Brendan F.)	Speier (Scanlon)
(Thompson)	Lowenthal	Suozi (Panetta)
(CA)	(Beyer)	Tlaib (Dingell)
Foster (Beyer)	Lowey (Meng)	Tonko
Frankel (Kuster)	Maloney	Vargas (Keating)
(NH)	Carolyn B.	Veasey (Beyer)
Garamendi	(Rose (NY))	Vela (Gallego)
(Sherman)	McEachin	Watson Coleman
Gonzalez (TX)	(Wexton)	(Pallone)
(Cuellar)	McNerney	Welch
Grijalva (Clay)	(Raskin)	(McGovern)
Harder (CA)	Moore (Beyer)	Wilson (FL)
(Haaland)		(Hayes)

□ 1315

MOMENT OF SILENCE IN REMEM- BRANCE OF THE OVER 100,000 AMERICANS WHO HAVE PASSED AWAY FROM THE COVID-19 VIRUS

The SPEAKER. The Chair asks that all Members in the Chamber, as well as Members and staff throughout the Capitol and Members wherever they are, rise for a moment of silence in remembrance of the over 100,000 Americans who have passed away from the COVID-19 virus.

MOTION TO GO TO CONFERENCE ON H.R. 6172, USA FREEDOM RE- AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2020

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, pursuant to clause 1 of rule XXII, and by direction of the Committee on the Judiciary, I offer a motion on 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.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. JACKSON LEE). The Clerk will designate the Senate amendments.

Senate amendments:

(1) In subsection (a)(2)(B) of section 602 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1872), as added by section 301(b)(3), insert after "section 103(i)" the following: ", a proceeding in the Foreign Intelligence Court of Review resulting from the peti-

tion of an amicus curiae under section 103(i)(7), or a proceeding in which an amicus curiae could have been appointed pursuant to section 103(i)(2)(A).

(2) In section 302, strike subsections (a) and (b) and insert the following:

(a) EXPANSION OF APPOINTMENT AUTHORITY.—
(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 103(i)(2) (50 U.S.C. 1803(i)(2)) is amended—

(A) by striking subparagraph (A) and inserting the following:

"(A) shall appoint one or more individuals who have been designated under paragraph (1), not less than one of whom possesses privacy and civil liberties expertise, unless the court finds that such a qualification is inappropriate, to serve as amicus curiae to assist the court in the consideration of any application or motion for an order or review that, in the opinion of the court—

"(i) presents a novel or significant interpretation of the law, unless the court issues a finding that such appointment is not appropriate;

"(ii) presents significant concerns with respect to the activities of a United States person that are protected by the first amendment to the Constitution of the United States, unless the court issues a finding that such appointment is not appropriate;

"(iii) presents or involves a sensitive investigative matter, unless the court issues a finding that such appointment is not appropriate;

"(iv) presents a request for approval of a new program, a new technology, or a new use of existing technology, unless the court issues a finding that such appointment is not appropriate;

"(v) presents a request for reauthorization of programmatic surveillance, unless the court issues a finding that such appointment is not appropriate; or

"(vi) otherwise presents novel or significant civil liberties issues, unless the court issues a finding that such appointment is not appropriate; and"; and

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking "an individual or organization" each place the term appears and inserting "one or more individuals or organizations".

(2) DEFINITION OF SENSITIVE INVESTIGATIVE MATTER.—Subsection (i) of section 103 (50 U.S.C. 1803) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(12) DEFINITION.—In this subsection, the term 'sensitive investigative matter' means—

"(A) an investigative matter involving the activities of—

"(i) a domestic public official or political candidate, or an individual serving on the staff of such an official or candidate;

"(ii) a domestic religious or political organization, or a known or suspected United States person prominent in such an organization; or

"(iii) the domestic news media; or

"(B) any other investigative matter involving a domestic entity or a known or suspected United States person that, in the judgment of the applicable court established under subsection (a) or (b), is as sensitive as an investigative matter described in subparagraph (A)."

(b) AUTHORITY TO SEEK REVIEW.—Subsection (i) of section 103 (50 U.S.C. 1803), as amended by subsection (a) of this section, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (4)—

(A) in the paragraph heading, by inserting "AUTHORITY" after "DUTIES";

(B) by redesignating subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) as clauses (i), (ii), and (iii), respectively, and adjusting the margins accordingly;

(C) in the matter preceding clause (i), as so designated, by striking "the amicus curiae shall" and inserting the following: "the amicus curiae—

"(A) shall";

(D) in subparagraph (A)(i), as so designated, by inserting before the semicolon at the end the following: ", including legal arguments regarding any privacy or civil liberties interest of any United States person that would be significantly impacted by the application or motion"; and

NAYS—1

Massie

NOT VOTING—13

Abraham	Granger	Rooney (FL)
Brooks (IN)	Hollingsworth	Sensenbrenner
Buchanan	LaHood	Young
Carter (TX)	Marchant	
Crawford	McHenry	

□ 1312

Mr. DUNN changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. YOUNG. Madam Speaker, I was unable to vote on May 28, 2020. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on rollcall No. 114, on passage of H.R. 7010, as amended.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ABRAHAM. Madam Speaker, on Thursday, May 28, I was unavoidably detained on

(E) by striking the period at the end and inserting the following: “; and

“(B) may seek leave to raise any novel or significant privacy or civil liberties issue relevant to the application or motion or other issue directly impacting the legality of the proposed electronic surveillance with the court, regardless of whether the court has requested assistance on that issue.”;

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (7) through (12) as paragraphs (8) through (13), respectively; and

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

“(7) **AUTHORITY TO SEEK REVIEW OF DECISIONS.**—

“(A) **FISA COURT DECISIONS.**—Following issuance of an order under this Act by the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court, an amicus curiae appointed under paragraph (2) may petition the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court to certify for review to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court of Review a question of law pursuant to subsection (j). If the court denies such petition, the court shall provide for the record a written statement of the reasons for such denial. Upon certification of any question of law pursuant to this subparagraph, the Court of Review shall appoint the amicus curiae to assist the Court of Review in its consideration of the certified question, unless the Court of Review issues a finding that such appointment is not appropriate.

“(B) **FISA COURT OF REVIEW DECISIONS.**—An amicus curiae appointed under paragraph (2) may petition the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court of Review to certify for review to the Supreme Court of the United States any question of law pursuant to section 1254(2) of title 28, United States Code.

“(C) **DECLASSIFICATION OF REFERRALS.**—For purposes of section 602, a petition filed under subparagraph (A) or (B) of this paragraph and all of its content shall be considered a decision, order, or opinion issued by the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court or the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court of Review described in paragraph (2) of section 602(a).”.

(3) In section 302(c), redesignate paragraph (2) as paragraph (3).

(4) In section 302(c), strike paragraph (1) and insert the following:

(1) **APPLICATION AND MATERIALS.**—Subparagraph (A) of section 103(i)(6) (50 U.S.C. 1803(i)(6)) is amended to read as follows:

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—

“(i) **RIGHT OF AMICUS.**—If a court established under subsection (a) or (b) appoints an amicus curiae under paragraph (2), the amicus curiae—

“(I) shall have access to, to the extent such information is available to the Government—

“(aa) the application, certification, petition, motion, and other information and supporting materials, including any information described in section 901, submitted to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court in connection with the matter in which the amicus curiae has been appointed, including access to any relevant legal precedent (including any such precedent that is cited by the Government, including in such an application);

“(bb) an unredacted copy of each relevant decision made by the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court or the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court of Review in which the court decides a question of law, without regard to whether the decision is classified; and

“(cc) any other information or materials that the court determines are relevant to the duties of the amicus curiae; and

“(II) may make a submission to the court requesting access to any other particular materials or information (or category of materials or information) that the amicus curiae believes to be relevant to the duties of the amicus curiae.

“(ii) **SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION REGARDING ACCURACY.**—The Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court, upon the motion of an amicus cu-

riae appointed under paragraph (2) or upon its own motion, may require the Government to make available the supporting documentation described in section 902.”.

(2) **CLARIFICATION OF ACCESS TO CERTAIN INFORMATION.**—Such section is further amended—

(A) in subparagraph (B), by striking “may” and inserting “shall”; and

(B) by striking subparagraph (C) and inserting the following:

“(C) **CLASSIFIED INFORMATION.**—An amicus curiae appointed by the court shall have access to, to the extent such information is available to the Government, unredacted copies of each opinion, order, transcript, pleading, or other document of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court and the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court of Review, including, if the individual is eligible for access to classified information, any classified documents, information, and other materials or proceedings.”.

(5) Redesignate section 207 as section 208.

(6) Insert after section 206 the following:

SEC. 207. DISCLOSURE OF RELEVANT INFORMATION; CERTIFICATION REGARDING ACCURACY PROCEDURES.

(a) **DISCLOSURE OF RELEVANT INFORMATION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“TITLE IX—DISCLOSURE OF RELEVANT INFORMATION

“SEC. 901. DISCLOSURE OF RELEVANT INFORMATION.

“The Attorney General or any other Federal officer making an application for a court order under this Act shall provide the court with—

“(1) all information in the possession of the Government that is material to determining whether the application satisfies the applicable requirements under this Act, including any exculpatory information; and

“(2) all information in the possession of the Government that might reasonably—

“(A) call into question the accuracy of the application or the reasonableness of any assessment in the application conducted by the department or agency on whose behalf the application is made; or

“(B) otherwise raise doubts with respect to the findings that are required to be made under the applicable provision of this Act in order for the court order to be issued.”.

(2) **TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of contents of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 is amended by adding at the end the following:

“TITLE IX—DISCLOSURE OF RELEVANT INFORMATION

“Sec. 901. Disclosure of relevant information.”.

(b) **CERTIFICATION REGARDING ACCURACY PROCEDURES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Title IX of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978, as added by subsection (a), is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 902. CERTIFICATION REGARDING ACCURACY PROCEDURES.

“(a) **DEFINITION.**—In this section, the term ‘accuracy procedures’ means specific procedures, adopted by the Attorney General, to ensure that an application for a court order under this Act, including any application for renewal of an existing order, is accurate and complete, including procedures that ensure, at a minimum, that—

“(1) the application reflects all information that might reasonably call into question the accuracy of the information or the reasonableness of any assessment in the application, or otherwise raises doubts about the requested findings;

“(2) the application reflects all material information that might reasonably call into question the reliability and reporting of any information from a confidential human source that is used in the application;

“(3) a complete file documenting each factual assertion in an application is maintained;

“(4) the applicant coordinates with the appropriate elements of the intelligence community (as defined in section 3 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003)), concerning any prior or existing relationship with the target of any surveillance, search, or other means of investigation, and discloses any such relationship in the application;

“(5) before any application targeting a United States person is made, the applicant Federal officer shall document that the officer has collected and reviewed for accuracy and completeness supporting documentation for each factual assertion in the application; and

“(6) the applicant Federal agency establish compliance and auditing mechanisms on an annual basis to assess the efficacy of the accuracy procedures that have been adopted and report such findings to the Attorney General.

“(b) **STATEMENT AND CERTIFICATION OF ACCURACY PROCEDURES.**—Any Federal officer making an application for a court order under this Act shall include with the application—

“(1) a description of the accuracy procedures employed by the officer or the officer’s designee; and

“(2) a certification that the officer or the officer’s designee has collected and reviewed for accuracy and completeness—

“(A) supporting documentation for each factual assertion contained in the application;

“(B) all information that might reasonably call into question the accuracy of the information or the reasonableness of any assessment in the application, or otherwise raises doubts about the requested findings; and

“(C) all material information that might reasonably call into question the reliability and reporting of any information from any confidential human source that is used in the application.

“(c) **NECESSARY FINDING FOR COURT ORDERS.**—A judge may not enter an order under this Act unless the judge finds, in addition to any other findings required under this Act, that the accuracy procedures described in the application for the order, as required under subsection (b)(1), are actually accuracy procedures as defined in this section.”.

(2) **TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of contents of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978, as amended by subsection (a), is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 901 the following:

“Sec. 902. Certification regarding accuracy procedures.”.

(7) In section 208, as so redesignated, strike [section 501 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1861)] and insert: the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.) (if applicable)

(8) At the end, add the following:

SEC. 409. ANNUAL REPORTING ON ACCURACY AND COMPLETENESS OF APPLICATIONS.

Section 603 (50 U.S.C. 1873) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (e) as subsection (f); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (d) the following:

“(e) **ANNUAL REPORT BY DOJ INSPECTOR GENERAL ON ACCURACY AND COMPLETENESS OF APPLICATIONS.**—

“(1) **DEFINITION OF APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS.**—In this subsection, the term ‘appropriate committees of Congress’ means—

“(A) the Committee on the Judiciary and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate; and

“(B) the Committee on the Judiciary and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

“(2) **REPORT.**—In April of each year, the Inspector General of the Department of Justice shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress and make public, subject to a declassification review, a report setting forth, with respect to the preceding calendar year, the following:

“(A) A summary of all accuracy or completeness reviews of applications submitted to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court by the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

“(B) The total number of applications reviewed for accuracy or completeness.

“(C) The total number of material errors or omissions identified during such reviews.

“(D) The total number of nonmaterial errors or omissions identified during such reviews.

“(E) The total number of instances in which facts contained in an application were not supported by documentation that existed in the applicable file being reviewed at the time of the accuracy review.”.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Nadler moves to take from the Speaker's table the bill, H.R. 6172, with the Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN), and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, bills like the USA Freedom Reauthorization Act touch deeply held beliefs on all sides.

The bill we intended to consider last night strengthened privacy protections and made substantial improvements to the law. The bill, as amended by the Senate, is a good and important package of reforms.

Now, you may disagree with that assessment, you may genuinely believe that the bill doesn't go far enough to reform the FISA system or perhaps that it goes too far with those reforms. If you disagree with me on the merits of the bill, I respect that disagreement.

What I cannot accept, and what I suspect many Americans will not accept, is a transparent, inexplicable, totally unjustified flip-flop on this bill, a bill important both to the security and the privacy of the United States.

Just a few weeks ago, 126 Republicans joined 152 Democrats in support of a nearly identical measure, different only in that the Senate has added one amendment, a good amendment with almost universal support. Virtually all of those 126 Republicans changed their position in the past 24 hours.

Madam Speaker, the American people see through those excuses. Nobody believes that this sudden reversal has anything to do with complaints about proxy voting. Nobody believes that the flip-flop is about Michael Flynn or Roger Stone, or even President Trump, whose cases have nothing to do with the authorities we hope to reform.

There have been no real policy demands to explain the sudden reversal, no demands for changes in the bill. If my Republican colleagues had asked for substantive changes to the bill, we would have heard them out and tried to address their concerns.

But that is not what happened. The Republicans abandoned this bipartisan project for one reason, and one reason

only: the President tweeted, on a whim, and told them to oppose this bill.

Madam Speaker, this is just one more example of how the President and his enablers in this body have stood in the way of national security, of civil liberties, and of our responsibility as Members of Congress.

I refuse to let our efforts to reform FISA die simply because Republicans are unwilling to stand up to the President's whims.

This legislation ends the NSA's call detail records program; it applies the cutting edge of Fourth Amendment privacy protections to section 215; it forces the government to disclose years of secret FISA court opinions; it increases transparency across the board; it raises the stakes for any government attorney who would dare mislead the court; and it dramatically expands the role of the amicus to be an advocate for privacy and civil liberties and to push back against claims that should have been rejected by the court long ago.

It is our responsibility to continue our work, to pass this bill, to send it to the President's desk, and to ensure that these reforms are made law.

None of us should rest until we have done that work.

I would be very interested to hear what changed in the bill between yesterday morning and yesterday evening that caused the Republicans to withdraw their support from a bill they had agreed to, from provisions they said were improvements to national security, from provisions they said were improvements to civil liberties of American citizens, and suddenly all oppose it. What changed, other than the President's tweet?

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this motion and send the bill to conference where we can do the job we were sent here to do.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, everything has changed. The main change is it is worse than we thought.

Since March 10, when this body last dealt with the FISA legislation, all kinds of things have changed.

We have learned from the declassified transcripts how bad the situation was in the prior administration when they went after the Trump campaign.

We have learned about the concerted effort to frame General Flynn, a three-star general, 30 years serving our country, and everything they did.

We learned about January 4, when the FBI agents said: We should no longer pursue going after General Flynn. But what happened? Jim Comey told Peter Strzok: No, no, no. Go tell those agents we are going to continue to go after this guy.

We learned the very next day, January 5, Jim Comey met with the President, President Obama, and talked about General Flynn.

We learned on January 6 what happened that day. We learned that then-FBI Director Comey goes to Trump Tower and meets with then-President-elect Trump and talks to him about the dossier that they already know is false, that they know is Russian disinformation, they know is paid for by the Clinton campaign.

Then what did we learn just 2 weeks later? January 20, 2017, what did they do? They sneak two agents into the White House, two FBI agents, to set up General Flynn.

What else have we learned since we dealt with this issue on March 10?

We have learned about the unmasking of Michael Flynn, 39 people unmasking General Flynn's name, six people in Treasury. What are six Treasury officials doing unmasking the guy who is going to be the National Security Director in the incoming administration?

□ 1330

Finally, and probably most importantly, we have the report from Inspector General Horowitz; not the report he did on the Carter Page FISA—we already got that; we know how scathing that was. We know all the wrongdoings that took place there—but the investigation he is just starting on FISA in general.

He has looked at 29 cases involving American citizens—29 cases—and found in every single one of those cases multiple problems when they were surveilled; again, American citizens. In 4 of those 29 cases they couldn't even find the Woods file. They couldn't even find the file that you have to keep that has the basic evidence that you are then going to take to the FISA court. They couldn't even find it.

So he does something that you hardly ever see. He does what is called a management alert, basically pulling the fire alarm saying this is so bad, I am going to tell you what is going on now; and I have just gotten started on looking at the overall FISA.

So that is what has changed since March 10 when this body dealt with this issue.

And when the President of the United States, a pretty important person in this debate, when he says, you know what? I think we should hit the pause button. We should wait here a little bit until we get to the bottom of everything that took place; what Mr. Horowitz is looking at; what Mr. Barr is looking at; what U.S. Attorney John Durham is looking at. Maybe we should just kind of hit the pause button and figure all this out. That is all he said, and that is all we have advocated. That is why we took the position we did at the conference yesterday, and I appreciate the fact that Leader MCCARTHY and our conference took that position.

So let's wait and get all the facts. Let's wait until we actually hold people accountable before we renew this program which, as the President said yesterday, does allow some warrantless

searches of American citizens. So let's make sure we get it right. That is our position as Republicans.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I am glad the gentleman learned all this since noon yesterday when he testified in front of the Rules Committee in favor of this bill.

I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the distinguished majority leader.

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

The information I had was, as the chairman has indicated, that the gentleman who just spoke appeared before the Rules Committee in support of this bill. And we can get the transcript. I don't have it right now, but perhaps somebody can get that transcript for me.

For my entire career in public service, I have supported efforts to make America both strong and safe and a force for peace and reconciliation. In the course of those years, I have striven to draw an acceptable balance between our national security and the protection of our personal liberty and the right to privacy central to our unique extraordinary democracy; a government of laws, not men.

Pursuant to that principle, as the majority leader, I scheduled the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act for floor consideration over 2 months ago.

Previously, in 2008, ROY BLUNT, then the minority whip, and myself, the majority leader; Senator Kit Bond, Senator from Missouri; and Senator Jay Rockefeller, Senator from West Virginia, worked together, at a time of great controversy with respect to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, to forge a bill that would garner bipartisan support. It was a difficult bill, with the same kind of principle differences that Chairman NADLER spoke of earlier and I am going to speak about again.

We passed that bill in a bipartisan fashion with, as we have today, people on the right and people on the left concerned about its content. So there was bipartisan support and bipartisan opposition. Speaker PELOSI and to-be President Obama, then in the Senate representing Illinois, voted for that bill. I have tried to continue to forge that balance through the years.

The bill I brought to the floor a few months ago was a bipartisan effort to achieve that critical balance, and when it came to a vote, it received two-thirds of the votes from both Democrats and Republicans. This bill essentially had two-thirds of the votes on the Republican side and two-thirds of the votes on the Democratic side, so obviously, two-thirds of the votes of this House.

As I observed yesterday, Americans must have been heartened by the fact that we could reach a bipartisan agreement on such a difficult bill. It was not

a partisan bill. The leaders, all three top leaders, on both sides of the aisle supported, essentially, this bill.

That bill, upon Senate consideration, was amended by an overwhelmingly bipartisan vote to strengthen the protections of privacy, which should have been heartening to those on the right and the left, and it was certainly heartening to me.

And then, what did they do? They passed it, with 80 Senators, 48 Republicans supporting this bill; 48 out of 53 supporting this bill. But this is not a partisan bill; and this bill is about that balance.

Mr. NUNES and Mr. SCHIFF supported this bill and supported this balance. And two-thirds of us made a judgment that they had done a job worthy of support.

So two-thirds of the Democrats in the Senate, two-thirds of the Republicans in the Senate, two-thirds of the Republicans in this House, and two-thirds of the Democrats in this House have supported this bill. I believe that support was garnered because an assumption was made, a premise was adopted by the overwhelming majority of us, that it was a carefully crafted balance between security and individual liberties. It may not be perfect, but we have a responsibility to protect this country and our people.

In consultation, therefore, with other leaders, I scheduled this bill for consideration yesterday. The night before, I got a call from my friend, the minority leader, that the President was urging Republicans in the House to change their votes to "no."

In the twinkling of a presidential tweet, without any substantive logic to justify their actions, I was told that the 126 Republicans who had voted for this bill when it was considered in the House would now change their votes and vote "no."

Chairman NADLER has said this, and I want to share this because it is worth repeating. I believe when FISA passed the House in March, every Member, those who voted "yes" and those who voted "no" voted their principles and their conviction on what they believed was in the security interests of the United States. Every one of the 435 people—I don't think there were quite 435—that voted on that bill, in my view, voted on principle and out of conviction.

I, of course, believed that the two-thirds of the Members who voted for the bill, on principle, and pursuant to conviction about making this country safe, were voting, not for party, but for principle.

Therefore, I was surprised because I saw, not then nor now, any reason that either principle or conviction should be changed, particularly in light of the fact that 80 Senators—80 Senators—48 Republican colleagues of yours, Madam Speaker, voted for this bill.

Therefore, I assumed that we could bring Members back. We had a controversy where some didn't come back.

We had a new rule you don't like. We could bring the Congress back and vote on a bipartisan bill for America.

But, as a result of the President's antipathy toward Federal law enforcement and his personal sense of grievance, authorities that have expired will continue to be lapsed.

The complicity of those who believe that the reauthorizing of these authorities was in the best interest of the United States, in preventing its passage last night and today, is, I think, both sad and irresponsible.

Madam Speaker, I regret that we did not bring this bill to the floor for a vote.

This is a result, in my view, Madam Speaker, of patently political and indefensible abandonment of principle and responsibility, both as a coequal branch of government and its policy-making branch as well.

Madam Speaker, we need to send this bill to conference. I urge my colleagues to vote to send it to conference. And if you think this needs to be perfected in some way, as Mr. NADLER said, that is the place to do it now that we are not going to have it on the floor.

Let me repeat. I would have had it on the floor. But we will not get an opportunity to vote on it, so I will wait to see the result of a conference with the Republican-led Senate on the bill that the President has threatened to veto.

Two-thirds of us believed that this was a bill that was good for America. This is a serious issue with serious consequences, and I urge you to vote "yes." Do not kill this bill.

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

I just want to correct a couple of things that the majority leader said. You guys are the ones that let the FISA law lapse. There was a 75-day extension sent over here. You guys got the majority. You let it lapse.

We want to fix it. We want to correct it. We want to make sure it is not abused like it has obviously been abused. We didn't let it lapse, you guys did.

And frankly, if you guys got the votes for this bill, you got the majority, you could pass it today. You don't have the votes because we need more work to be done on this to correct it.

The leader also said something that was not accurate. He said the President had no basis for the tweet he issued yesterday.

Are you kidding me? Are you kidding me?

They spied on two American citizens associated with his campaign, and he has got no basis for the tweet he did yesterday?

They used a dossier to go to the secret court to get a warrant to spy on one of those individuals; a dossier that they knew was false; a dossier they knew was paid for by the Clinton campaign; a dossier that Jim Comey said—not me—Jim Comey said was salacious and unverified; a dossier where the author had already told the Justice Department that he was desperate to stop

Trump from getting elected, and they used it to go spy on the Trump campaign.

And the President has no basis for the tweet he issued yesterday?

□ 1345

Are you kidding me? You guys let it lapse. We are trying to fix it because we know how bad it is.

Finally, I would just reiterate 29 cases where American citizens were surveilled by the FBI, and every single one of those was a major problem when they went to the FISA court. As I said before, four of those cases, they couldn't even find the Woods File.

We want to fix this, and we are willing to take as long as it takes.

I agree with the chairman of the Judiciary Committee. There are good things in the legislation. I said that yesterday at the Rules Committee. But what I also said at the Rules Committee is: Let's get it right.

If the President is saying that we are not going to do this until we figure out everything that went wrong, I agree with him 100 percent. More importantly, the American people agree with that. They want this fixed. They don't want anything done on this until we get to the bottom of everything that took place in the Comey FBI.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ). Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT). The judge is my good friend and fellow Judiciary Committee member.

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, one of the advantages we have seen from having a typed speech is you don't forget things like I often do that are important points, but one of the weaknesses is you can't respond to the myriad of points that somebody just made explaining why we need massive reform to the FISA bill and the information that has come out.

Now, I got here 15 years ago, and I was part of the reauthorization back in those days. We got lied to by the Justice Department about how this would be used. They came back in the private meetings: Oh, we don't go after Americans.

We have seen from the information that has come out in recent weeks that they do exactly what they told us by behind closed doors they never did.

This thing needs to be massively reformed.

What happened in the last 24 hours? Something called a Rules Committee, and it wouldn't allow our reforms. It wouldn't allow this body to vote on important reforms.

Go reread the Fourth Amendment. We are not supposed to authorize searches and seizures against Americans without the proper due process, without a probable cause, and without particularly describing the places to be searched and what to be seized. And the FISA court has violated that.

Oh, some say, we just add an amicus in there and that will take care of it.

The FISA judges did not even have the honor of their courts after finding out they were lied to repeatedly and fraud was committed against them to do something about it. That tells you we need massive reform.

A vote to go to conference is a total abdication of this body's job to put out a good bill that does reform.

Madam Speaker, I ask everybody, vote "no" to go to conference so that we can force this House to do its job.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, let me just say, first of all, of course, much of what the distinguished gentleman from Ohio said is fiction, as we all know.

But, second of all, this bill as of yesterday noon was supported by Republicans and was supported by the gentleman from Ohio as making sufficient reforms, as making the reforms that we all recognize we need in the FISA system.

Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), who is the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, this is testimony dated 5/27/2020. I am going to read you some passages from that testimony:

"Thank you for the opportunity to talk about this important legislation."

I will go down, skip a couple of paragraphs. Perhaps he will want to point those out.

"Fortunately," the gentleman said, "this bill makes important structural reforms to the program to combat abuses."

He then said: "Most importantly, this bill includes accountability measures."

He went on to say: "It also includes reforms that strengthen Congress' oversight powers."

"Finally," he said, "I would like to thank Senators Lee and Leahy for their amendment to the House-passed bill which strengthens the amicus role in these proceedings by extending them to any sensitive investigative matter involving any U.S. persons. And I also fully support this inclusion as well of the Lofgren-Davidson amendment," which is not on the bill, "to limit the FBI's ability to obtain internet browsing history of Americans."

I am trying to find a word of opposition to this bill, clearly, taken by the Rules Committee as support of the passage of this bill.

My, my, my. As I have pointed out earlier, the consequences of a twinkling of a tweet from the President of the United States: Like that, changing the votes of 126 people, whom I believed voted on principle and on conviction for this bill for America.

Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

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

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, let me first point out, I already said that

I supported the legislation. I said that, but I also said we could make it better. And the President, in light of what we have learned in the last 2 months—we need to make it better. I think we can do that.

We should never forget the President of the United States plays a pretty important role. In fact, he has to sign the bills, last time I checked, so his position does have real impact.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from the great State of Ohio (Mr. DAVIDSON).

Mr. DAVIDSON of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, as the majority leader well knows better than most of us in the room, for a bill to become law, the President of the United States must sign it, and he has made clear that he is not going to sign this product. So, it is a complete waste of everyone's time to send over a bill that has no chance to become law.

Rather than make this bill better, rather than make this bill something that could become law, we are going to run out the clock on more broken process. Why are we going to do that? We are going to do that because the people who are working to preserve the broken status quo of warrantless spying on American citizens want to keep that status quo in place.

So, rather than allow real reform, we have had a process that bypassed the Judiciary Committee. When Chairman NADLER realized he didn't have the votes to move his own product through the committee, he pulled the whole committee process. In a committee process, amendments would be able to be offered, and because they knew the amendments would be offered in accordance with the rules of the House and would be adopted if they were given a chance to vote, they had to pull it.

So, they didn't run it through the committee. The people who are represented by all 435 of us in this body had no chance to have their voices heard in a regular process. Leadership jammed through this broken bill to try to put some window dressing of reform on it.

Some of them are important; they are better than the status quo. But they are just modest reforms. That is why they had so much support from the people who want to preserve it. Then, when there was a real reform, you saw that drop off. Then, when there was the Lofgren-Davidson amendment that really would reform it and stop warrantless spying on Americans' internet browser data, when it was spying on Americans, they stopped it—not a single vote on an amendment in the people's House of the United States of America to preserve and protect the freedoms guaranteed in the Fourth Amendment.

Yes, we must make our Nation secure. But we must do it constitutionally in full compliance with the

Bill of Rights. No one is exempt, Article I, Article II, or Article III.

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

Madam Speaker, I listened to the distinguished gentleman a moment ago: We shouldn't pass any legislation that the President won't sign.

The King of England used to have the royal prerogative, an absolute veto. The President of the United States does not.

This House and the Senate should do its job and pass proper legislation, and let the President do his job. We had two-thirds of the votes in this House for this bill.

Yes, the gentleman from Ohio mentions the Lofgren-Davidson amendment. I support that amendment. If we had gone forward, we could have gone with it. But the fact of the matter is, they have withdrawn their support because of the President's tweet, and for no other reason, we are where we are now.

To preserve the ability to have the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act and preserve national security as well as the improvements in the act embodied in this bill and in the Senate version of the bill that improves security while improving privacy protections against surveillance, we must approve this motion to go to conference.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, I repeat what I said before. We have a choice. The Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, as everybody agrees, is not in good shape. FISA is necessary to preserve the security of the United States. I think everyone agrees with that. But we need improvements to FISA to make sure that while we protect the security of the United States against foreign aggression and foreign subversion, such as the Russian attempt to subvert our elections 4 years ago, we also must improve FISA to provide greater protections against unwarranted surveillance and provide greater protections for American civil liberties and privacy.

This bill does that. It may not do it as much as some people want, but it goes a heck of a lot further than what we have now. This bill must be passed if we are going to have the protections of civil liberties that we want.

Madam Speaker, this bill is a decent balance. I urge its adoption. To do that, we have to go to conference. I urge the adoption of the motion to go to conference, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. DeGETTE). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by

the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. GRIFFITH. 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.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 284, nays 122, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 115]

YEAS—284

Adams	Espallat	Luria
Aguilar	Evans	Lynch
Allred	Ferguson	Malinowski
Axne	Finkenauer	Maloney
Bacon	Fitzpatrick	Carolyn B.
Baird	Fletcher	Maloney, Sean
Balderson	Foster	Matsui
Barr	Fox (NC)	McAdams
Bass	Frankel	McBath
Beatty	Fudge	McCarthy
Bera	Gallagher	McCaul
Bergman	Gallego	McCollum
Beyer	Garamendi	McEachin
Bishop (GA)	Garcia (CA)	McGovern
Blunt Rochester	Garcia (TX)	McKinley
Bonamici	Gomez	McNerney
Bost	Gonzalez (OH)	Meeks
Boyle, Brendan	Gonzalez (TX)	Mfume
F.	Gottheimer	Moore
Brady	Graves (GA)	Morelle
Brindisi	Graves (LA)	Moulton
Brown (MD)	Graves (MO)	Mucarsel-Powell
Brownley (CA)	Green, Al (TX)	Murphy (FL)
Bustos	Grijalva	Murphy (NC)
Butterfield	Grothman	Nadler
Calvert	Haaland	Napolitano
Carbajal	Harder (CA)	Neal
Cárdenas	Hartzler	Neguse
Carson (IN)	Hastings	Newhouse
Cartwright	Hayes	Norcross
Case	Heck	Nunes
Casten (IL)	Higgins (NY)	O'Halleran
Castor (FL)	Hill (AR)	Pallone
Castro (TX)	Himes	Panetta
Chabot	Holding	Pappas
Cheney	Horn, Kendra S.	Pascarell
Cicilline	Horsford	Payne
Cisneros	Houlahan	Pelosi
Clark (MA)	Hoyer	Perlmutter
Clay	Hudson	Peters
Cleaver	Huffman	Peterson
Clyburn	Huizenga	Phillips
Cohen	Hurd (TX)	Pingree
Cole	Jackson Lee	Porter
Collins (GA)	Jeffries	Price (NC)
Conaway	Johnson (GA)	Quigley
Connolly	Johnson (SD)	Raskin
Cook	Johnson (TX)	Reed
Cooper	Joyce (OH)	Rice (NY)
Correa	Kaptur	Richmond
Courtney	Katko	Roby
Cox (CA)	Keating	Rogers (AL)
Craig	Kelly (IL)	Rose (NY)
Crenshaw	Kildee	Rouda
Crist	Kilmer	Rouzer
Crow	Kind	Roybal-Allard
Cuellar	King (NY)	Ruiz
Cunningham	Kinzinger	Ruppersberger
Curtis	Kirkpatrick	Rush
Davids (KS)	Krishnamoorthi	Rutherford
Davis (CA)	Kuster (NH)	Ryan
Davis, Danny K.	Kustoff (TN)	Sánchez
Davis, Rodney	Lamb	Sarbanes
Dean	Langevin	Scalise
DeFazio	Larsen (WA)	Scanlon
DeGette	Larson (CT)	Schakowsky
DeLauro	Lawrence	Schiff
DeBene	Lawson (FL)	Schneider
Delgado	Lee (NV)	Schrader
Demings	Levin (CA)	Schrier
DeSaulnier	Levin (MI)	Scott (VA)
Deutch	Lewis	Scott, Austin
Diaz-Balart	Lieu, Ted	Scott, David
Dingell	Lipinski	Serrano
Doggett	Loeb sack	Sewell (AL)
Doyle, Michael	Lofgren	Shalala
F.	Lowe	Sherman
Escobar	Lucas	Sherrill
Eshoo	Luján	Shimkus

Simpson	Thompson (MS)
Sires	Thornberry
Slotkin	Timmons
Smith (NJ)	Titus
Smith (WA)	Tonko
Soto	Torres (CA)
Spanberger	Torres Small
Speier	(NM)
Stanton	Trahan
Stefanik	Trone
Steil	Turner
Stevens	Underwood
Stewart	Upton
Stivers	Vargas
Suozzi	Veasey
Swalwell (CA)	Vela
Taylor	Velázquez
Thompson (CA)	Visclosky

Wagner
Walberg
Waltz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Weston
Wild
Wilson (FL)
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth

NAYS—122

Aderholt	Gohmert	Mullin
Allen	Golden	Norman
Amash	Gooden	Ocasio-Cortez
Amodei	Gosar	Omar
Armstrong	Green (TN)	Palazzo
Arrington	Griffith	Palmer
Babin	Guest	Pence
Banks	Guthrie	Perry
Barragán	Hagedorn	Pocan
Biggs	Harris	Posey
Bilirakis	Herrera Beutler	Pressley
Bishop (NC)	Hice (GA)	Reschenthaler
Bishop (UT)	Higgins (LA)	Rice (SC)
Blumenauer	Jayapal	Riggleman
Brooks (AL)	Johnson (LA)	Rodgers (WA)
Buck	Johnson (OH)	Roe, David P.
Bucshon	Jordan	Rogers (KY)
Budd	Joyce (PA)	Rose, John W.
Burchett	Keller	Roy
Burgess	Kelly (MS)	Schweikert
Byrne	Kelly (PA)	Smith (MO)
Carter (GA)	Kennedy	Smith (NE)
Chu, Judy	Khanna	Smucker
Clarke (NY)	Kim	Spano
Cline	King (IA)	Stauber
Cloud	Latta	Takano
Comer	Lee (CA)	Thompson (PA)
Davidson (OH)	Lesko	Tiffany
DesJarlais	Long	Tipton
Duncan	Loudermilk	Tlaib
Emmer	Lowenthal	Van Drew
Engel	Luetkemeyer	Watkins
Estes	Marshall	Weber (TX)
Fleischmann	Massie	Westerman
Flores	Mast	Williams
Fortenberry	McClintock	Wilson (SC)
Fulcher	Meng	Wittman
Gabbard	Meuser	Wright
Gaetz	Miller	Yoho
Garcia (IL)	Moolenaar	Zeldin
Gianforte	Mooney (WV)	

NOT VOTING—25

Abraham	Hern, Kevin	Rooney (FL)
Brooks (IN)	Hollingsworth	Sensenbrenner
Buchanan	LaHood	Steube
Carter (TX)	LaMalfa	Walden
Costa	Lamborn	Walker
Crawford	Marchant	Walorski
Dunn	McHenry	Young
Gibbs	Mitchell	
Granger	Olson	

□ 1510

Mses. HERRERA BEUTLER, OCASIO-CORTEZ, Messrs. GUTHRIE, and KIM changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. BALDERSON and CONAWAY changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion was agreed to.

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 28, 2020. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on rollcall No. 115, a motion to disagree to the Senate amendments and agree to go to conference on H.R. 6172.

Mr. ABRAHAM. Madam Speaker, on Thursday, May 28, I was unavoidably detained on rollcall vote No. 115. Had I been present to vote, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall vote No. 115.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE
RESOLUTION 965, 116TH CONGRESS

Barragán (Gallego)	Hastings (Wasserman Schultz)	Napolitano (Correa)
Bass (Cicilline)	Heck (Kilmer)	Payne (Wasserman Schultz)
Bera (Aguilar)	Horsford (Kildee)	Peters (Rice (NY))
Blumenauer (Beyer)	Huffman (Kildee)	Pingree (Kuster (NH))
Bonamici (Raskin)	Jayapal (Raskin)	Pocan (Raskin)
Brownley (CA)	Johnson (TX)	Porter (Wexton)
(Kuster (NH))	(Jeffries)	Price (NC)
Cárdenas (Sánchez)	Khanna (Sherman)	(Butterfield)
Chu, Judy (Takano)	Kirkpatrick (Gallego)	Roybal-Allard (Sánchez)
Cisneros (Houlahan)	Krishnamoorthi (Brown (MD))	Ruiz (Aguilar)
Cohen (Beyer)	Lawrence (Kildee)	Rush
Crist (Murphy (FL))	Lawson (FL)	(Underwood)
Davis (CA) (Wild)	(Evans)	Schneider (Houlahan)
DeSaulnier (Matsui)	Levin (CA)	Schrader (O'Halleran)
Deutch (Rice (NY))	(Kildee)	Schrier (Kilmer)
Doggett (Raskin)	Levin (MI)	Serrano (Meng)
Escobar (Garcia (TX))	(Raskin)	Speier (Scanlon)
Eshoo (Thompson (CA))	Lewis (Kildee)	Suozi (Panetta)
Foster (Beyer)	Lieu, Ted (Beyer)	Talb (Dingell)
Frankel (Kuster (NH))	Lipinski (Cooper)	Tonko (Meng)
Garamendi (Sherman)	Loftgren (Boyle, Brendan F.)	Trahan (McGovern)
Gonzalez (TX)	Lowenthal (Beyer)	Vargas (Keating)
(Cuellar)	Lowey (Meng)	Veasey (Beyer)
Grijalva (Clay)	Maloney, Carolyn B. (Rose (NY))	Vela (Gallego)
Harder (CA)	McEachin (Wexton)	Watson Coleman (Pallone)
(Haaland)	McNerney (Raskin)	Welch (McGovern)
	Moore (Beyer)	Wilson (FL)
	Mucarsel-Powell (Wasserman Schultz)	(Hayes)

On his 25th combat mission in Vietnam, he was shot down, severely injured, and spent the next 7 years as a prisoner of war in the prison known as the Hanoi Hilton.

Many Members have read his book "Captive Warriors," which describes the hellish conditions and the courage and fortitude of Sam and his fellow prisoners as they fought to survive.

After serving in the Texas State House, Sam was elected to Congress in 1990 and served until January 2019, including, for a time, as acting chairman of the Ways and Means Committee.

He now goes to join his wonderful wife, Shirley, and his son, Bob.

Madam Speaker, I know of no one in the House who was more universally admired across the Chamber than Sam Johnson.

Sam sacrificed much in service of our Nation, but always with courage and good humor and a deep, deep love of country.

He inspired those of us who worked with him, and his memory will continue to be an inspiration to follow his example of service, sacrifice, and love of country.

Madam Speaker, I ask that the House observe a moment of silence in memory and in honor of this great American.

The SPEAKER. Will all Members please rise, and those who are in their offices and staff throughout the Capitol, for a moment of silence in honor of our dear Sam.

□ 1515

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, as we face the crisis that COVID-19 has confronted us with, the House must do its duty in full and do so in a way that contributes to the safety and welfare of our people, not in a way that harms it.

Members are advised there will be no votes expected in the House next week. Members are further advised that an updated 2020 legislative calendar will be released in the coming days.

I expect conversations to continue on additional legislation addressing COVID-19 and the legislation we passed honoring our heroes. In the event that an agreement is reached on a bipartisan or partisan bill—I don't know how an agreement can be reached on a partisan bill, but a bipartisan bill—then we will make sure that the House has 72 hours before they need to come back to vote on that legislation.

I am disappointed that Leader MCCONNELL said, when asked about the next phase of coronavirus relief, he said, I think that's a decision to be made a month from now.

As we know, we have a lot of people in crisis. We see food lines that are very, very long. We see unemployment rising steeply. There are many people

in this country that think waiting is not appropriate.

I am pleased the House has adopted a resolution to allow the committees to work remotely, Madam Speaker. I expect to use the coming weeks to get our committees back up and running so that they can begin having hearings and markups on critical legislation.

As my friend, Mr. SCALISE, knows, we have a number of must-pass bills that need to be addressed; the National Defense Authorization Act, the 12 appropriation bills, the surface transportation bill, and the WRDA bill as well. As committees begin consideration of these bills, I will be in touch with Members about when they will be scheduled this summer.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE), the minority whip.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend from Maryland for walking through those items.

I first want to start by sharing and associating myself with the comments made by my friend from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY) about the loss of our dear friend, Sam Johnson.

Sam and I got to be close friends, and I can picture him sitting right over there by General Lafayette's painting, in his scooter, as he was voting and sharing stories with friends in his last few months when he served here with us with distinction for so long, and the conversations and just the understanding of a giant that we served with, someone who served our country, spent 7 years in the Hanoi Hilton, as we talked about.

They never broke him. They probably broke every bone in his body trying, but he and those other brave men in that prison never once faltered in their love and dedication to our country and to their family.

He missed his wife. We know now he is with her and in a special place, and we are all better for having served with Sam Johnson. He truly is missed and was a special friend.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I want to echo the gentleman's comments. Although the Congressman, the patriot, the hero, did not always vote with me, nor I with him, we became good friends. And I shared with the gentleman and others in this body a deep respect for who he was as a person, a decent man, a patriotic man, a good man and, obviously, as the gentleman pointed out, a very courageous man as well.

He served many missions, was shot down, imprisoned, but they did not break Sam Johnson, nor did they break the love he had for his country, and we honor the service he gave.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the Speaker as well for leading that tribute, and I am sure at some time in the future we will spend an appropriate amount of time here on the floor where colleagues can share

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON
H.R. 6172, USA FREEDOM REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2020

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees on H.R. 6172:

Messrs. NADLER, SCHIFF, Ms. LOFGREN, Messrs. JORDAN, and NUNES.

There was no objection.

MOMENT OF SILENCE HONORING
REPRESENTATIVE SAM JOHNSON

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

Mr. THORNBERRY. Madam Speaker, yesterday, we lost a former colleague, a patriot, and a true American hero.

Calling the gentleman from Texas, Sam Johnson, a hero is not some sort of inflated rhetoric or hyperbole; it is the best description I know of Sam Johnson and his life.

Born in San Antonio, raised in Dallas, a graduate of SMU, Sam then served 29 years in the United States Air Force.

He was a fighter pilot, and some of those fighter pilot traits came through in everything he did, from how fast he drove across the highways of Texas to the way he approached legislation.

Sam was a veteran of the Korean conflict and, of course, the Vietnam war.

those stories about someone that everybody ought to know. We know we have some giants like JOHN LEWIS and Sam Johnson who we got to serve with. Sam left and now is no longer with us. John still is and, obviously, he is going through his own battle, and we pray for John as well.

But as we have our battles of the day politically, it is good to remember the special people that get to make up this body and become part of this great institution in which we have the honor to serve. So I appreciate the Speaker and the leader allowing us to have that moment.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

Ms. PELOSI. I thank the gentleman for yielding. It is a sad day for us, but what a joy for all of us to have served with Sam Johnson, a bona fide American hero, to serve with him in the Congress.

I appreciate that the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE) mentioned him and JOHN LEWIS in the same sentence, because I had the privilege—JOHN LARSON set up a Heroes Night, a bipartisan Heroes Night, and I had the privilege of giving Sam the award that night as a true hero.

He always beamed when he talked about Shirley, and he loved the children, his son, Bob. Now he is with them, with Shirley and Bob.

This was a very special person. I was mentioning to the distinguished whip earlier that we were there when the room was named for him. We were there when his picture was hung. He always wanted us all around him to celebrate the recognition that he received so that he could boast of his bipartisanship and his patriotism, which we all admired.

I was mentioning to the distinguished whip and Mr. THORNBERRY and others that on one of those occasions he had a fellow prisoner of war there with him, and that bond is something so beyond anything we can imagine. Imagine the strength, the courage, the patriotism, just the faith in God that he had.

So I thank the gentleman for the opportunity to share some personal comments about a really great man; always friendly, always smiling, always teasing about political differences but, as always, just being a model of greatness to all of us.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, if anybody wants to have a good read, his book, "Captive Warriors," tells the story of those years in the Hanoi Hilton; not only the unbreakable bond of those heroes that he served in that prison with, but also the unbreakable love between he and Shirley. She never wavered from her love of him, 7 years removed, while some of that time she didn't even know if he was alive.

He loved her till the day she died and till the day he died because he mourned her death every day since, and it was something for all of us—again, as we

have our daily battles here—just to know the special kind of people that we get to serve with, and he was surely one.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, as I said, what we are going to do over the next couple of weeks, we have adopted a rule that allows the committees to meet even if they can't be here for health reasons, depending upon what the status is in D.C. and the Capitol, where it is around the country, including transportation.

The rule that we adopted provides that committees must have, in order to conduct virtual or hybrid hearings, a practice session, then two hearings before they go to a markup.

So obviously, if we are going to work on this floor, we need product and, obviously, product comes from the committees. And so I am very hopeful that the committees will be getting up and running at top speed in many respects.

And, of course, the committees have been working so very hard, and the Members have been working so very hard, in my view, on both sides of the aisle, as they have been home and talking to their hospitals, talking to their governors and their county commissioners and their local folks, nursing home administrators, so many people that we have kept in touch with through these weeks to see what we could do to assist them with whatever they needed.

□ 1530

The committees will be getting up to speed, and they will be qualifying for having hearings. I expect work product to be coming later this month, and we will be giving notice in the near term on a longer term schedule. But the House will not be in session next week, and we will be looking at how the committees are proceeding from that point on.

We will give, as I said, as we have in the past, 72 hours' notice to Members when and if we have to come back.

I want to again say also that we are very hopeful that our Republican colleague will engage in the matters that were included in the HEROES bill because our States are struggling. I know my State is a relatively wealthy State, but its revenues are off 20, 25 percent. I don't know what Louisiana's position is, but I am sure they are struggling as well. Municipalities are struggling, cities are struggling, and counties are struggling from the revenue reduction that is a direct result of COVID-19. So, we are trying to help those States.

In addition, of course, we invested substantial sums in testing, isolating, tracing, and treating individuals who have COVID, and we need to follow up on whom they have contacted so that we can make sure that they isolate themselves because the only way we are going to get a handle on this is to make sure we reduce the transition from one to the other.

We are also hopeful that we will develop, and there is money in there to

develop, a therapeutic to mitigate the adverse effects of COVID-19 but also a vaccine to protect us from getting COVID-19.

Until that happens, we also need to give additional help to our small businesses and individuals who are really struggling as unemployment is at historic levels. Over 38 million Americans—maybe it is now closer to 40 million Americans—are without jobs. We have given them assistance, and we need to give them some more.

That is where we stand now, and we will operate with an intent in mind of getting the business of the House done, in addition to the extraordinary work that we have done on five responses now from the House on the effects that the coronavirus has caused in this country both to human beings' health and to the health of our economy.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

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

Madam Speaker, we have worked together to help try to address the problems within our country, both economically and the health side, small businesses, medium-sized businesses, large businesses, and State and local governments.

Trillions of dollars have already been spent. When you think just about the hundreds of billions of dollars that we sent to States through various means, whether it is direct aid, the \$150 billion package that we have sent to States, we see that each State got a large share of that money, billions of dollars in some cases for each State.

I don't know one State that has spent all of their allotment. Many are working to try to figure out if they are going to help local governments or not. It was surely our intention here that it wouldn't just be for States, that 45 percent of that money should be available for local governments as well. I would urge Governors to respect that intent of this body.

Rather than continuing to look to Washington, I think States need to start looking within and saying: How can we work to safely reopen our States, and how have other States done it successfully if other States are behind?

We have models out there. That is why we always say the States are the great incubators of democracy. We all have smart people in this country who are figuring this out. States that are reopening successfully that aren't seeing spikes in their hospitals have done things and used protocols working off of guidance from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention to successfully get their economies back open again.

No economy is back open at the level it needs to be, and that is why we need to encourage everybody to safely reopen so that the real answer to States that have budget problems is to start getting their economies going again; get people back to work again; get people out having their checkups with

their doctors again, their immunizations for the children who aren't getting immunized, the cancer treatments, the mammograms, and the colonoscopies that were being skipped for months. We are seeing studies that are coming out from very well-respected health experts who are talking about the real health danger of having shut-ins and people not getting out again.

We have to weigh all of this, and we have to keep encouraging the great progress we are seeing from some of these great drug companies here in America that are working on a cure, that are finding therapies that are effective for COVID-19 with the help, by the way, of some of those trillions of dollars that we have spent here in Washington to find, hopefully, a vaccine. Even Dr. Fauci is talking about the possibility of a vaccine being available soon. We need to make sure that we are working to help ramp up production when that is found so that we can make it available to anyone who wants to take it.

We need to be also focused on holding China accountable. We need to be focused on bringing production back to America of PPE, which was in short supply in those critical weeks after we found out China, while they were lying to the world about this disease, with the WHO joining in with them, was stopping and blocking the export of PPE, which they make the lion's share of, including American companies in China that weren't even allowed to sell PPE back to us when they had orders in place to do so.

So, we should be investigating that. I am sorry that that is not happening here.

We should be addressing how we can bring more of that manufacturing back to America to create new jobs for Americans making our own protective equipment for our frontline workers like doctors and nurses. Unfortunately, that focus hasn't been there.

But the real issue is: What should Congress' role be in this? Shouldn't Congress be leading the way in showing people how to safely reopen and do our work?

While we have had only a limited number of opportunities to come back here and vote directly on the House floor, it has been a smooth process. It has been a process that has been safe for Members, staggered votes where social distancing, which is still the standard that everybody should be practicing, is able to be exercised in a safe and effective way.

Clearly, we had a very big difference on the proxy voting, and I think we have already seen abuses of that process. But the real issue is: When are we going to get back to a functioning, regular schedule for the House of Representatives?

A major company here, Disney, announced yesterday they are going to start opening their parks again in a few weeks. You have the National Bas-

ketball Association talking about playing games again, whether or not there are fans in the stands. When you talk about a sport that can't exercise social distancing, they are working on protocols right now to test players and to allow games to go on. We all know the physical nature of a sport like basketball or even football. Hockey is talking about coming back. NASCAR is already racing again.

As all of these things are happening and these ideas and these great ways to safely get different parts of our economy open again, we don't even know what the schedule of the House is and when the House will actually be back voting again.

The Armed Services Committee could be in a large room in the Capitol that is sitting vacant right now, debating the National Defense Authorization Act, so we don't get caught bringing up legislation at the midnight hour. We can actually start working on that now. That work can be done here in Washington. It doesn't have to be done remotely.

These are the concerns that we would ask: Is there going to be a time when the majority leader would put out a new schedule that actually shows what our voting pattern will be?

We know, obviously, when you look at May, April, and even June, clearly, that has changed. But at some point, will it be mid-June? Will it be July?

Again, if NBA players can be playing basketball in July, can't we have a regular schedule by then that the House will be conducting business?

We have seen the Spanish flu, and people had to get here with horses and buggies, yet they figured out how to do it.

Can we lead the way again in showing people how to safely do our business with a consistent schedule that right now doesn't exist?

Mr. HOYER. The answer is yes. We are going to have out a fuller schedule in the near term. But we have to find out how our committees can operate.

I want to say, regarding the national defense authorization bill, Members on both sides of the aisle have been working very, very hard at a distance, on the phone, and in other ways. So, I expect them to be ready to come to the floor this summer, and we are going to pass that bill, we think, before the summer break. That is for certain.

Madam Speaker, I yield to my friend.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, if I could ask the gentleman on the voting and whether it is in committee, clearly, there are rooms here in the Capitol—we have seen the Rules Committee utilize the Ways and Means Committee where they are able to be spread out at distances well beyond the safe standards of social distancing, well beyond 6 feet where you can have in-person hearings where the back and forth of a debate and the votes that would go with it where a proxy vote doesn't really fit that situation can occur. I would hope that we do that.

This shouldn't have been a partisan exercise. I know early on we talked about trying to find a way to conduct our business where both parties would agree, and the minority leader and the Speaker were talking about doing that, and we thought that would be how it would end up. Of course, that wasn't what happened with the proxy voting. But even my friend just mentioned that if somebody proxy voted, then it would be for health reasons. Yet, yesterday, the first time where this new experiment that has never been done in over 230 years was conducted, there were Members who voted by proxy signing a document saying that they couldn't be here to physically attend proceedings, yet it turns out they were in other places. In some cases, it took them longer to get to a rocket launch than it would have taken them to get here to the United States Capitol, in clear violation of the intent of proxy voting. That literally was just on the first day.

I don't know if the gentleman is going to revisit proxy voting. But, clearly, we have seen most people can come here and do the work. Even some who chose not to could have been here.

What message does that send to the country when we should be the ones leading the way to safely reopen?

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I think the country is distancing itself as well. I don't know whether my friend drove to work today, but there are hardly any cars on the street. There are hardly any cars on the street in New York. The reason is because people are taking the advice of the government and practicing social distancing.

We think that makes sense. We think that is consistent with medical advice, and that is what we have been doing.

It is very nice to say, well, they could have been here, but there are a lot of West Coast Members who have to get on airplanes. Some of those airplanes now, because there are so few flights, are very crowded, and people are concerned because they are not practicing social distancing.

When I am speaking, I don't wear a mask. But if you see me in the Capitol and getting into my car, I have a mask on. I think we are setting an example. I think we are setting an example of how you distance here on this floor, which we are all practicing right now.

So, I think the House is setting a good example of understanding that it is not business as usual. When you walk down the street and people are wearing masks, you know it is not business as usual. You know it is not the America of 3 or 4 months ago, Madam Speaker.

In any event, I think we are going to proceed. We have provided to do the business of the American people. We did that just in the last 2 days. We passed a number of very important bills, important bills to small business in particular.

I was sorry that we didn't resolve the FISA question, but we did go to conference. We will see what happens on

that. We have passed, as the gentleman mentioned earlier, extraordinary legislation through this House over the last 2 months to ensure that the American people got the help they needed and that the economics of our country will undergird it to the extent we could. So, we have done a lot of work.

I want to say this: I think we do a disservice to our Members and to this institution if we go home and pretend that Members somehow aren't working because they are not physically in this room. I don't know, I presume my friend's Members—but I tell you, Madam Speaker, the Members on my side of the aisle are working around the clock and communicating around the clock.

That bill that we passed in a bipartisan way, we took a lot of time, days and days and days and days of hours-and hours- and hours-long conversations to get to a consensus on what ought to be in that bill, and we passed it in a bipartisan way.

So, my presumption is my friend did the same. I don't know; I was not on my friend's phone calls. But you do a disservice, I think—I don't mean you personally. But we do a disservice to allow the President or anybody else—nobody is on vacation. People are working harder now than if we didn't have this coronavirus is my observation.

I am hopeful that we will move on. I am hopeful that we will be back to business as usual and as soon as possible—"possible" is the operative word—with the advice of our Capitol physician, with the advice of the administration, and my own Governor.

My friend talked about States. I have a Republican Governor, Governor Hogan, whose father was one of my predecessors. I know he is still very cautious and urging caution for our citizens.

Madam Speaker, unless the gentleman has something further, I am prepared to yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1545

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I would just say that, clearly, we have a disagreement on how business should be conducted on the House floor, specifically as it relates to proxy voting and whether or not we can be here physically doing the job. And, clearly, when we are at home in our districts, we are finding other ways to get work done, to communicate with constituents, to communicate with people all around the Nation. Using technology, it has definitely helped the ability for us to do it, but it is not the same thing as when we are here.

The other side of that, because one piece of it is the ability to be here—and, clearly, we have the ability to be here. There are flights. If somebody is not comfortable flying, they used to take horse and buggy. They didn't have planes, and yet they found a way to get here in tougher times. But then you

look at the message that we are trying to send. And, yes, there are some places that you don't have traffic on the road because their officials have chosen not to open as aggressively as others, using safety protocols.

No one is talking about compromising safety, but there are many States that have shown how to safely reopen on a much wider scale where you can get people back out doing the things that they want to do again, and that is the real issue. You are watching aspects of the private sector, you are even watching other levels of government, large cities, large States that are reopening and doing it successfully, not overrunning their hospitals.

Most of our hospitals are telling us they want more patients. They want the people who normally would be getting their checkups and immunizations and even hip replacements and things that are part of their life cycle, their quality of life, and their ability to live with cancer treatments and things like that that aren't being done. There are people dying right now because they are not being tended to.

In my home parish, I actually talked to my coroner about this. He took a 6-week period—just 2 weeks ago, took a 6-week period and took that exact 6-week period a year ago, and there was a 42 percent increase in non-COVID-related deaths, just in my home parish. This year, more—Madam Speaker, 42 percent increase—because people aren't going out, aren't going to the doctor. If they had chest pains, they weren't going to a doctor because the doctor's office is closed, where they could catch it, and so they were dying in their house.

These are real numbers from the coroner. I mean, there is a problem that is created by not allowing people to go about their lives again in a safe way.

So we ought to be leading the way, leading the way to show people how to do it. And, again, we have had votes here on the House floor before proxy voting in the midst of this pandemic, and it went very smoothly. And if there are better ways we can find to do it, we will do it.

But we followed all the protocols of the Attending Physician. I didn't hear of any Members complaining about that process. Everybody went about it their own way, practicing the social distancing that we all encourage. Yet we are not doing that on a consistent basis, and that doesn't send the right message.

As the gentleman reworks the schedule, and I hope it is done soon, I hope it takes into account the fact that it is important for us to show the rest of the country that we can be here doing our job.

Yes, there are things that we are going to do remotely. There are things we always do remotely. If we are on a 3-week schedule in D.C. and 1 week back home in our districts, it is important that we go back home to stay in touch with the people who actually

elect us, the people who make this country work so that we can come back here and represent them better.

But we do have to come back here and do the work. You can't phone it in sometimes. You can't do that remotely. There are certain parts of our job where we actually have to be here.

In the rough-and-tumble of a legislative process, things change on the fly; and if you are back home or going to some other event somewhere else because you choose not to come here, it is kind of hard to say you gave your proxy to somebody and then things change 2 minutes before a vote. It is going to be hard for that person to know how to change their vote by proxy when they are not here.

So there are flaws in there that don't need to be there because we have proven we can be here. I just hope that that is taken into account when the new schedule is being worked out, and, again, hopefully released as soon as possible so that as other people and industries and groups are starting to show how they are going to come back safely, we can do the same thing—not last. Clearly, we are not going to be first now, but hopefully, as other people are making those decisions, we can be part of that, not at the tail end of it.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and I yield back the balance of my time.

COVID-19, STRATEGIC TESTING FOR WORKERS

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, as of yesterday, the United States death toll from COVID-19 has reached over 100,000 precious lives.

Recent headlines tell the story of COVID-19 risks as workers report to work with no testing. The Toledo Blade reports: "Coronavirus Strikes Fermi 2 Nuclear Plant During Refueling." Reuters reports: "All Three Detroit Automakers Had Workers Test Positive for COVID-19 Since Plants Reopened." And Willamette Week reports: "The Reopening of Vancouver, Washington, Is On Hold as 65 Workers Test Positive for COVID-19 at a Fruit Processing Facility."

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD the articles I mentioned.

[From the Blade, Apr. 8, 2020]

CORONAVIRUS STRIKES FERMI 2 NUCLEAR PLANT DURING REFUELING; UTILITY KEEPS WORKING

(By Tom Henry)

NEWPORT, MICH.—An undisclosed number of coronavirus cases have been documented inside Fermi 2 during the nuclear plant's latest refueling outage.

But owner-operator DTE Energy said it believes it has enough precautions in place now to complete the work and get the plant restarted in the coming weeks.

In a statement, DTE spokesman Stephen R. Tait said the company "can confirm that we have had employees test positive, but are

not giving out numbers, locations or names at this time.”

Media reports showed the first worker tested positive about the same time the refueling outage began on March 21. A Detroit television station reported at least two more positive cases were documented within days of that.

DTE won't say for the record when it expects to complete Fermi 2's outage.

But many similar operations—which once took six weeks or longer—have been shortened to about a month in recent years. Utilities lose hundreds of thousands of dollars in potential electricity sales each day nuclear plants sit idle.

Nuclear plants are refueled every 18 to 24 months, depending on the type of uranium used in their reactor cores.

Fermi 2, located along western Lake Erie in northern Monroe County's Frenchtown Township, is one of many nuclear plants across the United States scheduled to be refueled during the spring or fall of 2020, the two seasons when demand for electricity is lowest.

Energy Harbor's Davis-Besse nuclear plant along the Lake Erie shoreline in rural Ottawa County recently completed its latest refueling.

Both plants are about 30 miles from downtown Toledo.

The coronavirus pandemic has, of course, complicated those efforts this year.

To help keep refuelings on schedule, the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission last month allowed for an exemption from rules which limit the number of consecutive hours workers are allowed to be inside the plant at a time. The agency said in a March 28 letter to the Washington-based Nuclear Energy Institute that it will consider such requests on a case-by-case basis, and that exemptions will be limited to 60 days.

“We are aware of the NRC's willingness to relax some rules for overtime at plants if there is a need,” Mr. Tait said. “At this time, we have not requested any variances.”

The NRC has “no immediate concerns in this area,” Viktoria Mitlyng, agency spokesman, said. “We are communicating regularly with Fermi staff to discuss current activities and future plans, including staffing, medical screening, reductions in nonessential maintenance work, and other related matters.”

In nearly all refuelings, including at those at Fermi 2 and Davis-Besse, hundreds of specialized, out-of-state contractors augment the regular plant workforces, often resulting in 1,000 or more workers assigned to any given site at a time. Work is usually divided into eight-hour shifts, with activity occurring 24 hours a day.

Officials have noted those contractors move throughout the country from job to job, bringing with them the potential of carrying viruses outside of the sites they last worked.

Monroe-area resident Michael J. Keegan, a longtime activist associated with the activist group Don't Waste Michigan, said he worries the NRC will again allow DTE to postpone some of the work planned for the submerged portion of Fermi 2's pressure suppression chamber, also referred to as the torus.

The utility came to an agreement with the NRC to fix degraded coating there, a situation that has lingered for 31 years. It was first identified in 1989, the NRC has said.

One of the concerns is that loose paint chips in drains could make it difficult for vital reactor coolant pumps to move water in the event of an emergency.

The NRC told DTE it will grant the utility's request to remove only coatings found to be degraded through inspections.

“If degraded coating is found, they will remove it prior to returning the reactor to op-

eration after the spring 2020 outage,” Ms. Mitlyng said.

Fermi 2, one of Michigan's largest employers, is about 30 miles south of Detroit, which is now one of America's hot spots for the coronavirus pandemic.

[From Reuters, May 27, 2020]

ALL THREE DETROIT AUTOMAKERS HAD WORKERS TEST POSITIVE FOR COVID-19 SINCE PLANTS REOPENED

DETROIT.—In the week since U.S. auto factories reopened after coronavirus lockdowns, workers at all three Detroit automakers have tested positive for COVID-19 but only Ford Motor Co has temporarily closed plants.

The U.S. auto industry reopened many plants last week after a two-month shutdown due to the global pandemic. To ensure safety during the outbreak, companies imposed new safety measures, including screening employees, use of face masks and social distancing.

Ford paused production at its Claycomo, Missouri, plant for an hour on Tuesday after a worker tested positive. Work resumed at the plant, which builds the F-150 pickup truck and Transit van, without workers being sent home following a deep cleaning, Ford spokeswoman Kelli Felker said Wednesday.

General Motors Co and Fiat Chrysler Automobiles NV (FCA) said Wednesday they have had workers test positive since the restart, but have not been forced to idle plants. They did not disclose the number of workers affected.

On Wednesday, a union leader at Ford's Kentucky Truck Plant said on Twitter a worker there tested positive, but had not worked since May 21. Felker said the plant never closed.

Last week, Ford closed two assembly plants, due to a positive test at its Dearborn, Michigan, factory and a parts shortage due to a positive test at a supplier that closed the Chicago plant. It had marked the second consecutive day for closures in Chicago following two positive tests.

United Auto Workers Local 600, which represents hourly workers in Dearborn, last week demanded testing for every worker there and that Ford shut down the plant for 24 hours after a positive test. Ford said the safety of its workers is a top priority and cited the safety measures it has developed in conjunction with the UAW.

In Mexico, Ford told workers it was targeting a May 28 restart at its Hermosillo plant. GM and FCA have restarted operations in Mexico.

[From wweek.com, May 25, 2020]

THE REOPENING OF VANCOUVER, WASH., IS ON HOLD AS 65 WORKERS TEST POSITIVE FOR COVID-19 AT A FRUIT PROCESSING FACILITY

(By Tess Riski)

Clark County's application to move into Phase 2 of reopening has been put on pause. The COVID-19 outbreak at a fruit processing plant in Vancouver, Wash., climbed from 38 workers Friday to 65 employees Monday. The Oregonian first reported.

The facility, called Firestone Pacific Foods, halted production May 19. On May 23, Washington state health officials suspended Clark County's request to enter Phase 2 of the state's reopening plan due to the outbreak.

The state health department cited the Firestone outbreak as its reason for suspending Vancouver's reopening.

The county health department said in a press release Saturday that it is identifying and notifying close contacts of all who test-

ed positive and asking them to quarantine for 14 days.

Firestone processes frozen fruit mostly berries. Food processing plants have been epicenters of COVID-19 outbreaks across the U.S., in part because social distancing is difficult on assembly-line floors.

The facility told The Oregonian it's unaware of any workers who have been hospitalized because of the virus.

“While this outbreak is unfortunate, our response demonstrates we have the confidence and capability to respond to situations like this,” Dr. Alan Melnick, the Clark County health officer, said in a press release.

[From the New York Times, May 25, 2020]

‘THIS IS NOT THE HUNGER GAMES’: NATIONAL TESTING STRATEGY DRAWS CONCERNS

(By Apoorva Mandavilli and Catie Edmondson)

The Trump administration's new testing strategy, released Sunday to Congress, holds individual states responsible for planning and carrying out all coronavirus testing, while planning to provide some supplies needed for the tests.

The proposal also says existing testing capacity, if properly targeted, is sufficient to contain the outbreak. But epidemiologists say that amount of testing is orders of magnitude lower than many of them believe the country needs.

The report cements a stance that has frustrated governors in both parties, following the administration's announcement last month that the federal government should be considered “the supplier of last resort” and that states should develop their own testing plans.

“For months, it was a tennis game, it was going back and forth between the feds and the states, and it's now landed with the states,” said Scott Becker, executive director of the Association of Public Health Laboratories.

Mr. Becker noted that the federal government plans to distribute some testing supplies, including swabs and viral transport media, and to store test kits in the strategic national stockpile. “That's actually quite significant,” he said. “That's a positive step.”

The Department of Health and Human Services prepared the strategy, which meets requirements under the Paycheck Protection Program and Health Care Enhancement Act, signed into law by President Trump on April 24, that federal agencies come up with a strategic testing plan within 30 days. It was reported earlier by The Washington Post.

Mr. Becker, public health experts and Democratic leaders panned the proposal, saying the strategy runs the risk of states competing with one another and may create deep inequities among them.

The strategy mirrors a divide that has played out in Congress for months. As they negotiated the virus relief bill in March, Democratic lawmakers pushed to require the administration to submit this national testing plan to Congress. Republicans resisted, saying those decisions belonged to each state.

Mr. Becker and others said it's reasonable to expect states to implement some aspects of the testing, such as designating test sites. But acquiring tests involves reliance on national and international supply chains—which are challenging for many states to navigate.

“That's our biggest question, that's our biggest concern, is the robustness of the supply chain, which is critical,” Mr. Becker said. “You can't leave it up to the states to do it for themselves. This is not the Hunger Games.”

In a joint statement on Monday, Speaker Nancy Pelosi; Senator Chuck Schumer, the Democratic leader; Representative Frank Pallone, Democratic chairman of the House Energy and Commerce Committee; and Senator Patty Murray, the ranking Democrat on the Senate's health committee, said the Trump administration was not taking responsibility for ramping up national testing capacity.

"This disappointing report confirms that President Trump's national testing strategy is to deny the truth that there aren't enough tests and supplies, reject responsibility and dump the burden onto the states," the lawmakers said. "In this document, the Trump administration again attempts to paint a rosy picture about testing while experts continue to warn the country is far short of what we need."

Experts also took issue with the report's assertion that continuing to test only about 300,000 people a day, by targeting only those likely to be positive, would be enough to contain the outbreak.

"On the face of it, the idea that 300,000 tests a day is enough for America is absurd," said Dr. Ashish Jha, director of the Harvard Global Health Institute.

He offered a quick rundown of the numbers to illustrate the estimate's inadequacy. Most hospitals nationwide now test everyone who is admitted for any reason, roughly 100,000 tests each day, fearing that they may be asymptomatic and yet still spreading the virus. Testing the 1.6 million residents of nursing homes—known to be at high risk of coronavirus infection—and workers every two weeks would require 150,000 more tests each day. Add high-risk places like meatpacking plants that need regular testing, and the numbers rapidly build.

"Without having tested a single person for symptoms of Covid, we would quickly exhaust our entire national supply of testing if all we have is 300,000 tests per day," he said.

The H.H.S. report noted that an analysis by the Safra Center at Harvard estimated the need at more than three million tests per day. But the federal report said that estimate was based on faulty assumptions.

The Safra authors who crafted the estimate said that the federal report had cherry-picked one simple example from their analysis without considering other evidence.

"We ran multiple models, all of which pointed to the same order of magnitude," said Danielle Allen, director of the Safra Center. "They've selected one non-primary model in an appendix and selectively adjusted assumptions to generate a different number."

Dr. Allen said millions of daily tests would be required to have 4 percent of people test positive with the coronavirus—the level they say is needed to halt the spread of the virus. The administration's target, 10 percent, would allow only for mitigation.

"There is not a single country that I'm aware of that achieved disease suppression with a positivity rate of 10 percent," she said.

And 300,000 daily tests would be insufficient even for mitigation, Dr. Jha said, estimating that would require at least 900,000 tests per day.

The proposal also leaves it to states to plan for contact tracing and isolation, rapidly identify new clusters of coronavirus infection and adopt new technologies. It says the federal government is "supporting and encouraging" states to rely heavily on guidance from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

However, the C.D.C. has been slow to release guidance for states during this outbreak, Dr. Jha said. And the agency fumbled its role in testing strategy, most recently

with last week's dust-up over the mixing of test results for active infection with serology. "This is not C.D.C.'s shining moment," he said.

Governors have bristled at claims from the administration that the supply of tests was adequate, routinely asking for more federal assistance. Some states have ultimately decided to negotiate directly with suppliers to obtain test kits.

Federal virus relief legislation required states to release their individual testing plans last week, but they requested an extension to later this week. If elements of those state plans prove promising, Mr. Becker said, the federal strategy could be revised or merged with them.

[From CNN, May 21, 2020]

CORONAVIRUS TESTING IS 'A MESS' IN THE US, REPORT SAYS

(By Maggie Fox)

Coronavirus testing in the United States is disorganized and needs coordination at the national level, infectious disease experts said in a new report released Wednesday.

Right now, testing is not accurate enough to use alone to make most decisions, including who should go back to work or to school, the team at the University of Minnesota said.

"It's a mess out there," Mike Osterholm, head of the university's Center for Infectious Disease Research and Policy (CIDRAP), which issued the report, told CNN.

"Testing is very, very important, but we're not doing the right testing."

The number of tests that have been completed—numbers widely reported by states and by the White House—show only part of the picture, the report reads.

"The data is really kind of screwed up," Osterholm said. "It's because the public health system is overwhelmed."

The report has some specific recommendations for diagnostic tests that check to see if someone is currently infected with coronavirus.

Testing is most useful for clinical care of patients, for disease surveillance and contact tracing and for monitoring frontline workers such as emergency responders, doctors and nurses who may have been exposed, the report recommends. People with symptoms should also be tested, it says.

But coronavirus testing is not accurate enough yet to use in many other ways, the CIDRAP team said.

It recommends against:

Universal testing in hospital settings

Testing in schools or other low-risk settings

Widespread community-based testing

Antibody tests to decide who goes back to work

Immunity passports

It might be useful to test asymptomatic people in long-term care facilities in some cases because they are likely to have many cases, the report said. "Asymptomatic shedding of the virus may be detected with a molecular test (which looks for the virus itself) or an antigen test (which looks for important pieces of the virus). It is not yet clear where, when and how asymptomatic individuals should be tested."

The report also says that antibody tests should be used only with caution. These tests check the blood for evidence of an immune response to the virus, and indicate that someone has been infected for some days or has even cleared an infection. They are most useful for identifying donors of plasma used to treat patients or for deciding on how to manage patients when standard diagnostic tests are negative, the report says.

It's not clear if antibody tests are useful for testing of health care workers to determine immune status, according to the report.

"We believe that greatly expanding SARS-CoV-2 testing is a critical element in our response to COVID-19," the report reads. "For testing to be maximally effective, coordination across the system and across jurisdictions is necessary. Ideally, this requires federal guidance, leadership and support, with strong jurisdictional buy-in at the state and local levels."

The report calls on the US Department of Health and Human Services to appoint a panel to oversee and organize testing. "The panel should include representatives from public health, clinical laboratory, and medicine; the laboratory testing research and development, marketing, and product support industries; ethicists; legal scholars; and elected officials," it says.

Osterholm noted that some states are combining data from diagnostic tests and antibody tests to make estimates about how many people have been infected. The Food and Drug Administration advises against using tests in this way and so does Osterholm. "You need to do the right test at the right time to get the right result," he said. "Nobody is thinking through that."

Plus, there's not enough coordination to ensure that states have the testing supplies they need. This is a system and if a system breaks down anywhere, it breaks down everywhere," Osterholm said.

"What good are the test results if you can't trust them?"

[From the New York Times, May 25, 2020]

AS MEATPACKING PLANTS REOPEN, DATA ABOUT WORKER ILLNESS REMAINS ELUSIVE

(By Michael Corkery, David Yaffe-Bellany and Derek Kravitz)

The Smithfield Foods plant in Tar Heel, N.C., is one of the world's largest pork processing facilities, employing about 4,500 people and slaughtering roughly 30,000 pigs a day at its peak.

And like more than 100 other meat plants across the United States, the facility has seen a substantial number of coronavirus cases. But the exact number of workers in Tar Heel who have tested positive is anyone's guess.

Smithfield would not provide any data when asked about the number of illnesses at the plant. Neither would state or local health officials.

"There has been a stigma associated with the virus," said Teresa Duncan, the director of the health department in Bladen County, where the plant is located. "So we're trying to protect privacy."

Along with nursing homes and prisons, meatpacking facilities have proven to be places where the virus spreads rapidly. But as dozens of plants that closed because of outbreaks begin reopening, meat companies' reluctance to disclose detailed case counts makes it difficult to tell whether the contagion is contained or new cases are emerging even with new safety measures in place. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention said there were nearly 5,000 meatpacking workers infected with the virus as of the end of last month. But the nonprofit group Food & Environment Reporting Network estimated last week that the number has climbed to more than 17,000. There have been 66 meatpacking deaths, the group said.

And the outbreaks may be even more extensive.

For weeks, local officials received conflicting signals from state leaders and meatpacking companies about how much information to release, according to internal

emails from government health agencies obtained through public records requests by Columbia University's Brown Institute for Media Innovation and provided to The New York Times. The mixed messages left many workers and their communities in the dark about the extent of the spread in parts of Iowa, Nebraska and Colorado.

The emails also reveal the deference some county officials have shown toward the giant meatpacking companies and how little power they have in pushing the companies to stem outbreaks.

"Bad news spreads way faster than the truth," said a county health official in Colorado of an outbreak at a Cargill plant, according to notes from a conference call last month. "At this point, we are not doing anything to cast them in a bad light. Will not throw them to the Press."

Questions about the transparency of governments and companies about the coronavirus extend far beyond meatpacking. Chinese officials have been widely criticized for not fully disclosing the extent of the virus's spread within their borders. And in the United States, President Trump has questioned the official death toll from the coronavirus, suggesting that the numbers may be inflated even as public health experts and statisticians say the opposite is more likely true.

The meat companies are not legally required to disclose how many workers are sick. But legal experts say privacy is not a valid reason for keeping the numbers from the public.

"Alerting a community about the number of cases in a particular place is a standard public health response," said Nicole Huberfeld, a public health expert at Boston University. "People need to act appropriately if they are exposed."

The lack of full disclosure also demonstrates the industry's sway as a major employer in the Midwest and the South.

While more than 80 percent of beef and pork workers are unionized, even labor leaders acknowledge it is not as easy to shut down meat plants as other factories because they are essential to the food supply. Auto plants, for example, were shut down relatively early during the pandemic and have only just begun to reopen.

After some slaughterhouses did close, restaurants and stores experienced significant shortages of meat, leading Mr. Trump to issue an executive order designating meat plants "critical infrastructure" that must stay open.

But the order did not address crucial issues like testing, leading many companies to reopen plants or keep them operating without fully assessing whether employees had contracted the virus.

Across the country, many local health departments have encouraged companies to test employees—but stopped short of ordering them to do so.

On April 21, health officials in Dallas County, Iowa, told Tyson Foods that they could provide rapid testing kits for workers at its local plant in Perry, according to the emails. An early draft of that message to Tyson managers underscored the urgency, saying, "At this time, we strongly recommend this option be implemented immediately."

But the county's lawyer asked that the language be revised to read, "At this time, we ask you to consider this be implemented as soon as possible."

In an interview, the county attorney, Chuck Sinnard, said he recommended revising the language because he did not believe the health department had the authority to order Tyson to conduct tests.

"It was in the vein of choosing wording cautiously and conservatively so we didn't

get in a position where we were overstepping our bounds," he said.

On May 5, the state health department, which ultimately worked with Tyson to test employees, said 730 workers, or 58 percent of the plant's work force, had tested positive for the virus. About two weeks ago, Tyson started to disclose the number of coronavirus cases at a handful of its plants around the country where there has been widespread testing.

In North Carolina, workers and community advocates in the Tar Heel area started to raise the alarm in April, as local news outlets reported a string of infections linked to the Smithfield plant.

In neighboring Robeson County, 59 residents who work at the Tar Heel facility have become infected, out of a total of 669 cases in the community, according to Melissa Packer, the county's assistant health director.

But like the rest of the public, Ms. Packer does not know the full extent of the outbreak at the plant.

In conversations with state officials this month, Ms. Packer said, a number of county health directors requested that plantspecific numbers stay private. One of the reasons, she said, was that the local officials wanted to avoid antagonizing the meatpackers while they worked alongside them to curtail the outbreaks.

"A lot of the concerns were around fractured relationships," Ms. Packer said. "Some local health directors from the counties where there are processing plants expressed some concerns about how that may negatively impact the relationship they have built with the management of the companies."

A spokeswoman for North Carolina's health department, Amy Ellis, declined to reveal plant-specific data. She said the state has recorded a total of 1,952 cases across meat plants in 17 counties.

Smithfield said it continued to "report all Covid-19 cases to state and local health officials, as well as the C.D.C." and was working to provide free testing to all its employees.

This month, Gov. Pete Ricketts of Nebraska announced that the state would not disclose the number of coronavirus cases in specific meat plants without the consent of the companies. The state is releasing aggregate case numbers across the meat processing industry, the governor's spokesman said. Some of Nebraska's big meatpackers have also started revealing less about case numbers to their employees.

Eric Reeder, a local union president representing workers in 14 plants around Nebraska, said that the larger the outbreak, the less transparent some of the companies have become about the case numbers.

"When a plant hits several hundred cases, they get more tight-lipped, and that makes it difficult for workers to protect themselves and their families," said Mr. Reeder, president of the United Food & Commercial Workers union local 293.

Those transparency issues were on display last month when Teresa Anderson, the director of the Central District Health Department in Grand Island, Neb., told the meat processor JBS that she planned to conduct coronavirus testing at a park near the company's plant, which employs 3,700 people.

JBS wanted assurances that the test results would not be made public.

"We understand that you will be asking and recording the employer," Nicholas White, a compliance official at JBS, wrote in an email to Ms. Anderson on April 15. "But we would ask that you not disclose that information as part of any public disclosure of the testing results."

Six days later, though, Ms. Anderson announced that more than 200 people connected

to the Grand Island plant were infected. By May 5, at least 328 employees had tested positive, according to the emails from Grand Island, some of which were previously reported by ProPublica.

A spokesman for JBS, Cameron Bruett, said the company did not want to publicize the number of positive cases at the plant because little testing was being conducted in the broader area. Releasing the data, he said, "would distort any one company's role in community spread."

The tussle over whether plants should test workers has stretched for months in some states, creating critical delays in isolating infected workers. Local health authorities concede that asymptomatic employees are still coming to work with the virus, fueling the spread.

As recently as May 14, health officials in Wyandotte County, Kan., warned that the virus was continuing to spread inside a National Beef plant.

"The outbreak has gone on for a month," a county epidemiologist said in an email to her colleagues.

"Should we bust in, show our badges and test everyone?" a colleague suggested. "Ha!"

A National Beef spokesman said the company was following the county's health guidelines.

Even when case numbers are disclosed, many health departments say they have little authority to act at meat plants.

Last month, a worker in a Triumph Foods pork plant in St. Joseph, Mo., emailed the city saying at least two employees were infected and 90 percent of the staff was still working "less than a meter away" from one another.

"Workers are scared," the employee said. "Can the government take action on the matter for the protection of workers and the city?"

A health official wrote back on April 21, saying the city had "limited authority" in closing a business and suggested that the workers cover their noses and mouths and use hand sanitizer.

Since then, Triumph has supplied workers with masks, among other protective measures, according to the company website. But at the time, the plant worker was not comforted by the city's assurances.

"Are you telling me that it doesn't matter that two workers are infected," he wrote. "Because the plant is worth more than the workers' health?"

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, testing requires a national strategy, not a 50-State, helter-skelter search for limited supplies. Without rigorous expanded surveillance testing, many more American lives are put on the chopping block because of pure stupidity and callousness.

If the President can find billions to build more nuclear weapons, then surely we can find the money to protect those who build them and all workers who dedicate their talents to moving our Nation to full throttle again.

Mr. President, get a testing regimen in place. It is your duty. No excuses.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

VITAMIN D SUPPLEMENTS TO REDUCE COVID-19 DEATHS

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

Mr. GROTHMAN. Madam Speaker, as America opens up and we go over 100,000 deaths attributed to the COVID, it is important that we look at all our options to reduce the number of deaths related to this disease.

I feel the government is leaving too much to the pharmaceutical industry to develop a vaccine. Well, the answer may be a more natural one and one that is a lot cheaper for the American public.

Madam Speaker, I strongly believe that we should be looking more at the benefits of vitamin D. Vitamin D is from the Sun. It is free. I encourage people to ignore the politicians who say you have to spend all day indoors, but get out and grab the Sun.

We have been told since we were children that you get vitamin D from the Sun, and that is the way you stay healthy. If you can't grab the rays, grab some vitamin D pills. That is another way to get your vitamin D.

It is not just me saying it. I encourage folks back home to Google "Northwestern University vitamin D," or "Trinity College in Dublin, Ireland, vitamin D," and you will see there are a lot of experts outside of the CDC who are already pushing it.

Madam Speaker, I encourage people to use that method to keep the number of deaths from COVID down.

COVID-19 ON THE NAVAJO NATION

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

Mr. LUJÁN. Madam Speaker, since the beginning of this crisis, I have heard from Tribal leaders about the human tragedy of COVID-19 on the Navajo Nation: whole families ravaged by the disease, doctors overwhelmed by the surging cases, and insufficient Federal help.

These leaders are sounding the alarm for a community in crisis, and I have been working to ensure the medical professionals who serve the Navajo Nation have every tool at their disposal to treat patients and protect themselves.

But instead of doing right by the Navajo Nation, this administration, ProPublica found, awarded a \$3 million contract for personal protective equipment to an 11-day-old company headed by a former White House staffer. As a result, the IHS received hundreds of thousands of masks that may be unsuitable for medical use.

This lack of leadership endangers lives. That is why I am working with the New Mexico delegation and our colleagues from Arizona to hold the Trump administration accountable.

The Navajo Nation deserves the full support of the Federal Government during this crisis and not to have this administration turn a blind eye while the Nation loses one more parent, grandparent, son, or daughter. This administration must act as an honest

partner to the Navajo people, and I will fight to ensure that happens.

HISTORIC FLOODING IN MID-MICHIGAN

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

Mr. MOOLENAAR. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the first responders, emergency officials, and the people of mid-Michigan for their swift action, heroic work, and incredible compassion in responding to the flooding in our region last week.

In the face of the COVID-19 pandemic, historic rain, and the failure of two dams, they quickly and safely evacuated more than 11,000 people without a single death or injury and provided shelter for those who were displaced.

I have been on the ground meeting with residents who have been affected, especially in Sanford, which took the hardest hit from this heartbreaking event. Residents have lost businesses, homes, and cherished family possessions.

In the face of these challenges, our community is coming together. We are grateful for the overwhelming support that has come from across the State and from nonprofits and businesses. My colleagues here in Congress have also reached out to me, and I appreciate their kind words and offers of assistance.

Madam Speaker, today, I say thank you to everyone in mid-Michigan and across the country for their support during this challenging time.

IN RECOGNITION OF KENNY BELKNAP

(Mrs. LEE of Nevada asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. LEE of Nevada. Madam Speaker, on behalf of Nevada's Third District, I rise today to recognize Mr. Kenny Belknap, an honors and AP government teacher at Del Sol Academy.

For decades, Clark County schoolteachers have been forced to work with a tight budget. Like Mr. Belknap told me: "We're just trying to keep our head above water."

He is used to parsing materials and assigning two students to one textbook as they fight for space in an overcrowded classroom. And, unfortunately, that was before the COVID-19 pandemic.

The economic fallout of the coronavirus crisis is devastating State and local governments. In my home State of Nevada, the Clark County School District is expecting budget cuts of \$38 million this year alone. It is classes like Mr. Belknap's that will hurt the most from this loss.

Congress can help by prioritizing Federal funding to States, towns, and

communities to relieve budget shortfalls so our education, healthcare, and public services don't suffer.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to help our States and local communities and give teachers like Mr. Belknap a chance to give his students the opportunities they deserve.

RECOGNIZING AMERICANS LOST TO COVID-19

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

Mr. SOTO. Madam Speaker, today we mourn the lives of over 100,000 Americans who lost their lives and pray for the recovery of over 1.75 million Americans infected by COVID-19. This represents an unimaginable pain, but the numbers really don't tell the story. I want to take a moment to describe four central Floridians we lost by this pandemic:

Rob Carlos, Poinciana, a retired Disney cast member known as Pirate Bob; Dr. Neil Powell, Orlando, an Air Force veteran and dentist who made central Florida smile brighter;

Bill Smith of Lake Wales, an electrician who worked on national launchpads and the Magic Kingdom;

And Virgilio Germán of Kissimmee, a retired carpenter, who loved to sing Mexican ballads to his wife, Gigi.

These and other stories throughout central Florida will continue to be in our hearts as we do everything we can to get beyond and survive this pandemic.

□ 1600

THE NEED FOR MEDICAL RESEARCH

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

Mr. SHERMAN. Madam Speaker, our work now is to negotiate a new relief bill. So far we have spent trillions of dollars bandaging our economic wounds, yet less than one-half of 1 percent has gone to beat the disease through research on therapeutics and prophylaxes.

All hands should be on deck. Every reasonable idea should be tested. But our professional medical researchers are today sitting at home because their non-COVID research has been suspended and our COVID research funding has been modest.

The HEROES Act provides \$5.5 billion to do this medical research. That is the most important one-quarter of 1 percent of that bill, and we need to fight to expand it in negotiations.

Medical research is the best investment we can make for America. It is also the only way we are likely to provide major help for the billions of people who live in poor countries, and it is the best investment that we can make in America's standing in the world.

Thomas Edison looked at 3,000 different filaments to invent one practical light bulb. It took him 2 years. We need to test 3,000 different combinations of compounds, and we don't have 2 years.

STOP POLICE BRUTALITY

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

Mr. JEFFRIES. Madam Speaker, I respect those police officers in every community who are there to protect and serve and those who have fallen in the line of duty, but we cannot tolerate police violence, and we cannot tolerate police brutality.

George Floyd was murdered by an out-of-control police officer. When will it end?

Amadou Diallo, 42 shots, police officers found not guilty.

Sean Bell, 50 shots, police officers found not guilty.

Eric Garner, choked to death, police officers let go by the grand jury.

Decade after decade after decade, when will it end?

This time must be different. Those perpetrators must be prosecuted to the full extent of the law, and Congress must do everything in its power to stop this type of tragedy from ever happening again.

WE CAN'T BREATHE

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Madam Speaker, "I Can't Breathe" is a poem I delivered on this floor 6 years ago when Eric Garner got choked out by the police.

Today, I am here for George Floyd, another Black man who died facedown on the hot pavement, suffocated to death by a police officer as he begged for his life for 8 minutes.

Black folks in America in 2020 are caught between being suffocated to death by the COVID-19 coronavirus or being choked to death by rogue, uncaring, and unconcerned police officers.

Black folks in America are caught up in three pandemics, when you add the reality that our businesses are getting choked out of PPP. Black people bear an unparalleled burden in this country.

When just 12 percent of Black and Latino business owners who applied for PPP report receiving what they asked for, something is wrong.

When we make up 13 percent of the population but 60 percent of COVID deaths, something is wrong.

When we have armed vigilantes and rogue police officers killing us on the streets, something is terribly wrong.

The American Dream should not be a nightmare for any of her people. It is time to bring an end to open season on Black people in America. We can't breathe.

ISSUES OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. HAYES). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Madam Speaker, I am going to remove my mask as I speak. We are appropriately socially distanced here. I am grateful for the time.

Before I begin my own remarks, I am going to yield to the honorable gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS), a senior member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, who will be departing from us soon. He is in his last term, has announced his retirement.

It has been a pleasure to serve with you, my friend. We have a long way to go, but it is always great to see you, and I look forward to your remarks.

CONGRATULATING REVEREND DR. DALE A.

MEYER ON HIS RETIREMENT

Mr. SHIMKUS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the contributions of Reverend Dr. Dale A. Meyer upon the occasion of his retirement as president of Concordia Seminary in St. Louis.

In May of 2005, Dr. Meyer became the 10th president of Concordia Seminary. Over 15 years later, on June 30, 2020, Dr. Meyer will start a new season in life, retiring and turning over the reins of this beloved institution to new leadership.

His contribution to the seminary was immense. During his tenure, Concordia's long-term debt was eliminated, its endowment quadrupled, and it earned top marks from its most recent accreditation by the Higher Learning Commission and the Association of Theological Schools.

From the start of his tenure to the end, Dr. Meyer worked alongside his wife, Diane; the faculty; and key staff to cultivate a culture that was service oriented and external facing. This meant instituting activities designed to instill a spirit of community volunteerism into first-year students. This meant adding benches on campus and expanding holiday displays each year so visitors knew they were welcome at this place.

It meant working with his wife, Diane, and Gayle Zollmann-Kiel, coordinator of campus grounds, to create community gardens for people to enjoy all summer and fall, thereby feeding the community both spiritually and figuratively. And it meant, during the current pandemic, having the bell tower on campus play music to lift the spirits of all those around.

No wonder the seminary received several civic awards, including being named among the 100 Top Workplaces in St. Louis in 2015.

Dr. Meyer's retirement marks a season of change for the seminary. However, it also marks the closing of a chapter of a long career of service for him personally.

While Dr. Meyer's first job was helping his parents, Arthur and Norma

Meyer, deliver milk for Dixie Dairy on the south side of Chicago, he was called to serve on a full and winding professional path. This path was so full of wonder that he would often marvel at the, "milkman moments" that unfolded, remarking: "What am I doing here? God has blessed me so."

Dr. Meyer completed his bachelor's degree in 1969 at Concordia Senior College in Fort Wayne, Indiana, and earned a master of divinity from Concordia Seminary in 1973. He earned a master's degree a year later and a doctorate in 1986 in classical languages from Washington University in St. Louis. He also is a recipient of an honorable doctor of divinity in 1993 from Concordia Theological Seminary in Fort Wayne, Indiana.

Dr. Meyer first joined the faculty at Concordia Seminary as a guest instructor in 1979, going on to serve as head pastor of St. Salvator Lutheran Church in Venedy, Illinois, and St. Peter Lutheran Church in New Memphis, Illinois, both currently in my district, and at Holy Cross Lutheran Church in Collinsville, Illinois, which is my home congregation. These church communities are so beloved by the Meyers that they continue to worship at all three parishes to this day.

It was at Holy Cross Lutheran that I and my wife, Karen, came to know Dr. Meyer and his family. Our lives have been intertwined, to say the least: Diane sold us our first home; I taught the oldest of his two daughters, Elizabeth, civics at Metro East Lutheran High School and ran many of 5k races to come with his youngest daughter, Katie; my own children played music in their daughter's wedding; and my wife, Karen, served as the head organist at Holy Cross with Dale; and so on.

Dr. Meyer moved on from Holy Cross in 1989 after being selected to serve as a speaker on "The Lutheran Hour" radio program at Lutheran Hour Ministries. "The Lutheran Hour" is the world's oldest continually broadcast gospel radio program, first airing in 1930.

Dr. Meyer also hosted a national television show, "On Main Street," for Lutheran Hour Ministries. In 2001, "On Main Street" episodes received two prestigious Emmy awards from the National Academy of Television Arts and Sciences, St. Louis/Mid-America Chapter. During this time, he took part in some of his favorite "milkman moments," including opening both the U.S. Senate and the U.S. House of Representatives in prayer.

In addition to his published writings, Dr. Meyer served in numerous leadership practices, such as third vice president of the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod, a charter board member of the Association of Lutheran Older Adults, an honorary director of God's Word to the Nations Bible Society, and as a board of trustee of the American Bible Society.

Dr. Meyer finally returned home to Concordia Seminary in St. Louis in

2001, serving as the Gregg H. Benidt Memorial Chair in Homiletics and Literature. He became interim president in 2004 and the 10th president of the institution in 2005.

For the next 15 years, he could be seen working on the campus grounds, attending “Bach at the Sem,” and strolling with Ferdie, the oversized-in-body-and-heart golden retriever that became the quasi-mascot on campus and, sadly, recently passed away.

Dr. Meyer likes to tell students: “It is a great time to be the church.” As the world suffers greatly from the pandemic, we are grateful for his efforts to raise public servants to serve all those who are hurting and to share the Gospel loud and clear for all to hear.

As Dr. Meyer begins his beautiful journey of retirement, he will enjoy more time with his two grown daughters, Elizabeth, known as Lizzie, Pittman and Catherine, known as Katie, Bailey; their spouses, Darren and Charles; and their five grandsons that he refers to as Cinco de Meyer: Christian, Connor, and Nicholas Pittman, and Andrew and Jacob Bailey.

Madam Speaker, I want to personally thank Dr. Meyer and his wife, Diane, for their ministry.

I thank Congressman FORTENBERRY for yielding to me.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. I thank Congressman SHIMKUS, because as he was speaking, I was reminded of my own Concordia College I represent, which is a part of the consortium of Lutheran colleges, which I know is very close to his heart. So I thank him for mentioning the gentleman.

Madam Speaker, before I begin, may I inquire as to the allotted amount of time. Is it 30 or 60 minutes?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman was recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Madam Speaker, our world has changed. Who could imagine just 3 short months ago where we would be right now as this silent avenger has threatened life, the life that we knew, and we suddenly found ourselves quarantined in our homes and apartments with nowhere to go, no planes to catch, no appointments to make, just quiet isolation with family and neighbors across the way.

Many friends are suffering, suffering unemployment or job uncertainty, or the impact of the sickness directly. The trauma of this crisis is so, so real.

With that said, Madam Speaker, I am sure all of us in this body are doing quite a bit of reflection, adjustment, and alteration as we go back to what I call first principles, and here is an example.

As I was reviewing my mail recently, my daily mail, a gentleman wrote to me. He was concerned about something. It might not be about what we will talk in a moment, our dependence on China for protective equipment and medical supplies, it might not be the latest surge of the virus in cities throughout America, but, nonetheless, it was important to him that he point

something out to me: The flag at one of our small post office locations is not flying, and it hasn't been flying for some time.

So my diligent staff actually contacted the gentleman. I believe they reached out to the post office themselves, but it sat out there as a lingering issue. So I decided to call the postmaster myself, and I apologized to her. I said: I know this is highly unusual that a Congressman would call you directly.

She said: It is about the flag, isn't it?

I said: Yes, ma'am.

She said: I don't have anybody to help me. I have the equipment to fix it. The top of the pole is broken. I just don't have anyone to help me.

I said: Let's get it fixed.

I called our electric system. We have a public power system in Nebraska. They deal with us all the time on a whole variety of issues. Their response was: We will get it fixed.

There are a couple of levels of issues here, Madam Speaker, and the reason I tell the story.

First of all, it was important to that gentleman that that flag, which represents us all, right behind you, the binding notion of what it means to be an American, that people have fought and died for, the symbol of this dignity, this nobility of tradition that defines not only where we have been but, really, what we ought to strive to be. Maybe he didn't think through all of that, but he just wanted the flag to fly at a government building.

□ 1615

The postmaster had no ill will or ill intent, she just didn't have any help. In a previous time maybe we would have just said, well, you need to get the purchase order written, but in my own way, let's just solve the problem.

And whether it is a person who has had a problem with their Social Security check or their economic stimulus check, or a farmer who has not been able to get their emergency loan, or a small business tripped up on some aspect of the Paycheck Protection Program—which by the way, has been a bipartisan life-sentence by this body—to go person by person, business by business, I am sure that many of us have adjusted to the new reality of serving people where they are. And maybe in some small way in the midst of this trauma and crisis, this is a silver lining of returning back to, first, principles versus the abstract discussions that can sometimes consume us, and the ruckus, fighting, and pushing and shoving over things that never seem to come to any end.

But hanging a flag in front of a post office is important, because it is who we are and what we ought to be. And I want to thank that constituent for calling me. Of course, in a great Nebraska way, when I told him we got it fixed, he said: Well, is it an all-weather flag? I said: Sir, I don't know that. We did what we could.

Madam Speaker, I want to turn back to another set of issues that actually happened before coronavirus hit our country and hit this body as well. One of the most basic expectations of our government is the health and well-being of our Nation. Three months ago, this week, in a timely subcommittee hearing—I sit on the Appropriations Committee and two subcommittees, on State and Foreign Operations, and I am the ranking member of the Agriculture Subcommittee, and we have jurisdiction over the Food and Drug Administration.

So in a timely subcommittee hearing, I asked the Inspector General of the Department of Health and Human Services this question—it is a simple question, it is just three words—are our drugs safe? Four words. Are our drugs safe?

This raging coronavirus has drawn much attention to this much overlooked problem. And in the name of global profiteering, what has happened is that we have enabled a dangerous outsourcing of pharmaceutical production to foreign countries. A significant portion of that outsourcing is to the very origin of the place where coronavirus came from, China.

Over 80 percent of active drug ingredients and 40 percent of finished drugs on the American market, from ibuprofen to reduce your fever, to antibiotics to treat infection, they are produced outside the United States. Even if we vigilantly inspect our domestic manufacturing processes, we cannot possibly get a handle on drug safety when our drugs are sourced from over 150 countries, including a significant portion from China.

The Department of Health and Human Services, HHS, has a daunting task in managing the spending and performance of agencies that are so large they can be bigger than some countries' GDP. And one of those agencies is the Food and Drug Administration, the FDA.

There is an inherent and unfair duality, however, in how FDA's foreign and domestic inspection regimes are carried out. FDA inspectors routinely conduct surprise inspections in America to ensure that drug companies are producing medicine in a clean, safe, and responsible manner.

But when it comes to foreign inspections, the FDA customarily gives companies advance notice, often as much as 12 weeks, enabling drug suppliers plenty of time to clean up their acts. This is counterproductive and it is wrong, and it creates an uneven playing field for companies trying to manufacture drugs right here in the United States of America.

Compounding these problems, the FDA inspectors also face obstruction, coercion, and deception in foreign countries. In one case, a Chinese company reportedly imprisoned an inspector in a conference room for an hour to force her to destroy the photographs that she took of its facilities.

Madam Speaker, this inadequate monitoring of foreign production of medicine, it really does have dire consequences. In 2008, a tainted batch of the blood thinner, heparin, which is made in China, killed over 100 people worldwide, including 81 in America. It led to this drug's recall.

In August of 2018, the FDA issued an alert that a Chinese manufacturer of a thyroid medicine was recalled due to inconsistent quality. At this hearing that I am referencing with the Department of Health and Human Service's Inspector General, I asked: Why has so much of our drug production moved overseas? Why?

Now, of course, in asking that question, Madam Speaker, I basically knew the answer, it has to do with capitalization on low wages, lax safety, environmental and labor standards in those countries. But my fuller intention in asking the question was to probe as to whether or not we have inadvertently, in U.S. law and regulatory structure, perversely encouraged offshoring.

These troubling dynamics take on a special urgency given the massive spread of COVID-19. Several months ago, the FDA identified 20 drugs that exclusively source their active pharmaceutical ingredients or finished drug products from China. The agency then issued an alert that at least one Chinese drugmaker had ceased production of a human drug due to coronavirus infection at its manufacturing facilities. So drugs with short expiration dates are particularly vulnerable to these supply-chain disruptions. Another level of problem.

So solving these issues can become easier when we can fully identify and inspect foreign sources of medicine. But with the bulk of our foreign drug supply originating from a country that suppressed news about the coronavirus origins, its severity, and its timing, and to this day prevents the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention from fully accessing the actual virus, I am not optimistic that we will gain better information.

I get it, Madam Speaker, it is convenient in this moment to point a finger at China, but we have plenty to do in our House to restore some order here. The Inspector General promised me an answer within 2 weeks to my question. Do you remember what it was? Have we inadvertently through our legal or regulatory structure perversely incentivized the offshoring of drug production from America? The Inspector General promised me an answer in 2 weeks. I have heard nothing yet.

The reality here is that we have to change how we do public policy in our country, just like so many other processes—business and society are shifting. Coronavirus has caused a tectonic plate shift. We are seeing massive spikes in the use of digital technology, which has huge implications for telemedicine, telework, and tele-education. In a bit of a silver lining in this time of crisis and suffering, I am frankly

proud that this body has come together to protect healthcare, to protect individuals and families, and to protect small businesses and farmers.

Once our body itself recovers our rhythm and order here, there are some particularly good places to start thinking about action around our healthcare security.

So policy question one: How much of our drugs come from foreign sources? To solve this, we should enhance the FDA's powers to track the ingredients. We should require labeling as to where they come from. And, third, increase reporting requirements for the pharmaceutical companies themselves, particularly within the precursor ingredients.

Bottom line, we need clear answers about how we oversee the foreign production of drugs and drug ingredients. We also need the right incentives to ensure that U.S. companies will produce more and more drugs and drug ingredients right here, here at home in America. It is about healthcare security. If it is made in America, we will all feel much better about knowing that it is safe.

But going beyond these policy considerations about our healthcare security, Madam Speaker, I want to take a moment to possibly pull back the curtain and read into what we are experiencing now, some future trends. It is not to diminish in any way the trauma, disruption, and suffering that has hit our country, but there are many open-ended questions that we are facing now. And it might be helpful to look into what some new realities are going to be in short order.

We have adopted masks and social distancing. We casually use terms like "herd immunity," "flattening the curve," and "community spread." We have also accepted a world with less noise, less urgency, but more intimate connection with those in our immediate orbit. We wonder what we will encounter when the doors fully open once again and we are uncaged to see the world through an entirely new lens.

So perhaps here is a little bit of a sneak peek. First, Madam Speaker, our relationship with work has substantially changed. For those fortunate to still have good employment, telework has arrived. While many Main Street businesses are really hurting, many have also transformed themselves into online, brick-and-mortar hybrids.

Like never before, people are ordering groceries online, medical supplies, and other essentials through their phones for pick up and delivery. Doctors are seeing patients remotely. And in a little-known shift, we are actually reimbursing properly for telehealth. It is here to stay, and it is going to make some huge advances in our well-being, and perhaps save some funds.

School, of course, has temporarily centralized in the home, reconnecting families in important, beautiful, exciting, if not sometimes stressful ways. The handshake may be in decline, but

the elbow bump, thumbs-up, and head nod are, of course, enjoying a renaissance.

As we extrapolate from these changes to a world in which we are hopeful that better treatments are right around the corner, we are seeing less dependence on automobiles, more connectedness to the outdoors, an increase in victory gardens, and local foods. A nice side effect, nature is recovering. The air is cleaner. Traffic is down. Cities feel calmer. This reality presages the aligning preferences, and this is a fascinating fact, the economic preference curves of the baby boom generation and the millennial generation are aligning for livable, walkable, nurturing communities.

But even while we consider the rosier side of this predicament, we have urgent questions. When are we getting back to normal? When can we hug those we love? When can we visit those incapable of visiting us? What does normal even mean?

Madam Speaker, here is one aspect of what normal may look like. A new intrusive reality, I have an acronym for it, I call it SSTT, screening, sanitation, testing and testing.

So let's unpack this. SSTT is a suite of best practices that will gradually enable the full reopening of our State in Nebraska, where I live, and our country, while ensuring those who are vulnerable, especially the elderly and those with underlying conditions, are fully protected.

On screening, you will see more high-tech thermal scans when you enter large public places. As we experienced after 9/11 with the dramatically-enhanced security screening, your temperature will be regularly taken.

As for the next S, sanitation. I found a new respect for medical personnel who must wear these surgical masks hours on end through the day. They are hot. They are bothersome, as I am sure you can attest, Madam Speaker. But they are now part of the normalization of our own personal protective equipment routines at retail establishments, at work, and on public transportation. You are already seeing the sneeze guards and other physical barriers at grocery store check-out stands. Hand sanitizer sales are not declining any time soon, as the surprisingly fragile COVID-19 is easily killed through basic hygiene and surface disinfectants.

□ 1630

Social distancing is a subset of sanitation. Perhaps we should change the name. Perhaps we should call it social respect because this is what it means. It is an embrace of a necessary constraint out of concern for the public good, and it also lessens our own individual vulnerability.

When combined with advancing our ability to work from home if sick, these factors are certainly lessening the disease's impact, thankfully.

New configurations for workplace foot traffic and airflow will emerge as

we embrace the need to consistently and vigilantly fight this virus. Look for TSA-style COVID prechecks at airports, on trains, and at hospitals. Watch for new office architecture: open floor concepts and lunch buffets being out; plexiglass partitions, staggered desks, one-way walkways will be in. Zoom is the new communal coffee break. As offensive as this seems, look for social distancing monitors on elevators in large office buildings.

Again, the acronym is SSTT. The first “T” stands for testing. There will be a dramatic increase in onsite work testing. Early diagnosis of those who show symptoms or who have some reasonableness to think they may have been exposed is one way to significantly reduce the spread of the disease.

I have been very proud to continue to work with the University of Nebraska Medical Center. During the Ebola epidemic, we worked with the Obama administration to help the University of Nebraska Medical Center, which has a long history in infectious disease and virology, to build out containment facilities just in case Ebola would impact us significantly in America.

You might recall, Madam Speaker, that the first coronavirus cases that came off the cruise ship went immediately to Nebraska. Our National Guard hosted people. Those who needed to be in isolation and then those who needed to be quarantined who had the disease went to the University of Nebraska. That is because we have led the country in forward-thinking as to how to create the possibility of containment for some type of pandemic.

We have a lot more to do, such as creating a surge hospital concept for our military and our country at large. Nonetheless, in working with the University of Nebraska Med Center, trying to think about how we just don’t sit back and let the sick come to us but that we go forward and use institutions that have occupational health specialists and larger capacities to become the center for controlling the diseases themselves in a manner that parallels the necessary public health response that is going on.

Again, sanitation and screening are part of that and onsite work testing.

The second “T” though in the SSTT is for serological testing. This test determines whether you have developed antibodies to the virus, which are needed for immunity. As we are discovering, a number of people who have had the disease don’t have any symptoms. They didn’t know they had it. They could have antibodies, which will help them fight the disease, should they be reexposed in the future. Said another way, it means a person who has had the virus recovered, and it lessens the possibility of reinfection for them.

Both types of testing will become widespread, faster, cheaper, and ordinary—again, helping us control the spread.

As we work toward a vaccine or effective treatment to stop the serious ef-

fects, this SSTT suite of approaches—again, the University of Nebraska, I am proud of them for developing this and their outreach to the community. It may not be a panacea, but it will give us the data and confidence to more robustly and quickly open our economy and gradually reduce the need for strict containment measures.

It is changing a bit now, Madam Speaker, but on an earlier trip to D.C. for some votes we took several weeks ago in which we replenished the funds for the highly successful Paycheck Protection Program—Madam Speaker, if you don’t mind, I am going to divert for a moment because I am proud of my State.

Again, this was a bipartisan airlift, the Paycheck Protection Program, to help small businesses maintain personnel on the payroll while we tried to get in front of the disease spread, creating a one-two simultaneous step to protect our healthcare system and protect our economic well-being. The Paycheck Protection Program was vital to this effort, widely supported by many of us, as well as the replenishment.

Nebraska has a very robust community banking system. We worked very aggressively with the small business associations and got the word out so we, on a per capita basis, have the largest number of loans for the Paycheck Protection Program, which, again, is so important to the well-being of our economic vitality as we fight our way through this virus.

The point being, though, I went to get on the airplane, and I stood in Omaha Eppley Airfield and then later at Chicago O’Hare and witnessed this eerie stillness around me: vacant terminals, closed businesses, nearly empty planes, a science fiction movie come to life.

Madam Speaker, the Earth has really stood still for a moment, but perhaps in this stillness, just perhaps, we have rediscovered some important things, and we do see some trends that will mark a new way forward.

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

JUSTICE FOR GEORGE FLOYD

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

Mr. MFUME. Madam Speaker, I rise today because I want to call the name of George Floyd.

George Floyd lost his life this week because of a Minneapolis police officer.

George Floyd died for no known reason. He was not armed. He was not intoxicated. He was not aggressive. And he was not threatening.

George Floyd pleaded for his life. He cried out for help. He groaned in pain. And then he died with his face pressed against the ground and the knee of a police officer against his neck.

This was not an arrest. This was murder. It was the murder of George

Floyd, and it ought to be prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law.

God help us as a Nation if we choose to be silent at this sad and tragic time.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 4(b) of House Resolution 967, the House stands adjourned until 9 a.m., Monday, June 1, 2020.

Thereupon (at 4 o’clock and 37 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, June 1, 2020, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker’s table and referred as follows:

4368. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a letter to report a violation of the Antideficiency Act, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1351; Public Law 97-258; (96 Stat. 926); to the Committee on Appropriations.

4369. A letter from the Inspector General, Office of Inspector General, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting a GAO Opinion Regarding FDIC OIG Appropriations; to the Committee on Appropriations.

4370. A letter from the OSD FRLO, Office of the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Service by Members of the Armed Forces on State and Local Juries [Docket ID: DOD-2020-OS-0029] (RIN: 0790-AK35) received May 15, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Armed Services.

4371. A letter from the Administrator, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a report advising that the cost of response and recovery efforts for FEMA-3392-EM in the State of Louisiana has exceeded the limit for a single emergency declaration, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 5193(b)(3); Public Law 93-288, Sec. 503(b)(3) (as amended by Public Law 100-707, Sec. 107(a)); (102 Stat. 4707); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4372. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service’s IRB only rule — Bond remarketing relief (Notice 2020-25) received May 15, 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.

4373. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service’s notification of relief — Extension of Certain Timeframes for Employee Benefit Plans, Participants, and Beneficiaries Affected by the COVID-19 Outbreak received May 15, 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.

4374. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service’s IRB only rule — Revenue Procedure 2020-21 received May 15, 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.

4375. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service’s IRB only rule — Notice Proposing Revenue Procedure Updating Group Exemption Letter Program

[Notice 2020-36] received May 15, 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.

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. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois (for himself and Mr. BACON):

H.R. 7042. A bill to amend title IV of the Social Security Act to expand foster parent training and authorize new appropriations to support the obtaining of a driver's license; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BUCK (for himself, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. BUDD, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. ROY, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina, Mrs. LESKO, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. POSEY, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. RIGGLEMAN, Mr. BABIN, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. CLINE, and Mr. STEUBE):

H.R. 7043. A bill to withhold funding authorized under the CARES Act from any State or municipality that provides economic stimulus payments through a program designed to exclusively assist illegal aliens; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. BUDD (for himself, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. BERGMAN, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. POSEY, Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina, and Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia):

H.R. 7044. A bill to withhold the pay of Members of the House of Representatives who cast a vote or record their presence in the House by proxy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CASE (for himself and Ms. GABBARD):

H.R. 7045. A bill to require the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct a study on lands that could be included in a National Forest in Hawaii, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. CASTEN of Illinois:

H.R. 7046. A bill to amend the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 to place certain limitations on commodity ownership and to repeal the merchant banking authority, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. EMMER (for himself, Mr. MARSHALL, and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois):

H.R. 7047. A bill to provide for expedited additional support under the farm and ranch stress assistance network, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, 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. GOTTHEIMER (for himself, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. PAYNE):

H.R. 7048. A bill to establish requirements for skilled nursing facilities, nursing facilities, and assisted living facilities to manage the outbreak of COVID-19, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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. JOHNSON of South Dakota (for himself, Mr. VELA, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina):

H.R. 7049. A bill to require the Secretary of Defense to develop a plan to improve the Defense of Department-wide management of the investments in weapon systems of the Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 7050. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to establish a program to provide grants to retrain certain transportation workers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. KING of Iowa:

H.R. 7051. A bill to provide Federal relief to hog producers, especially family farmers and independent producers, who have been forced to euthanize hogs due to the COVID-19 pandemic, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LAMALFA:

H.R. 7052. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2141 Ferry Street in Anderson, California, as the "Norma Connick Post Office"; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. LOWENTHAL (for himself, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CORREA, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. ROUDA, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Mr. CONNOLLY):

H.R. 7053. A bill to defer removal of certain nationals of Vietnam for a 24-month period, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. MENG:

H.R. 7054. A bill to encourage the donation of menstrual products to nonprofit organizations for distribution, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MEUSER (for himself and Mr. SUOZZI):

H.R. 7055. A bill to provide for an increased fine and term of imprisonment for fraud in connection with the COVID-19 pandemic, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HALLERAN (for himself and Mr. YOUNG):

H.R. 7056. A bill to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to award additional funding through the Indian Health Services Sanitation Facilities Construction Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, 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. RASKIN:

H.R. 7057. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize and provide for the expansion, intensification, and coordination of the programs and activities of the National Institutes of Health with respect to post-viral chronic neuroimmune diseases, specifically myalgic encephalomyelitis/chronic fatigue syndrome (ME/CFS), to support the COVID-19 response, and other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, and Mr. CUELLAR):

H.R. 7058. A bill to provide a payroll tax credit for certain bonuses paid to employees who worked continuously during the COVID-19 pandemic; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee (for himself and Mr. CORREA):

H.R. 7059. A bill to provide for liability protection for health care providers for damages with respect to any harm caused by any act or omission of such health care professional or related health care entity in the course of arranging for or providing health care serv-

ices during the COVID-19 public health emergency period, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TURNER (for himself and Mrs. DAVIS of California):

H.R. 7060. A bill to improve the military justice system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WALTZ (for himself, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. BUCK, Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. POSEY, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. BALDERSON, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. BABIN, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. OLSON, Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. STAUBER, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. WITTMAN, Ms. CHENEY, Mrs. LESKO, Mr. STEWART, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. COOK, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. HICE of Georgia, Mr. EMMER, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. FULCHER, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. CALVERT, and Mr. DUNCAN):

H.R. 7061. A bill to promote the domestic exploration, research, development, and processing of critical minerals to ensure the economic and national security of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Science, Space, and Technology, Small Business, the Judiciary, and 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. WATERS (for herself, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. COHEN, Ms. NORTON, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. BARRAGAN, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. SUOZZI, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. WELCH, Mr. GARCIA of Illinois, Ms. WILD, Mr. RUSH, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. MORELLE, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mrs. HAYES):

H.R. 7062. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to eliminate cost-sharing with respect to coverage of insulin as a covered part D drug and associated medical supplies and to provide mail order access to insulin and such supplies under the Medicare program during the COVID-19 emergency period; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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. WILSON of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. GIBBS, and Mr. GUEST):

H.R. 7063. A bill to amend the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938 to limit the exemption from the registration requirements of such Act for persons engaging in activities in furtherance of bona fide religious, scholastic, academic, or scientific pursuits or the fine arts to activities which do not promote the political agenda of a foreign government, to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to clarify the disclosures of foreign gifts by institutions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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. BROWNLEY of California (for herself, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. KHANNA, Mr.

ROSE of New York, and Mr. CICILLINE):

H. Res. 982. A resolution designating May 28, 2020, as the first annual “National Food Allergy Prevention Awareness Day” to raise awareness and encourage the prevention of severe food allergies among children; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. JUDY CHU of California (for herself, Ms. MENG, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. ROUDA, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. BERA, Mr. COX of California, Mr. RASKIN, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, and Mr. CISNEROS):

H. Res. 983. A resolution recognizing the significance of Asian/Pacific American Heritage Month in May as an important time to celebrate the significant contributions of Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders to the history of the United States; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. LAMBORN (for himself, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. BIGGS, and Mr. BANKS):

H. Res. 984. A resolution condemning Twitter’s partisan censorship of President Donald J. Trump; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. LEE of California (for herself, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. NORTON, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. RUSH, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Ms. MOORE, and Ms. JOHNSON of Texas):

H. Res. 985. A resolution expressing the moral responsibility of Congress to end adult and child poverty in the United States; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. LIPINSKI (for himself, Mrs. WALORSKI, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. TONKO):

H. Res. 986. A resolution commemorating the 80th anniversary of the Katyn Massacre; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. MENG:

H. Res. 987. A resolution raising awareness regarding period poverty; 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. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 7042.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I of the Constitution and its subsequent amendments and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. BUCK:

H.R. 7043.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BUDD:

H.R. 7044.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. CASE:

H.R. 7045.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. CASTEN of Illinois:

H.R. 7046.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 Clause 3

By Mr. EMMER:

H.R. 7047.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. GOTTHEIMER:

H.R. 7048.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: To make all laws that 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 Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota:

H.R. 7049.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Ms. JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 7050.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. KING of Iowa:

H.R. 7051.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 & Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. LAMALFA:

H.R. 7052.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. LOWENTHAL:

H.R. 7053.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of Article 1 of the Constitution

By Ms. MENG:

H.R. 7054.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. MEUSER:

H.R. 7055.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. O'HALLERAN:

H.R. 7056.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. RASKIN:

H.R. 7057.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. REED:

H.R. 7058.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8: Power to tax

By Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee:

H.R. 7059.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, which states “[t]he Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.”

By Mr. TURNER:

H.R. 7060.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. WALTZ:

H.R. 7061.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, clause 2 and Article 1, Section 8, clause 18

By Ms. WATERS:

H.R. 7062.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina:

H.R. 7063.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 372: Mrs. FLETCHER and Mr. BRINDISI.

H.R. 701: Mr. NORMAN.

H.R. 702: Mr. NORMAN.

H.R. 703: Mr. NORMAN.

H.R. 1209: Ms. SHERRILL.

H.R. 1461: Mrs. FLETCHER.

H.R. 2056: Mrs. HARTZLER and Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 2117: Mr. PAPPAS.

H.R. 2501: Ms. MENG.

H.R. 2571: Mr. RIGGLEMAN and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 2859: Mr. WEBER of Texas.

H.R. 2895: Mr. MAST, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. FERGUSON, and Mr. KELLER.

H.R. 3124: Mr. NORMAN.

H.R. 3637: Ms. BARRAGÁN.

H.R. 4104: Mr. SIREs, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. RYAN, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. KING of New York, and Ms. DELAURO.

H.R. 4189: Mr. SPANO.

H.R. 4280: Mr. MALINOWSKI.

H.R. 4309: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York and Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 4408: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. CÁRDENAS, and Mr. KHANNA.

H.R. 4644: Mr. WENSTRUP.

H.R. 4705: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 5076: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. NORTON, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. FOSTER, and Ms. CRAIG.

H.R. 5297: Mr. MCKINLEY.

H.R. 5350: Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 5873: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. SWALWELL of California, and Mr. TED LIEU of California.

H.R. 5986: Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 6104: Mr. HAGEDORN.

H.R. 6297: Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee.

H.R. 6364: Mr. GOODEN and Mr. SMITH of Missouri.

H.R. 6403: Mr. ROUDA.

H.R. 6419: Ms. WILD.

H.R. 6431: Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico.

H.R. 6443: Mr. KATKO.

H.R. 6466: Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina.

H.R. 6473: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.

H.R. 6474: Mr. CÁRDENAS.

H.R. 6492: Mr. CARBAJAL.

H.R. 6499: Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 6519: Mr. PALAZZO.

H.R. 6537: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York and Ms. DEGETTE.

H.R. 6607: Mr. SAN NICOLAS and Mrs. HAYES.
 H.R. 6619: Mr. PERLMUTTER.
 H.R. 6628: Ms. JACKSON LEE and Ms. LEE of California.
 H.R. 6633: Mrs. DEMINGS and Mr. TRONE.
 H.R. 6637: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.
 H.R. 6643: Mrs. AXNE.
 H.R. 6644: Mrs. HAYES.
 H.R. 6678: Mr. MAST.
 H.R. 6709: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 6724: Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. RASKIN, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. BEYER, and Ms. SCANLON.
 H.R. 6742: Mr. BERGMAN, Mr. TIFFANY, and Mr. MAST.
 H.R. 6748: Mr. WELCH, Mr. TONKO, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. SPANBERGER, Mr. NEGUSE, and Mr. BRINDISI.
 H.R. 6784: Mr. GOHMERT.
 H.R. 6788: Mr. EVANS, Mr. CLAY, and Mr. LUCAS.
 H.R. 6802: Mr. LATTA, Mr. GOODEN, Mr. STEWART, Mr. BUDD, Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee, and Mr. WATKINS.
 H.R. 6805: Mr. BABIN.
 H.R. 6813: Ms. STEFANIK, Mrs. LESKO, and Ms. PORTER.
 H.R. 6814: Mr. CÁRDENAS.
 H.R. 6820: Mr. STANTON, Mr. WELCH, Mr. KIM, Ms. FINKENAUER, Ms. OMAR, and Ms. MOORE.

H.R. 6821: Mr. HUDSON, Mr. KATKO, and Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.
 H.R. 6861: Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois and Ms. SCANLON.
 H.R. 6864: Mr. VELA.
 H.R. 6866: Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. WELCH, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. CISNEROS, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
 H.R. 6896: Mr. LAMBORN.
 H.R. 6918: Mr. TAKANO and Mr. GREEN of Texas.
 H.R. 6934: Mr. BUDD and Mr. STEIL.
 H.R. 6957: Mrs. HAYES, Mr. BARR, and Mr. WELCH.
 H.R. 6968: Mr. STIVERS, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. UPTON, Ms. SLOTKIN, and Mr. CASE.
 H.R. 6976: Mr. HICE of Georgia.
 H.R. 6984: Ms. NORTON, Mr. TRONE, and Mr. DEUTCH.
 H.R. 6987: Mr. FITZPATRICK and Mr. RUSH.
 H.R. 6993: Mr. GOSAR, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. PALLONE, and Mr. GOODEN.
 H.R. 7004: Mr. CLEAVER.
 H.R. 7010: Mr. PAYNE, Ms. BLUNT ROCH-ESTER, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. EVANS, and Mr. GALLAGHER.
 H.R. 7017: Mr. RIGGLEMAN.
 H.R. 7020: Ms. NORTON, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Mr. HASTINGS.
 H.R. 7022: Mr. KIND, Mrs. AXNE, Mr. COX of California, Ms. FINKENAUER, Mr. DELGADO, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.

H.R. 7023: Mr. BISHOP of Utah and Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee.
 H.R. 7025: Ms. DEGETTE.
 H.J. Res. 2: Mr. CASE.
 H. Res. 823: Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.
 H. Res. 835: Mr. McEACHIN.
 H. Res. 975: Ms. BARRAGÁN.
 H. Res. 979: Mr. GAETZ and Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII, petitions and papers were laid on the clerk's desk and referred as follows:

101. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Township of Hillsborough, NJ, relative to a resolution in support of Coronavirus Relief Package, H.R. 6467, Coronavirus Community Relief Act; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

102. Also, a petition of the Town of Farmington, NY, relative to Resolution 164-2020, in support of 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.