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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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


I hereby appoint the Honorable Henry Cuellar to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

Nancy Pelosi,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

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

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

THE CULTURE WE CREATE IN OUR ARMED SERVICES MATTERS

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

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

We advanced progressive ideals to support our military families: improve readiness; sharpen our technological edge; and foster American leadership, our alliances, and a culture that is in line with the values of our Nation.

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

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

Our armed services are not immune to these currents.

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

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

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

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

This culture extends to gender disparities we still see in our Armed Forces. We have made progress and, this year, witnessed historic barrier-breaking firsts:

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

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

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

However, there is more work to be done:

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

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

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

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

Together, Mr. Clyburn, Mr. Johnson, Mr. Cummings, and Mr. Meek led the effort to create the Military Leadership Diversity Commission, whose recommendations in 2011 are the basis for many of the diversity and inclusion provisions found in this year’s NDAA, which are some of the most significant steps towards diversity and inclusion advocacy.
that Congress itself has taken since the desegregation of the Armed Forces in 1948. It seeks to foster opportunities for women and minorities.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

HONORING MAJOR GENERAL BILL BLAND

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

REMEMBERING KYLE STEVEN HUGUIN

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

Friends, family, and members of Kyle’s community recently recognized the 1-year anniversary of his passing at the youthful age of 30. He was from Savannah, in Georgia’s First Congressional District, and was an outstanding, kind, and loving individual, who was a friend to all.

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

While reminiscing on Kyle’s abundance of joy that he brought to all family, friends, and others, they recalled that “he had one of the best smiles ever.” He represented what it looks like to truly live life to the fullest and never take any day for granted.

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

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

CONGRATULATING BRUNSWICK-GOLDEN ISLES CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

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

Accreditation with the U.S. Chamber of Commerce is the only program of its kind. It defines excellence in chamber planning and recognizes chambers for outstanding contributions toward positive change in their communities.

There are currently only 204 chambers across the country that have earned the accreditation designation, and only 12 are five-star.

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

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

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

CRITICAL INITIATIVES INCLUDED IN FISCAL YEAR 2021 NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT

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

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

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

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

These include provisions which will strengthen manufacturing in my home
Mr. Speaker, I acknowledge Congressmen JARED GOLDEN, Congresswoman SUSAN DAVIS, and Congressman BILL KEATING, who are cosponsors of this legislation, and I thank them for their support of this critical initiative which will benefit all of our districts.

This year’s NDAA also includes the Service members Civil Relief Act, H.R. 2750, which I authored, clarifying that the spouses of service members and their families under the Service members Civil Relief Act cannot be waived through forced arbitration unless it is agreed to after a dispute arises.

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues, Congressman JARED GOLDEN, Congresswoman SUSAN DAVIS, and Congressman GUY RESCHENTHALER, for their strong bipartisan support for this provision to protect our men and women in uniform.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Today, the United States maintains that longstanding relationship as the 5th largest export market for Portugal, and its largest trading partner outside the European Union.

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

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

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

THE CONVERSATION ON STATUE REMOVAL

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

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

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

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

Since 1870 statutes have been present in the Capitol, and since then, Democrats retained a majority in the House 39 times. They had ample opportunities to remove controversial statues from the Capitol, yet, they did nothing. Why? Because they did not want to have a meaningful discussion on this issue with us, we welcome it.

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

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

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

For years, the North Carolina Democracy Party has used former Governor Aycock’s name, along with Governor Vance, for major fundraisers, and have held meetings in buildings named after him. Where was the initiative then? North Carolina’s former Governor Bev Perdue, sidestepped questions about buildings named after former Governor Aycock in press conferences. Instead, she pivoted to his impact on public education in North Carolina. Again, I say, where was the initiative to remove the statues then?

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker, describing the vote we held today as “political showmanship” would be an understatement.
Maybe it is to compensate for the fact that Democrats are responsible for the statutes having been placed in the Capitol and the times Democrats failed to act in the past. You be the judge.

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

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

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

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

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

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

A Federal agent, gas mask, body armor, camouflage, bristling with weapons and tactical gear; approaches Mr. David. He winds up, and he says, “So are white people; so are white people. What a terrible question to ask.”

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

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

Mr. Speaker, this is important because democracies die, but they do not die fast. They die because people come to believe that the media is the enemy of the people. They die because a President’s supporters are more given over to that President than they are to the rule of law; and they die because citizens become used to the sight of Federal agents acting, not to protect property, they are not authorized to patrol municipal streets to enforce State and local law. That is an idea that goes back to our dissatisfaction with King George, and it is an idea that my Republican friends used to care about.

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

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

The President responds to real crisis; almost 150,000 Americans dead of COVID–19, denial, misinformation.

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

David repeatedly in the face with pepper spray. Now this is heartening to see. A Federal agent repeatedly with his truncheon. He doesn’t move, not a muscle.

Well, the agent is confused by this and he hesitates. But backup arrives. Another Federal agent sprays Mr. David repeatedly in the face with pepper spray. Now this is heartening to the first agent, so he winds up and hits Mr. David again with his bat. Now how cynical you have become about our country. I don’t care whether you have signed over your time, your talent, your treasure, your integrity to the support of Donald J. Trump. If you have a drop of American blood in your veins, your soul dies a little as you watch the heavily armed Federal agent beat a United States Navy veteran.

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

Are there bodies piling up in the streets of Portland?

Are there 150,000 dead—just to choose a number—Americans in Portland? No.

There is not a single fatality. Of course not.

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

But protecting property in Portland or anywhere else is the job of the local police department, the State police and, in a worst-case scenario, the National Guard. Why? First, while Federal agents are legally entitled to protect Federal property, they are not authorized to patrol municipal streets to enforce State and local law. That is an idea that goes back to our dissatisfaction with King George, and it is an idea that my Republican friends used to care about.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

RECOGNIZING THE HEROIC SERVICE OF DETECTIVE JOSH SIMMONS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

CONGRATULATIONS TO THE CLASS OF 2020

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. Malinowski) for 5 minutes.
Mr. MALINOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, over the last 3 months, the people in my State of New Jersey have pulled together in extraordinary ways to fight the coronavirus. Our leaders made good decisions. But, more important, all of us understood that public health had to come first.

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

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

Many of our graduating seniors did end up having outdoor graduations, but they came late and with social distancing. And let’s face it, a socially distanced graduation is kind of an oxymoron. But we have also seen our communities come together in creative ways to celebrate the accomplishments of our 2020 graduates, and I want to recognize those efforts today.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

During my time in Congress, I have worked hard to reach out to young people to encourage their interests and involvement in the conversations that are happening every day here in Congress. I have visited dozens of schools throughout the 75 towns of my district and have hosted two classes of my youth advisory council.

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

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

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

CALLING FOR TEMPORARY PAYROLL TAX HOLIDAY

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

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

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

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

No government program, no matter how generous, can replace a strong, functioning economy. President Trump has called on Congress 5 minutes to deliver this bill to his desk for signature, and the time to deliver is now. The American people are waiting and watching.

Mr. SPANO. Mr. Speaker, today I wish to lend my voice to House efforts to hold China accountable for their role in the spread of the coronavirus. China lied: Americans died. It is really that simple.

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

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

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

The time for answers is now.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

For almost 2 months, communities throughout our country, particularly Democrat-led urban centers, have experienced levels of lawlessness and civil unrest unseen for decades. I am not referring to those who have exercised their First Amendment rights to peacefully assemble and protest. No, I am talking about those who vandalize, destroy, and knowingly break the law.
stirring havoc and instilling fear into families and business owners. From San Francisco to Portland, from Minneapolis to New York City and everywhere in between, we have seen the consequences of protecting the mob over innocent civilians. This cannot be, and it cannot continue.

Law and order must be brought back to our neighborhoods, and we must hold cities and their leaders accountable for adequately protecting those whom they have sworn to serve. All Americans, regardless of ZIP Codes, have a right to feel safe in their homes and on their roads. Mob rule will not be tolerated. We must reestablish law and order in America, and we must do it now.

REQUIRE FEDERAL CORONAVIRUS PREPAREDNESS

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

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, our Nation is in crisis. Yesterday, the United States reported more than 1,000 new confirmed cases in the United States, and the CDC believes the number is many times greater. There are hotspots around the country, most notably in Southern States.

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

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

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

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

Sadly, around the country, testing capacity remains below where it needs to be. Hospitals in many States are over capacity in their ICUs, under-staffed, and anxious about all the looming shortages of PPE, the masks, gloves, and gowns we need to safely treat patients, protect workers and residents in our nursing homes, confidently open our schools, and get our economy on the road to recovery.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

HONORING COLONEL CHARLES POWELL

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

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

Charles was a true American hero who devoted his life to serving others, and his passing is a loss that will unerringly resonate throughout the community. His genuine love for God and others, dedication to his family, and service to his country and community set the gold standard of excellence that we should all strive for. Although he is leaving this Earth, his legacy will live on through countless lives he has impacted during his lifetime.

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

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

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

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

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

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

San Angelo was forever changed when these two spitfires flew into town in 1960. Charles was appointed as the wing commander at Goodfellow Air Force Base, which was slated for closure at the time. Charles and JoAnne immediately leapt into action, developing the relationship between Goodfellow and the community of San Angelo and completely transforming the mission of the base. After Charles’ 4 years as wing commander, Goodfellow was removed from the closure list. Today, the connection between the base and San Angelo stands as the premier example of effective military-civilian partnership.

Thankfully, after Charlie retired from the service, the Powells never left San Angelo. Instead, they immediately set to work planting deep roots in the community and making San Angelo a better place to live. These two have been some of the most dedicated public servants our community has ever seen.
Through their innumerable service initiatives, they have been Goodfellow’s most dedicated champions who served as the bridge between San Angelo and Goodfellow.

Through it all, Charles and JoAnne stood together, side by side and hand in hand, serving, transforming countless lives, not the least of which was my own. I had the pleasure of meeting the Powells when I ran for Congress in 2004, and in 2005, I hired JoAnne on as the first member of my staff. At that point, she and I have imagined the depth of the impact that Charlie and JoAnne would have on me, my family, and every member of my team over the years to come.

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

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

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

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

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

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

PUBLIC APOLOGY TO THE HONORABLE ALEXANDRIA OCASIO-CORTEZ

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise to apologize for the abrupt manner of the conversation I had with my colleague from New York. It is true that we disagree on policies and visions for America, but I had with my colleague from New York. It is true that we disagree on policies and visions for America, but I

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

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

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

THE WAY WE TREAT ONE ANOTHER MATTERS

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

Mr. HoYER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the words of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YoHo). They were appropriate because the language we use matters. The way we treat one another matters. Mr. YoHo needed no apology for his passion about poverty and for the downtrodden, but he ought to remember and acknowledge that the person to whom he spoke so inappropriately was one of the strongest fighters in this Congress for those with the least, those who are downtrodden, those who are forgotten.

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

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

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

RECESS

The recess was declared by the Chair.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. TAKANO led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

SENATE SHOULD PASS THE HEROES ACT

Mr. Cicilline asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.

Mr. Cicilline. Madam Speaker, it has been more than two months since the House passed the HEROES Act. In
that time, there have been more than 50,000 new coronavirus deaths, bringing the total to more than 140,000 Americans and more than 2.5 million more cases. Yet the Senate has done nothing.

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

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

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

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

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

It helps 110 million Americans with $600 weekly unemployment benefit through January, providing a vital safety net for a record number of Americans who are unemployed. Right now, that expires in just 9 days.

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

I urge the Senate to pass this bill immediately.

IN SUPPORT OF THE GREAT AMERICAN OUTDOORS ACT

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

STUDENT LOAN DEBT CRISIS

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

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

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

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

NATIONAL FRAGILE X AWARENESS DAY

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

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

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

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

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

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

EXTENDING UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS

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

Mr. TAKANO. Madam Speaker, I rise today because supplemental Federal unemployment benefits expire next week, and Republicans in the Senate refuse to extend these benefits for the American people.

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

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

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

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

IN SUPPORT OF THE CITIZENS OF JAMMU AND KASHMIR

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

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

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

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

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

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

IN SUPPORT OF THE NO BAN ACT

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

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

More than 3 years ago, President Donald Trump’s Muslim ban put into action the xenophobic and racist agenda that he promised during his campaign.
It immediately led to chaos at our airports, where I was honored to stand in solidarity with our incoming immigrants and those cruelly ripped apart from their families.

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

This isn’t the only time America has shamefully shut our doors based on race, ethnicity, or nationality. But we can’t undo the damage done and make sure history does not repeat itself. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation today.

PROVIDING ASSISTANCE TO SMALL DEFENSE MANUFACTURERS

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

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

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

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

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

FEDERAL OFFICERS IN PORTLAND

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1015

RECOGNIZING RADIO STATION WHUB

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

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

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

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

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

RECOGNIZING ESCALATION OF VIOLENCE ALONG ARMENIAN-AZERBAIJANI BORDER

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

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

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

Since then, the conflict, sadly, has escalated. The Azeri armed forces have been indiscriminate in attacking Armenian schools and factories, factories producing personal protective equipment that is essential during this pandemic.

Azerbaijan must be held accountable. In the midst of this global pandemic, they are not being appropriate in their actions—as well as increase aid to Armenia to counter Azeri aggression.

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

LAUNCHING JUSTICE IN POLICING WEBSITE

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

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

For millions of Americans, this issue is already stretched. It is critical now more than ever that we work toward peace with Artsakh.

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

In the appropriations bill yesterday, a $20 million augmentation was made to the country of Armenia. I urge my colleagues to support that and urge immediate action condemning Azerbaijan’s disgraceful actions.
professionally and serve their communities well, and there are so many exemplary officers committed to addressing head-on the inherent bias and the problems in the culture of policing that lead some to commit acts of misconduct.

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

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

His wise words continue to inspire Americans to be courageous in standing up for what is right, and it is not Republicans alone whom I am counting on to lift our country up to the highest of our ideals.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

FOSTERING UNDERGRADUATE TALENT BY UNLOCKING RESOURCES FOR EDUCATION ACT

Ms. JAYAPAL. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 891, I call up the bill (H.R. 2460) to reauthorize mandatory funding programs for historically Black colleges and universities and other minority-serving institutions, with the Senate amendment thereto, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Senate amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; REFERENCES.

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

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

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

Section 371(b)(1)(A) (20 U.S.C. 1067q(b)(1)(A)) is amended by striking "for each of the fiscal years 2008 through 2019," and all that follows through the end of the subparagraph and inserting "for fiscal year 2020 and each fiscal year thereafter."

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

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

(1) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (11) of section 6103(l) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

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

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

(ii) The filing status of such taxpayer.

(iii) The adjusted gross income of such taxpayer.

(iv) Total number of exemptions claimed, and total number of individuals and dependents claimed, as applicable, of such taxpayer.

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

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

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

(ii) The filing status of such taxpayer.

(iii) The adjusted gross income of such taxpayer.

(iv) The amount of any net earnings from self-employment (as defined in section 163), wages (as defined in section 3212(a) or 3401(a)), taxable income from a farming business (as defined in section 236(e)(4)), and investment income for the period reported for the tax return.

(v) The total income tax of such taxpayer.

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

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

(viii) Amount of any credit claimed under section 25A for the taxable year.
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“(ix) Amount of individual retirement account distributions not included in adjusted gross income for the taxable year.

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

(ii) The amount of tax-exempt interest.

(iii) Contributions and repayments to self-employed SEP, Keogh, and other qualified plans which were not included in adjusted gross income for the taxable year.

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

(I) Schedule A.

(II) Schedule B.

(III) Schedule D.

(IV) Schedule E.

(V) Schedule F.

(VI) Schedule H.

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

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

(C) RESTRICTION ON USE OF DISCLOSED INFORMATION.

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

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

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

(ii) reducing the net cost of improper payments to Federal financial aid recipients.

Such term does not include the conduct of criminal investigations or prosecutions.

(iii) REDISCLOSURE TO INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION, STATE HIGHER EDUCATION AGENCIES, AND DESIGNATED SCHOLARSHIP ORGANIZATIONS.

The Secretary of Education, and contractors of the Department of Education, as specifically authorized and designated by the Secretary of Education, may disclose return information received under subparagraph (B), solely for the use of such Secretary, purpose, and administrator, and administration of student financial aid or aid awarded by such entities as the Secretary of Education may designate, the following persons:

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

(2) A State higher education agency.

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

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

(D) REQUIREMENT OF NOTIFICATION OF REQUEST FOR TAX RETURN INFORMATION.

Subparagraphs (A) and (B) shall apply to any disclosure of return information with respect to a taxpayer only if the Secretary of Education has provided to such taxpayer the notification required by section 494 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 prior to such disclosure.”.

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

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

(I) by inserting “(A), (13)(B)” after “(13)” each place it appears,

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

(B) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to disclosures made under section 6103(l)(13) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (as amended by this section) after the date of notification required by section 494 of the Higher Education Act of 1965.

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

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

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

“The Secretary shall advise students and borrowers who submit an application for Federal student financial aid under this title or for the discharge of a loan based on permanent and total disability, as described in section 432(h)(1), of who request or an incremental increase in the student’s or borrower’s contribution to the plan on their loan (as well as parents and spouses who sign such an application or request or a Master Promissory Note on behalf of those students and borrowers) that the Secretary has the authority to request that the Internal Revenue Service disclose their tax return information (as well as that of parents and spouses who sign such an application or request or a Master Promissory Note on behalf of those students and borrowers) to officers, employees, and contractors of the Department of Education authorized and designated by the Secretary of the Department of Education, as specifically authorized and designated by the Secretary of Education, and contractors of the Department of Education to officers, employees, and contractors of the Department of Education responsible under subparagraph (A) and for mitigating risks (as defined in clause (ii)) relating to the programs described in such subparagraphs and for mitigating risks (as defined in clause (ii)) relating to the programs described in such subparagraphs and for mitigating risks (as defined in clause (ii)) relating to the programs described in such subparagraphs and for mitigating risks (as defined in clause (ii)) relating to the programs described in such subparagraphs and for mitigating risks (as defined in clause (ii)) relating to the programs described in such subparagraphs and for mitigating risks (as defined in clause (ii)) relating to the programs described in such subparagraphs and for mitigating risks (as defined in clause (ii)) relating to the programs described in such subparagraphs and for mitigating risks (as defined in clause (ii)) relating to the programs described in such subparagraphs and for mitigating risks (as defined in clause (ii)) relating to the programs described in such subparagraphs and for mitigating risks (as defined in clause (ii)) relating to the programs described in such subparagraphs and for mitigating risks (as defined in clause (ii)) relating to

(B) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to disclosures made under section 6103(l)(13) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, to the extent necessary for the Secretary to carry out this title.

SEC. 5. INCREASED FUNDING FOR FEDERAL PELL GRANTS.


(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking “$1,430,000,000” and inserting “$1,455,000,000”;

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

(3) by inserting “, except as expressly required by statute, or if a statute authorizes benefits not described in such subparagraphs.” before the period at the end.

SEC. 6. REPORTS ON IMPLEMENTATION.

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than each specified date, the Secretary of Education and the Secretary of Labor shall submit to the Committees on Education and Labor and Ways and Means of the House of Representatives regarding the amendments made by this Act. Each such report shall include, as applicable—

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

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

(3) implementation issues and suggestions for potential improvements.

(B) SPECIFIED DATE.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), the following specified dates shall apply:

(I) The date that is 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(II) The date that is 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(III) The date that is 1 year after the date described in paragraph (1) of this section.
State, and the Secretary of Homeland Security shall—

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

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

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

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

"(3) CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—Prior to the President exercising the authority under paragraph (1), the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Homeland Security, or the Secretary of the Judiciary of the Senate, the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate, the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, shall consult Congress and provide Congress with specific evidence supporting the need for the suspension or restriction and its proposed duration.

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

"(i) the action taken pursuant to paragraph (1) and the specific objective of such action;

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

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

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

"(C) TERMINATION.—Not later than 30 days after the President exercises the authority under paragraph (1), the suspension or restriction shall immediately terminate absent intervening congressional action.

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

"(E) PUBLICATION.—The Secretary of State and the Secretary of Homeland Security shall publicly announce and publish an unclassified version of the report described in paragraph (1) in the Federal Register.

"(F) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—

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

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

"(6) TREATMENT OF COMMERCIAL AIRLINES.—Whenever the Secretary of Homeland Security finds that a commercial airline has failed to comply with regulations of the Secretary of Homeland Security relating to requirements of airlines for the detection of fraudulent documents used by passengers traveling to the United States (including the training of personnel in such detection), the Secretary of Homeland Security may suspend or restrict air travel to the United States. A report on such actions shall be prepared and submitted to Congress and provide Congress with specific evidence supporting the need for the sustained exercise of presidential authority under such section 212(f) that identifies, with respect to countries affected by a suspension or restriction, the information described in subparagraph (A) of section 312(b) of title 42, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulation).

SEC. 104. TERMINATION OF CERTAIN EXECUTIVE ACTIONS.

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

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

SEC. 105. VISA APPLICANTS REPORT.

(a) INITIAL REPORTS.—

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(b) ADDITIONAL REPORTS.—Not later than 30 days after the date on which the President exercises the authority under section 212(f) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(f)), as amended by section 103 of this title, and every 30 days thereafter, the Secretary of Homeland Security and heads of other relevant Federal agencies, shall submit a report to the congressional committees referred to in paragraph (2) of section 312(b) of title 42, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulation).

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

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

"(3) CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—Prior to the President exercising the authority under paragraph (1), the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Homeland Security, or the Secretary of the Judiciary of the Senate, the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate, the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, shall consult Congress and provide Congress with specific evidence supporting the need for the continued exercise of presidential authority under such section 212(f), including the specific information supporting the need for the continued exercise of presidential authority under such section 212(f), including the specific information supporting the need for the continued exercise of presidential authority under such section 212(f), including the specific information supporting the need for the continued exercise of presidential authority under such section 212(f), including the specific information supporting the need for the continued exercise of presidential authority under such section 212(f), including the specific information supporting the need for the continued exercise of presidential authority under such section 212(f).

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

"(i) the action taken pursuant to paragraph (1) and the specific objective of such action;

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

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

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

"(C) TERMINATION.—Not later than 30 days after the President exercises the authority under paragraph (1), the suspension or restriction shall immediately terminate absent intervening congressional action.

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

"(E) PUBLICATION.—The Secretary of State and the Secretary of Homeland Security shall publicly announce and publish an unclassified version of the report described in paragraph (1) in the Federal Register.

"(F) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—

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

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

"(6) TREATMENT OF COMMERCIAL AIRLINES.—Whenever the Secretary of Homeland Security finds that a commercial airline has failed to comply with regulations of the Secretary of Homeland Security relating to requirements of airlines for the detection of fraud...
the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 355(c)(7)).

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

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

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

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

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

(10) ULTIMATE PARENT ENTITY.—The term ‘ultimate parent entity’ has the meaning given in the term in section 801.11 of title 16, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor regulation.

(11) DISPOSITION ON PRODUCT HOPPING.—

(1) PRIMA FACIE.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), a manufacturer of a reference product or listed drug shall be considered to have engaged in an unfair method of competition in or affecting commerce in violation of section 5(a) of the Clayton Act (15 U.S.C. 12(a)), and to constitute unfair methods of competition in or affecting commerce if—

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

(A) the manufacturer took actions with respect to the listed drug or reference product other than those described in subparagraph (a) to impair competition from a generic drug or a biosimilar biological product that is highly similar to, and has no clinically meaningful difference with respect to safety, purity, and potency from, the reference product, which may be established by objective circumstances.

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

(2) JUSTIFICATION.—

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

(i) the manufacturer took actions with respect to the listed drug or reference product other than those described in subparagraph (a) to impair competition from a generic drug or a biosimilar biological product that is highly similar to, and has no clinically meaningful difference with respect to safety, purity, and potency from, the reference product, which may be established by objective circumstances.

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

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

(iv) any other equitable remedy, including ancillary equitable relief.

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

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

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

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

(13) EQUITABLE REMEDIES.—

(A) DISGORGEMENT.—

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

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

(B) IN GENERAL.—

(i) that, except as provided in paragraph (1)(A), the manufacturer took the action for reasons relating to the safety risk to patients of the listed drug or reference product; and

(ii) the court of appeals of the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, or the court of the United States for the circuit in which the Commission seeks the disgorgement.

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

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

(B) affecting any other authority of the Commissioner under this Act to seek relief or obtain relief with respect to the violation of this Act; or

(C) affecting any other authority of the Commissioner under this Act to seek relief or obtain relief with respect to the violation of this Act.

(15) APPLICABILITY.—Section 27 of the Federal Trade Commission Act, as added by subsection (b), shall apply—

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

(B) a proceeding that commenced before the date of enactment of this Act.

(16) ANTI-TRUST LAWS.—Nothing in this section, or the amendments made by this section, shall apply to the extent that it supercedes the applicability of the antitrust laws as defined in subsection (a) of the first section of the Clayton Act (15 U.S.C. 12a), and the sixth section of the Clayton Act (15 U.S.C. 45) to the extent that it applies to unfair methods of competition.
(d) RULEMAKING.—The Federal Trade Commission may issue rules under section 533 of title 5, United States Code, to carry out section 27 of the Federal Trade Commission Act, as added by (a), including by defining any terms used in such section 27 (other than terms that are defined in subsection (a) of such section 27).

(2) By adding at the end the following:

"(k) applicant fails to provide information required under section 351(1)(2)(A) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 262(1)(2)(A)) that would enable the reference product sponsor to form a reasonable belief with respect to whether an infringement under this section could reasonably be asserted; and

'(bb) may be established—"'

(2) by adding at the end the following:

"(I) have an actual filing date of more than 20 years.

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

SEC. 203. TITLE 35 AMENDMENTS.

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

(b) APPLICABILITY.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to a submission described in clause (ii), by adding at the end the following:

"(ii) for good cause shown, which—

(1) in paragraph (2)(C), in the flush text following subparagraph (E), if the sponsor of an approved application for a drug or reference product has been made without undue delay; and

(2) in section 351(1)(7) of such Act.

The Chair recognizes the gentle-

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

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

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

The Chair recognizes the gentle-

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

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

When the ban was implemented, I rushed to the Seattle airport along with Chairman NADLER in New York City. We joined thousands of people in protest. Thanks to these efforts, we successfully secured the release in Se-

attle of two individuals. But the chaos and the pain that the ban cast upon American citizens, lawful residents, and international visitors can never truly be undone.

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

cious war, and persecution.

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

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

Citizens from Muslim-majority na-

tions made up 4.5 percent of the U.S. physician workforce in 2019; and yet, between 2016 and 2018, the number of applicants to the Educational Commis-

sion for Foreign Medical Graduates from Muslim-majority countries decreased by 15 percent, a decrease that exacerbates existing gaps in the U.S. physician workforce which is so desper-

ately needed in a time of COVID–19.

It is time to pass the No BAN Act to repeal President Trump’s bans and stop any future President from imple-

menting discriminatory bans that send the repugnant message that our foundational values of freedom of reli-

gion and liberty and justice for all do not apply.

Today is historic, as the No BAN Act is the first bill that directly addresses Muslim civil rights. And we would not be here today with-

out the courage of Muslims and allies across the country, especially the very important people at Muslim Advocates who work to repudiate the Muslim ban and move Congress to action.

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

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

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

There was no objection.

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

I rise today to address an amendment to H.R. 2486. The majority is actually playing procedural games here by including a non-germane provision to satisfy certain requirements.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- Does the country issue modern electronic passports?

These are clearly important things to know when determining whether to let a foreign national enter our country. Instead of expressing appreciation for what this President has been able to accomplish with regard to security, my colleagues have decided to consider this NO BAN Act, which effectively eviscerates the ability of the administration to take quick and decisive action to protect our homeland when concerns arise, even action to prevent entry of aliens based on a global health crisis like COVID-19.

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

Pursuant to the travel executive order, the President required the Secretary of DHS and Secretary of State, along with the Director of National Intelligence to determine what countries failed to meet international standards of information sharing or identity verification. The President placed travel restrictions on seven nations. Pursuant to the continued review of countries and an updated report in January, the President issued a proclamation imposing narrowly tailored travel restrictions on six additional countries: Burma, Eritrea, Kyrgyzstan, Nigeria, Sudan, and Tanzania.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

We met people like Hamed Khalid Darweesh, an Iraqi who put his life on the line for 10 years to work with American and coalition forces as a translator. He underwent a years-long extensive vetting process to secure a
Special Immigrant Visa granted to people who assist our military in Iraq and Afghanistan. In return for his efforts, this hero was welcomed to the United States with a door slammed in his face and a grueling ordeal at the airport was required to secure his release eventually. I am pleased that Congresswoman Velázquez and I were able to work with officials in New York and Washington to secure his release eventually, but we should never have had to do that. It is a stain on the country we are proud to represent in Congress. We do not betray those who save American troops.

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

The Court reached this decision based on its broad reading of section 212(f) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, which authorizes the President to “suspend the entry of all aliens or any class of aliens” when the President finds that such entry “would be detrimental to the interests of the United States.” I strongly disagree with the Court’s broad interpretation of that provision. Section 212(f) was intended to give the President discretion to quickly address emergent issues involving public health, national security, public safety, or international stability. It was not intended to provide carte blanche authority to the President to ban large categories of individuals without justifications or to rewrite immigration laws with which he disagrees.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Congress gave the President the authority we are discussing today when we passed, many decades ago, the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the years since, our courts have affirmed that authority on numerous occasions. So why, then, do my Democratic colleagues want to take this critical authority away?

I would like to read an excerpt from a 1966 decision out of the D.C. Circuit, in which the court stated that the very authority we are debating today ensures that "the Executive would not be helpless in the face of such a threat" of an alien who posed a danger to the United States.

Furthermore, the court stated that "the President’s sweeping proclama- tion power thus provides a safeguard against the danger posed" to our national security.

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

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

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

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

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

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

I will never forget that terrible day in January of 2017. I was on my way to a community event when I received a frantic call about 50 Muslims with green cards who were being detained at LAX for hours. At that moment, I decided to drop everything and help in any way I could.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

As I was thinking of this legislation today—I have a statement for the record, but I was thinking back to the
"rump" hearing that we had under the leadership of the Judiciary Committee at the time the NO BAN was announced. The distinguished chair, Ms. Chu, talked about how people reacted at the airports and the rest—among them, John Lewis—going to the airport.

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

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

Some military who were Muslim—actually Khizr Khan was there, a Gold Star father; his son had given his life for our country, a Muslim, and now we were saying there is going to be a Muslim ban.

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

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

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

So, Madam Speaker, I salute the maker of this amendment, Chairwoman Judy Chu. I salute Pramila Jayapal, who has been relentless, persistent on this matter, and I thank all of our colleagues who fought so hard.

Just to recall, we remember the day after the inauguration that women turned out in huge numbers not only in Washington, but all over the country and all over the world. They knew the power of their presence.

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

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

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

I hope we have a good, bipartisan vote on this repeal of the Muslim ban and the access to counsel that goes with this legislation. Madam Speaker, on the base of the Statue of Liberty, which is a beacon of freedom and hope for the world, are inscribed these words: “Give me your tired, your poor/ Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free/ Send these, the homeless, tempest-tossed to me.”

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

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

Thank you also, Congresswoman Pramila Jayapal for her leadership to ensure that those unjustly detained have access to legal counsel.

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

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

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

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

These bans fuel anti-Muslim discrimination, which sadly, the White House is encouraging, when it misleads the public and says that the bans are needed to keep us safe—when in reality, the bans only weaken our response, by enacting reporting requirements to Congress to create an oversight mechanism for the future.

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

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

Madam Speaker, I urge a strong ‘yes’ vote.

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

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

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

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

This is not about a policy. This is about a person. It is about a person, the President, who the other side, and especially this committee that I have served as ranking member on and now...
serve as a member of, has consistently gone after for, now, almost 19 months.

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

So, again, the problem here is it is great to couch this in political terms; it is not to couch this in great, deep policy issues; but, for 18 months, this is all that we have heard.

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

There are times I have wondered—and I know my friend from Arizona has as well. We have talked about this a little bit. I have wondered why we have sort of kept the House locked down for the last 5 or 6 months, but if this is what we have to do to make sure that the country gets back on track, this is what we have to do to move forward with this act, which we have talked about before in our committee and have pointed out many of the problems of this act. It eviscerates the ability of any administration to take nimble and decisive action to protect our homeland when cause for concern arises, like the threat of COVID-19.

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

When we understand this, this actually clarifies—it actually crystallizes it. So when you see every other President has used this in some form over the years, and it has only become a more important and a more serious concern as the current President, Donald Trump, and we have an election coming up very quickly, then we start seeing stuff like this, what is being done.

In January 2017, President Trump signed an executive order to restrict travel from certain countries that were at a high risk of terrorism and were public safety concerns, based off recommendations from the Secretaries of DHS and State, along with the DNI. It is important to understand these restrictions are not permanent. This is, again, another thing that permeates even some conversations I have heard already that we are making permanent changes when they are not permanent. They are there until the country gets it in order and are actually able to answer our security concerns, which is not going to be talked about today. We are not talking about security. We are not talking about terrorists. It is something else against certain groups and ethnic groups. This is about security.

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

Let me be clear; there is no doubt the President’s use of the 212(f) authority has helped us improve our security and the vetting of foreign nationals seeking entry into the U.S. Some countries restricted by this order have taken positive steps to come into compliance with the information-sharing and public safety standards and have worked to participate in protecting international security.

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

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

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

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

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

Fortunately, we know it will not; another day of political posturing on the floor of the House, we have seen this before on our borders, backlogging our customs process. And here is the interesting one that nobody has talked about that I have heard so far. I may have missed it, but I don’t think I did. Me and the gentleman from Arizona, we understand something. Everything coming here today has a price tag. This one does as well, $1 billion.

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

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

The majority, Democrats, have decided to include in this bill a prescription drug measure that could have been by bipartisan, and was bipartisan, if only they had abided by the agreed-upon, not negotiated by Members in both parties.

Instead, we are considering an old, partisan version of a prescription drug
Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congresswoman Chu for this important statement that is necessary for the American people: In God, We Trust. And the God we trust is a merciful God.

141,000 people dead from COVID-19. It is important when an administration, no matter who it is, fails the American people, the United States Congress must be the one that deals with that failure, and that is what the NO BAN Act stands for. It stands for expanding the INA’s nondiscrimination provision to prohibit discrimination based on religion and extends the prohibition on discrimination beyond the issuance of immigrant visas to include the issuance of nonimmigrant visas, entry, admission to the United States, and the approval or revocation thereof.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The NO BAN Act expands the INA’s anti-discrimination provision to prohibit discrimination based on religion and extends the prohibition on discrimination beyond the issuance of immigrant visas to include the issuance of nonimmigrant visas, entry and admission into the United States, and the approval or revocation of any nonimmigrant visa. The NO BAN Act terminates several of the President’s executive order which adds the countries of Belarus, Myanmar, Eritrea, Kyrgyzstan, Nigeria, Sudan and Tanzania to the President’s new and offensive Muslim Ban.

As a co-chair of the Congressional Nigerian Caucus, the United States cannot afford to take a “Musulman Ban” relationship with Nigeria due to its importance in the region.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Although Sudan has had some internal issues, for the last 20 years, it was a major donor in the March 1989 “Operation Lifeline Sudan,” which delivered 100,000 metric tons of food into both government and rebel held areas of the Sudan, thus, averting widespread starvation.

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

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

U.S. interests in Eritrea include supporting efforts for greater integration of Eritrea with
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Mr. BIGGS. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE), the minority whip.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

This is lunacy that we would be trying to make it harder for a President to keep Americans safe. Thank goodness President Trump used his executive powers to act like he did to stop the disease from spreading more into this country. He saved thousands of lives.

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

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

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

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

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

We are a gorgeous mosaic of people from throughout the world, different races, different regions, yes, different religions; that is what makes America a great country. It’s not xenophobia. Donald Trump’s hateful Muslim ban is unacceptable, unconscionable, and un-American. It is inconsistent with the principles of religious freedom and tolerance embedded in the First Amendment of the United States Constitution. That is why we are going to make it unlawful.

Vote “yes” on the NO BAN Act.

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

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

In fact, President Washington, addressing the Hebrew congregation at Touro Synagogue, wrote in a famous letter in 1790, when they asked, Will we have religious freedom in this new country? He wrote those words: “For happily the Government of the United States gives to bigotry no sanction, to persecution no assistance.”
And what has been the result of this religious discrimination, this Muslim ban? It has resulted in mothers and fathers being separated from their American children. Foreign students are prevented from studying at our Nation’s great universities; and doctors from countries like Yemen aren’t able to come here to provide care to patients in the United States, despite healthcare shortages across the Nation during a global health pandemic.

In addition to that, Madam Speaker, this legislation violates the founding principles of this country of religious freedom. I am very proud that this legislation includes provisions of the Affordable Prescriptions for Patients Through Promoting Competition Act, which the payers have saved a billion dollars in the form of lower prescription drug prices. All across the country, prescription costs are skyrocketing. People are going bankrupt and even dying because they can’t afford medication.

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

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

Madam Speaker, I thank Chairman Nadler, Congresswoman Chu, and Congresswoman Jayapal for their great work, and I urge my colleagues to pass this bill.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support it.

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

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

Mr. ROSE of New York. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the NO BAN Act. The Muslim ban undermines everything that this great country stands for, the greatest country in the history of the world.

It has torn apart my constituents’ families and trapped their loved ones in war zones and refugee camps. It has made Muslim Americans feel like second-class citizens in their very own country. They are Americans just as much as I.

This ban has done nothing to make us safe. Senator John McCain, in fact, once called the ban a self-inflicted wound in the fight against terrorism.

The administration’s own officials admit this does absolutely nothing to protect our country. The State Department says that just one-tenth of 1 percent of the people blocked by this country under the Muslim ban was deemed a security risk. Those stats do not lie. DHS cannot point to a single threat that our existing immigration policies and systems would not have handled.

If we are going to fight for this country to fulfill its promise, this ban must be overturned.

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

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. Omar).

Ms. OMAR. Madam Speaker, it gives me great pride to rise today in support of the NO BAN Act.

Our friends on the other side of the aisle might try to obscure the reality here by pointing to the Muslim countries that are not on the ban. The White House has tried to mislead the American people with their hateful policy up in a false story about national security, but we know the truth.

I have spoken countless times, both before and since I have entered this office, about the hateful brutality of the Muslim ban.

Today, I want to celebrate the work that brought us to this point. I want to
celebrate the countless Americans who went to the airport the day the first ban was announced. I want to celebrate the thousands of State Department employees who signed the dissent memo and those who resigned in protest. I want to thank my colleagues Asian-American and Pacific Islander Congressional Caucus. I urge my colleagues to vote with us and to support the NO BAN Act. I urge my colleagues to vote with us and to support the NO BAN Act.

Mr. BIGGS. I rise to express my deep concerns about the consequences of the Muslim ban. The ban has been extended to include travel from Iran, Iraq, Libya, Somalia, Sudan, Syria, and Yemen. This ban has had a profound impact on many American families. It has resulted in the separation of parents from their children, spouses from their partners, and children from their parents. It has also resulted in the denial of entry to thousands of Americans, including families with children who were born in the United States.

Madam Speaker, I rise to recognize the extraordinary service of my colleagues throughout the United States who have worked tirelessly to ensure that this ban is overturned. Congresswoman CHU has been a leader in the effort to overturn this ban. She has worked closely with other members of Congress to pass legislation that would overturn the ban. She has also spoken out against the ban in speeches and in interviews.

I want to thank my colleagues for their dedication and for their commitment to upholding the values of our country. I urge all Americans to join us in supporting the NO BAN Act and in working to ensure that this ban is overturned once and for all.
thousands gathered to oppose this hateful policy. I saw the America I know, an America of strength and compassion.

Madam Speaker, today, as we vote on this bill, we are being asked to choose between two visions. We can choose weak, bigoted America that says there is no place for our Muslim brothers and sisters or for Black people, or we can choose an America that lives up to its highest ideals, that welcomes those from around the world seeking safety and opportunity.

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

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

Mr. BEYER. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of JUDY CHU’s NO BAN Act.

In the words of John Lewis: “When you see something that is not right, not fair, not just, you have to speak up; you have to do something.”

The NO BAN Act is doing something. It is stating in clear, powerful legislation that America will never again let racism or religious intolerance be a barrier to lawful immigration. We will not allow ignorance or xenophobia to dictate America’s immigration policies.

Our strength has always—always—been our diversity. A functional Muslim ban or a ban of entire countries simply because they comprise a race or a religion that some President does not like is not just evil, it is stupid. Watch which American communities recover most quickly from the pandemic—those with the most diverse populations.

Madam Speaker, I stand here today, as I stood at the airport at the onset of the ban, to ensure our immigration system cannot be hijacked by hatred.

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

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

Ms. MATSUI. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the NO BAN Act.

Today is about our commitment to the most sacred of American ideals: to celebrate our diversity. But this administration has embarked on a crusade to demonize immigrants and our Muslim-American community.

Americans and their families have been targeted because of their religious beliefs, their race, and their ethnicity. Because of this bigotry, families and loved ones have been separated, unable to celebrate milestones or face hardships together.

Madam Speaker, I stand here today because one of the greatest and most beautiful things about our country is the diversity of people, views, and perspectives. We cannot allow an administration to upend our immigration system and upend our ideals. We must always stand up and speak out.

Madam Speaker, I remember my grandparents’ and parents’ stories about World War II, when they were ostracized and ultimately removed to internment camps. Let’s not forget this past xenophobic history.

Madam Speaker, I am proud to support this bill, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. BIGGS. Madam Speaker, I am prepared to close, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, you have heard a lot of incendiary language regarding the travel restrictions. The most incendiary language is always calling it “incendiary,” “a white nationalist agenda,” “racist,” “hateful,” et cetera.

Was it xenophobic, was it racist, was it hateful when the Obama administration implemented travel bans to the same seven nations?

Was it? No. Nor is it here either.

Madam Speaker, that kind of language is meant to incite public ridicule and distract from the real issue here.

As the Supreme Court noted, the text in this bill says nothing about religion. And as they went on to say: “The policy covers just 8 percent of the world’s Muslims—‘the bulk of Muslims are located in countries that were previously designated by Congress or prior administrations’—read, Obama administration—as posing national security risks.”

That is not a Muslim ban. This is a legitimate travel restriction implemented for the safety of this Nation.

Additionally, I heard from multiple friends across the aisle a straw man argument, a true straw man argument here, that this ban was religious in nature. But if that were the case, they would have stopped it after inserting religion with other proscriptions. But instead, they built up a huge bureaucratic apparatus to limit the authority of the State—of the United States. So it is a straw man argument.

Madam Speaker, the chairman mentioned that the Supreme Court ruling, in his opinion, was without justification, and so I am going to read what the Supreme Court said: “The President lawfully exercised that discretion based on his findings—following a worldwide, multiagency review—that entry of the covered aliens would be detrimental to the national interest.”

Mr. BEYER. Madam Speaker, that is for the President to find that the entry of the covered aliens “would be detrimental to the interests of the United States.”

But the President fulfilled that requirement by first ordering DHS and other agencies to conduct a comprehensive evaluation of every single country’s compliance with the information and risk assessment baseline.

That is what this policy was built upon. It is consistent with the Obama administration and the previous administrations.

But for whatever reason, and I think we all can surmise what that may be, when this President conducts an even more thorough evaluation of these nations and their processes and then issues a proclamation setting forth those extensive findings describing deficiencies in those practices—and, by the way, I am going here based on the Supreme Court’s decision that the practices of select foreign governments, several of which are state sponsors of terrorism, it is somehow xenophobic, a white nationalist agenda, racist, and hateful. But when the Supreme Court said it actually came back to Congress and added three more nations, it wasn’t.

The only ad hominem attack I would ever make here is that it surely seems potentially hypocritical to me. No visas would be revoked pursuant to P.P. 9645 or 9983. Individuals subject to those Presidential proclamations who possess a valid visa or valid travel document were permitted to travel and continue to be admitted to travel in this country.

To call it a Muslim ban is meant to incite—and I will say, we do terrible on this side of the aisle. My friends across the aisle, when you find that peg to hang your hat on, heck of a great job, because everybody does have every right to be suspicious. It is very effective, but it is highly misleading.

What this bill does is it emasculates the very notion of executive power in the President. It really does. The idea, because you want to emasculate the power of President Trump.

But what it does is it gives more power to the bureaucratic state, more power to the bureaucratic state. So the timeline is also going to prevent the President from acting quickly on this.

These are the issues that we have just been distracted from, because it certainly appears—and I will say, my friend from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), when she talked about symbolism in her speech, she is right. This is symbolic, this bill has symbolism. It is symbolic, if you will, of a hatred of this President. Because when the previous President’s administration did this, not a peep. This administration does the same thing, and it is outrageous.

Madam Speaker, the implementation was not great. They have admitted the implementation was not great, but that is an implementation problem, not a policy problem. And you want to change the entire policy and the entire structure not because the policy was bad. It was, we would’ve heard about it the last 40 years—but, instead, because the original implementation was bad.

The Supreme Court has upheld what this administration did because what they did was conduct a thorough vetting of their own policy regarding these nations and those nations’ policies in implementing safety mechanisms, and so they fulfilled that. Here we are today, saying: You know what? Because it is President Donald Trump, this is bad.

Madam Speaker, they are going to pass this bill. There is no doubt they...
are going to pass this amendment. But never forget the inherent inconsistency with the act that you are going to do on this bill with what you have done in the previous administrations.

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

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

Madam Speaker, I find it extremely disingenuous to deny the nature of the Muslim ban. You know why? Because the President told us so. He told us he was able to do a Muslim ban, and then he did it. And every country he put on the list was Muslim. Every country he has added to the list was Muslim.

Only Muslims and Muslim countries pose a threat to the United States of any nature; no one else in the world does? How stupid does he think we are?

This is a Muslim ban. It has been. It is an abuse of his office. It is an abuse of the law. It must be repealed. The honor of the United States must be redeemed. And that is why this dishonorable, hateful policy must be repealed. And that is why we must vote for this bill, to redeem the honor of the United States from the disgusting religious bigotry supported by the President and instituted by the President in this ban.

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

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

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2214 the “National Origin-Based Antidiscrimination for Non Immigrants Act” or NO BAN Act. I wish this bill was not necessary, but unfortunately, it is now more imperative than ever.

As a result of the President’s relentless attempts to rewrite our immigration laws, we must take immediate steps to rein in his repeat abuse of executive authority.

As a candidate for president, Donald Trump promised to ban all Muslims from entering the United States, suggesting—without any evidence—that it would somehow make our country safer. Immediately upon entering office, he tried to make good on that promise.

Ultimately, it took the President 10 months, 3 attempts, and the inclusion of a sham waiver process to craft a ban that stood up to Supreme Court scrutiny.

In a decision rightly criticized by Justices Breyer and Sotomayor—and many of us in this chamber—the majority concluded that despite statements calling for a “total and complete shutdown of Muslims entering the United States,” the President’s ban was somehow not inspired by blatant religious animus. Seeking to distance itself from these remarks, the Administration later claimed that the ban was necessary to keep our country safe from terrorist threats. And yet, a bipartisan coalition of more than 50 former national security officials found that rather than making our country safer, the ban actually undermines U.S. national security.

H.R. 2214 not only invalidates the various iterations of the Muslim Ban, it also amends the authority the President relied on in invoking the ban—section 212(f) of the Immigration and Nationality Act. But rather than getting it, as some of my Republican colleagues have claimed, H.R. 2214 maintains its basic structure, and incorporates checks and balances to ensure that it can no longer be so flagrantly abused.

H.R. 2214 will thus ensure that section 212(f) can only be used in a manner consistent with its intended purpose and historical norms, and that no President—Democratic or Republican—will be able to utilize it to usurp congressional control. This will undoubtedly stifle innovation. Why would any company invest the necessary research dollars to introduce a new product, if they can be held liable for truthful marketing of that product? In Committee, we fixed that.

The bill we’re voting on today is also out of step with current antitrust law. It would completely change the remedy and enforcement authority under traditional antitrust law, and for no obvious reason, apply those changes exclusively to just one industry. In Committee, we fixed that.

I find it troubling that the Majority is choosing to abandon the good faith negotiations and bipartisan work. The gentlemen from New York and Rhode Island worked with the Minority to come up with a good product that addresses drug pricing through regular order. The committee process works. We should be voting on the legislation that passed the Judiciary Committee by a voice vote. Not this version.

I oppose this legislation and urge my colleagues to do the same.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 891, the previous question is ordered on this portion of the divided question.

The question is: Will the House concur in the Senate amendment with the House amendment specified in section 4(a) of House Resolution 891?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

In the matter proposed to be inserted by the amendment of the Senate, strike sec-

TITLE III—ACCESS TO COUNSEL ACT OF 2020

SEC. 301. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Access to Counsel Act of 2020”.
SEC. 302. ACCESS TO COUNSEL AND OTHER ASSISTANCE AT PORTS OF ENTRY AND DEFERRED INSPECTION.

(a) ACCESS TO COUNSEL AND OTHER ASSISTANCE DURING INSPECTION.—Section 235 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1225) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(e) ACCESS TO COUNSEL AND OTHER ASSISTANCE DURING INSPECTION.—"

"(1) The Secretary of Homeland Security shall ensure that a covered individual has a meaningful opportunity to consult with counsel and an interested party during the inspection process.

"(2) SCOPE OF ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall—"

"(A) provide the covered individual a meaningful opportunity to consult with counsel and an interested party not later than one hour after the secondary inspection process commences and as necessary throughout the inspection process, including, as applicable, during deferred inspection.

"(B) allow counsel and an interested party to advocate on behalf of the covered individual, including by providing to the examining immigration officer information, documentation, and other evidence in support of the covered individual.

"(C) to the greatest extent practicable, accommodate a request by the covered individual for counsel or an interested party to appear in-person at the secondary or deferred inspection site.

"(3) SPECIAL RULE FOR LAWFUL PERMANENT RESIDENTS.—"

"(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Homeland Security may not accept Form I-407 Record of Abandonment of Lawful Permanent Resident Status (or a successor form) from a lawful permanent resident subject to secondary or deferred inspection without providing such lawful permanent resident a reasonable opportunity to seek advice from counsel prior to the submission of the form.

"(B) EXCEPTION.—The Secretary of Homeland Security may accept Form I-407 Record of Abandonment of Lawful Permanent Resident Status (or a successor form) from a lawful permanent resident subject to secondary or deferred inspection if such lawful permanent resident was unable to call their family members.

"(4) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

"(A) COUNSEL.—The term 'counsel' means—"

"(i) an attorney who is a member in good standing of the bar of any State, the District of Columbia, or a territory or a possession of the United States and is not under an order suspending, enjoining, restraining, disbarring, or otherwise restricting the attorney in the practice of law; or"

"(ii) an individual accredited by the Attorney General, acting as a representative of an organization recognized by the Executive Office for Immigration Review, to consult with a covered individual in immigration matters.

"(B) COVERED INDIVIDUAL.—The term 'covered individual' means an individual subject to secondary or deferred inspection who is—"

"(i) a national of the United States;

"(ii) an immigrant, lawfully admitted for permanent residence, who is returning from a temporary visit abroad;

"(iii) an alien seeking admission as an immigrant in possession of a valid unexpired immigrant visa; or"

"(iv) an alien seeking admission as a non-immigrant in possession of a valid unexpired non-immigrant visa;"

"(v) a refugee;"

"(vi) a paroled alien; or"

"(vii) an alien who has been approved for parole under section 212(d)(5)(A), including an alien who is returning to the United States in possession of a valid advance parole document.

"(C) INTERESTED PARTY.—The term 'interested party' means—"

"(i) a relative of the covered individual;

"(ii) in the case of a covered individual to whom an immigrant or non-immigrant visa has been issued by the petitioning sponsor thereof (including an agent of such petitioner or sponsor); or"

"(iii) a person, organization, or entity in the United States with a bona fide connection to the covered individual."

"(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

"(c) SAVINGS PROVISION.—Nothing in this title, or in any amendment made by this title, may be construed to limit a right to counsel or any right to appointed counsel under—"

"(1) section 240(b)(4)(A) (8 U.S.C. 1229a(b)(4)(A));

"(2) section 292 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1362), or

"(3) any other provision of law, including any final council of law, as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act.

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

The gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS) each control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 5581, the Access to Counsel Act of 2020.

Last September, the Judiciary Committee and the House Foreign Affairs Committee held a hearing to explore the Muslim ban, including the chaos that unfolded at overseas airports across the country when it was first announced.

I can personally attest to that chaos, based on my experience at JFK Airport immediately after the ban was implemented. Refugees, individuals with valid visas, and even lawful permanent residents of the United States were detained for hours and prevented from speaking with attorneys. Some even had their phones taken away and were unable to call their family members.

A serious issue grabbed the headlines then, it is unfortunately a problem that occurs daily. Due to the complexity of the U.S. immigration law and the fact-intensive nature of questions regarding admissibility, it is not uncommon for some people to spend hours undergoing inspection by U.S. Customs and Border Patrol.

During this time, individuals are often prevented from communicating with those on the outside. And if the individual is lucky enough to have a lawyer, CBP will often refuse to speak with them, even if they can provide critical information or correct a legal error.

Moreover, serious consequences can result from being refused admission. For example, an individual who is given an expedited removal order is barred from returning to the United States for 5 years.

H.R. 5581 will ensure that no one who presents themselves at a port of entry with valid travel documents is completely cut off from the world during inspection. H.R. 5581 allows such individuals, including U.S. citizens, to communicate with counsel and other parties if they are subjected to secondary inspection that lasts longer than one hour.

To be clear, this bill does not provide a right to counsel, nor does it impose any obligation on the Federal Government to pay for or otherwise provide counsel to individuals during CBP inspection proceedings. I wish it did, but it doesn’t. This is confirmed by the fact that the Congressional Budget Office found that H.R. 5581 would have no effect on direct spending or revenues.

I would like to extend a special thanks to my colleague, Representative JAYAPAL, for her leadership on this issue and for championing this bill. I encourage my colleagues to support it, and reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to this amendment to H.R. 2466.

The Access to Counsel Act of 2020 is a step forward for the many lawyers and legal aides who believe migrants and asylum seekers should all receive taxpayer-funded counsel at every stage of the immigration process. I think we just heard that, that is a stated goal.

Many immigration interest groups have made no mystery of the fact that they believe foreign nationals have a right to come to the United States and should all receive taxpayer-funded counsel at every stage of the process.

The Access to Counsel Act of 2020 is a step forward for the many lawyers and legal aides who believe migrants and asylum seekers should all receive taxpayer-funded counsel at every stage of the immigration process. I think we just heard that, that is a stated goal.

Many immigration interest groups have made no mystery of the fact that they believe foreign nationals have a right to come to the United States and should all receive taxpayer-funded counsel at every stage of the process. It is important to understand exactly what secondary screening is, why it is used, and the ramifications that this bill would have on the port of entry operations.

My colleagues across the aisle provided the Judiciary Committee no opportunity to hear from DHS experts about any of these issues. There was no hearing on this legislation even generally on the subject matter at hand.

CBP is extremely concerned about the impact the requirements of this
yield such time as she may consume to
consider my bill today, the Access to
Counsel Act, H.R. 5581. It is a com-
momnsense measure that would ensure
that U.S. citizens, green card holders,
and other people with legal status are
able to consult with an attorney when
Customs and Border Protection detains
them for over an hour.
I introduced this bill, Madam Speak-
er, as my first bill when I got to Con-
gress, and it was in the wake of the
Muslim ban. It was in the wake of that
chaos that was unleashed at airports
cross the country as people from
seven Muslim-majority countries found
themselves detained for hours, in some
cases pressured to sign papers giving
up their legal status, and in many
cases deported.
More often than not, these people did
not even have the opportunity to see
an attorney or even call anyone. They
did not even have the opportunity to
use the restrooms or to get water and
food.
Since then, however, Madam Speak-
er—it isn’t just that moment—there
have been numerous cases of students
detained for long periods at airports
and airports despite holding valid visas
secured after undergoing rigorous
vetting by the State Department. One
student was detained and deported in
spite of a court order saying that he
should be allowed to stay until a court
could review his case.
And earlier this year, we saw no less
than 200 people of Iranian American de-
cent detained at the northern border
in Blaine, Washington, for up to 12
hours with no access to counsel. These
lengthy detentions while CBP of-
counted denied that Iranian Ameri-
cans were being targeted for differ-
ent treatment.
Many of the people impacted were
U.S. citizens, as well as elderly people
and children. Some had even undergone
extra vetting to participate in a pro-
gram designed for trusted travelers at
the northern border.
A month later, CBP Acting Com-
missioner Mark Morgan said that border
officers had been "overzealous in their
actions," but the damage, Madam
Speaker, had already been done. There
were children of U.S. citizens—they
themselves U.S. citizens—who watched
their parents be detained and treated
in a way that no American citizen
should go through. No person should go
through that type of indignity and dis-
respect.
If my bill were enacted into law, it
would ensure that any time CBP de-
tains people with lawful status, then
those individuals would simply have
the right to call a lawyer and receive
assistance. It does not stop CBP from
doing its job; it does not create a right
to counsel for everyone. This is just a
simple phone call to their attorney.
So I would like to thank those who
bravely came forward to share their
stories, to make clear the Access to
Counsel Act is desperately needed, and
I urge my colleagues.
Mr. BIGGS. Madam Speaker, just to
point out, this bill does not say any-
where this contact will be limited to a
simple phone call. Nowhere does it say
that.
Mr. BIGGS. Madam Speaker, I just
wanted to quote directly from sec-
tion 2 of my bill: "The Secretary of
Homeland Security shall provide the
covered individual a meaningful oppor-
tunity to consult with counsel and an
interested party not later than one
hour after the secondary inspection
process commences and as necessary
throughout the inspection process,
including, as applicable, during deferred
inspection."
So again, this could be a phone call.
"Meaningful access" is a broad term
and it takes into account my colleague
from the other side’s concerns.
Mr. BIGGS. Madam Speaker, I re-
sert the balance of my time.
Mr. BIGGS. Madam Speaker, I am
prepared to close.
I think of Naco, that little port of entry in southern Arizona. I think of Douglas. I am telling you, the problem that this bill has is it doesn’t—if that is the goal. There are other problems, but if that is the goal, this language has not enough. I also have talked with those who have had the secondary inspection. If we are referring to the implementation of the travel restriction—and I think the world, including the administration, I think that it was rolled out poorly—that is a different animal than what happens on a normal basis.

I think of the San Luis Port of Entry or the Nogales Port of Entry, but, particularly, San Luis. It gets so much traffic through there. I can’t imagine what will happen when you try to bog down everything by allowing everyone who moves to a secondary inspection to have counsel or some other interested party, who we don’t really know who that is. That is not defined very well, either.

I think of all the commercial truck traffic that comes through Nogales. We don’t inspect but a small fraction of vehicles. That is there. It is very difficult to move traffic. The infrastructure itself is not conducive to this.

I will just say, the one thing I was reminded of as I was reviewing this bill for this debate today—and it really kind of came out in the debate when someone was talking about this notion of where we are now, which is if you become a focus of a criminal investigation, you get counsel. You get that opportunity for counsel.

I started thinking that, yes, exactly, this is what we are doing. We are saying now, in a civil administrative function, we are going to give you a right to counsel. Are we going to expand that to every area where there are civil administrative regulatory violations or potential violations? The answer is that would be absolutely, totally bizarre. It would be unworkable, just as this bill is unworkable.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY).

Mr. KENNEDY. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman for moving this legislation forward and to our colleague, Ms. JAYAPAL, for extraordinary work on this legislation.

Madam Speaker, you can learn an awful lot about a country by its approach to justice. You learn about its values, about the people it protects first, about the arc of its history, about the legislative tolerates and the inequities it reinforces.

When you aim that spotlight on our Nation, what it reveals is not pretty. It is not something to be proud of. Because being an American who call this Nation home, justice is not a guarantee. It is something withheld. It is something far too many will never experience.

Very few battle that injustice more frequently than immigrants who arrive on our shores and at our border because they believe in the promise of our Nation. If we believe in that same promise as fiercely as they do, we shouldn’t be scared to provide them with justice, with, at the very least, access to legal counsel.

Madam Speaker, we need to pass this bill to, at the very least, take a small step forward in living up to those ideals, and we need to do it today. Mr. BIGGS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I will just say this, I appreciate the sponsor of this indicating that, in their interpretation, a simple phone call would suffice. I don’t think that is the way CBP is interpreting this. I think they are interpreting this that they are going to have to build out infrastructure so there can be private facilities for counsel to meet with these folks. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I have no other speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I just want to go back to this and indicate there are a multiplicity of issues with this bill, but some things that I want to reiterate.

I think the bill is a step forward providing counsel for folks who are here getting a secondary inspection, which in the vast majority of cases is almost perfunctory and incidental and is very quick, in the normal case.

Again, I think it is bad facts—or, actually, good facts to make the argument. It is not going to make good policy. You are, again, arguing implementation of the travel restriction, which wasn’t great.

But the norm—the norm—if you get down to the border and spend time, as I have many times, you are going to see these secondary inspections are short, perfunctory. There is no need of counsel. They almost always turn out well for the person that is delayed, except for when they are a danger. Then, it becomes a problem, and they get an opportunity for counsel because now you have a criminal focus on them. That is the key here.

So, expanding this to civil cases, which is exactly what you are doing here, and putting us in line to walk down to where we ultimately are going to pay for that, that is not great policy. That is bad policy, and I am urging my folks to oppose this.

Madam Speaker, I yield the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I find it bizarre to suggest that you shouldn’t vote for a bill because some other bill may do something that you don’t like. This bill does not provide—I personally think maybe it would be a good idea, but that is not this bill. This bill does not provide for funded counsel in any way. It doesn’t do that. Maybe I should introduce a bill to do that. That is not this bill, so let’s forget about that.

This bill simply says that if an individual is held—an individual who may be an American who is supposed to have a green card holder, who if improperly, by mistake, is sent out of the country and may be forbidden from applying to come back in for 5 years, with all kinds of problems, who may be a cancer researcher, who is supposed to work at the Rockefeller Institute or Johns Hopkins or wherever and would be denied his or her talents because of a mistake.

All this bill says is that if someone is held in secondary inspection for at least an hour, they must be given an opportunity to call counsel, to call other people, to call their brother-in-law, to call whoever, and to communicate. That is all the bill says.

I fail to understand why it is at all controversial. I urge everyone to adopt this. I urge everyone to vote for this bill.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, as an original cosponsor and senior member of the Committee on the Judiciary, I rise in strong and enthusiastic support of H.R. 5581, the Access to Counsel Act of 2020, which ensures that individuals who are subjected to prolonged inspection by U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) at ports of entry have a meaningful opportunity to communicate with counsel and other interested parties.

This important legislation amends section 235 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA) to require the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) to ensure that certain individuals can communicate with counsel and other interested parties if they are subjected to prolonged inspection by CBP.

The protections afforded by the Access to Counsel Act of 2020 would apply to individuals who possess valid travel documents, but who are pulled out of the “primary” inspection line and referred to “secondary” inspection for extended processing.

If such individuals are held in secondary inspection for at least one hour, they must be permitted to communicate with counsel and other interested parties. Co-sponsored and interested parties would be able to provide information and documentation to the inspecting officer to facilitate the inspection process and offer support and assistance to the individual subject to inspection.
Madam Speaker, the stakes can be high for a person wrongfully refused admission and the consequences of being denied admission to the United States can be significant.

For example, a U.S. research institution equipped to correctly resolve legal uncertainties is inconsistent across ports of entry and CBP provides no public guidance on an individual’s ability to communicate with counsel and other individuals during the inspection process.

According to an American Immigration Council report, CBP policies and practices on access to counsel vary from one office to another.

While some ports of entry completely bar counsel in primary or secondary inspection, others provide specific procedures for interacting with counsel or provide the inspecting officer with broad discretion to decide whether and with whom to communicate.

Madam Speaker, the Access to Counsel Act of 2020 ensures that no one is cut off from the world due to the Administration’s hasty and mismanaged rollout of the Muslim ban and the widespread chaos that it engendered at airports across the nation.

Affected individuals were detained at airports for hours, and many were sent back to their home country without the ability to contact their families or receive the assistance of counsel.

Reports of similar treatment surfaced in January 2020, as tensions between Iran and the United States escalated and up to 200 individuals—including U.S. citizens or permanent residents, including a generation cancer researcher if that researcher is denied admission despite possessing a valid nonimmigrant visa—were held for several days, with some reportedly held for up to 12 hours.

These individuals—many of whom were U.S. citizens or permanent residents, including seniors and children—were held for several hours, with some reportedly held for up to 12 hours.

Madam Speaker, although complications in the inspection process can arise in response to sweeping immigration policy or shifting world events, the greatest impact on individuals comes from the consistent lack of access to counsel and other assistance at ports of entry.

All individuals—including U.S. citizens—who seek a lawful entry to the United States are subject to inspection by CBP officers at ports of entry.

Without access to counsel and other parties, many individuals are refused admission or issued an expedited removal order instead of being provided the chance to vindicate their rights and lawfully enter the country.

The Access to Counsel Act will ensure individuals who are seeking to lawfully enter the United States are treated fairly and with dignity.

The bill permits counsel and interested parties to appear in person at the port of entry, but also gives DHS and CBP enough discretion to determine—based on operational and other practical limitations—how the consultation takes place.

The bill provides extra protection for lawful permanent residents (LPRs) by prohibiting DHS from accepting a Record of Abandonment of Lawful Permanent Resident Status from an LPR without first providing the LPR a reasonable opportunity to consult with counsel.

Madam Speaker, the Access to Counsel Act of 2020 is supported by an impressive coalition of highly respected organizations, including: Amnesty International; American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU); America’s Voice; American Immigration Lawyers Association (AILA); Coalition for Humane Immigrant Rights; Immigration Hub; and National Iranian American Council (NIAC).

I urge all Members to join me in voting to pass H.R. 5581, the Access to Counsel Act of 2020.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5581, the “Access to Counsel Act of 2020,” that will ensure that individuals who lawfully present themselves at our ports of entry are treated fairly and allowed to communicate with counsel and other parties if they are subjected to prolonged inspection.

The Immigration and Nationality Act provides individuals in removal proceedings the right to representation at no expense to the government. Although federal regulations extend this right to immigration-related “examinations,” applicants for admission—specifically those in primary or secondary inspection—are excluded unless they become the focus of a criminal investigation.

However, our immigration laws are complex, and so are some questions regarding an individual’s admissibility.

Access to outside assistance is important to ensure that CBP has a complete understanding of the facts and the law before deciding admissibility. That is because grave consequences can result from being refused admission—consequences that extend well beyond simply turning around and getting back on a plane.

Individuals who are refused admission may be unable to reunite with their families or receive critical medical care unavailable in their home country. They may be turned away from a U.S. employer who desperately needs their skills. Or they may be denied the opportunity to appear in person at the port of entry, to communicate with counsel or other interested parties with information relevant to their request for admission, CBP will be better equipped to correctly resolve legal uncertainties and individuals will be treated more equitably.

I would like to thank my friend and colleague, Representative JAYAPAL for her leadership and commitment to this issue. Her efforts led to the introduction of this legislation, and I urge all my colleagues to support the Access to Counsel Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 891, the previous question is ordered on this portion of the divided question.

The question is: Will the House concur in the Senate amendment with the House amendment specified in section 4(b) of House Resolution 891?

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

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

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

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Byrd, on of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 3989. An act to amend the United States Semiquincentennial Commission Act of 2016 to modify certain membership and other requirements of the United States Semiquincentennial Commission, and for other purposes.

TAXPAYER FIRST ACT OF 2019

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1033, I move to take from the Speaker’s table the bill (H.R. 1957) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modernize and improve the Internal Revenue Service, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendments thereto, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Speaker read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SCHNEIDER). The Clerk will designate the Senate amendments.

 Senate amendments: Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Great American Outdoors Act”.

SEC. 2. NATIONAL PARKS AND PUBLIC LAND LEGACY RESTORATION FUND

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle II of title 54, United States Code, is amended by inserting after chapter 2003 the following:

“CHAPTER 2004—NATIONAL PARKS AND PUBLIC LAND LEGACY RESTORATION FUND

“Sec. 200401. Definitions.


SEC. 200401. Definitions.

“(1) ASSET.—The term ‘asset’ means any real property, including any physical structure or grouping of structures or landscape, trail, or other tangible property, that—

“(A) has a specific service or function; and

“(B)…”


“§ 200401. National Parks and Public Land Legacy Restoration Fund

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the Treasury of the United States a fund to be known as the ‘National Parks and Public Land Legacy Restoration Fund’. 

(b) DEPOSITS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2) for each of fiscal years 2021 through 2025, there shall be deposited in the Fund an amount equal to 30 percent of all energy development revenues due and payable to the United States from oil, gas, coal, or alternative or renewable energy development on Federal land and water credited, covered, or deposited as miscellaneous receipts under Federal law in the preceding fiscal year.

(2) MAXIMUM AMOUNT.—The amount deposited in the Fund under paragraph (1) shall not exceed $1,900,000,000 for any fiscal year.

(3) EFFECT ON OTHER REVENUES.—Nothing in this section affects the disposition of revenues that—

(A) are due to the United States, special funds, trust funds, or States from mineral and energy development on Federal land and water;

(B) have been otherwise appropriated—

(i) under Federal law, including—

(I) the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act of 2006 (43 U.S.C. 1331 note; Public Law 109-432); and

(II) the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 181 et seq.); or

(ii) from—

(I) the Land and Water Conservation Fund established under chapter 3031; or

(ii) the Historic Preservation Fund established under chapter 3031.

(c) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—Amounts deposited in the Fund shall be available to the Secretary and the Secretary of Agriculture, as provided in subsection (e), without further appropriation or fiscal year limitation.

(d) INVESTMENT OF FUNDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may request the Secretary of the Treasury to invest any portion of the Fund that is not, as determined by the Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Agriculture, required to meet the current needs of the Fund.

(2) REQUIREMENT.—An investment requested under paragraph (1) shall be made by the Secretary of the Treasury in a public debt security—

(A) with a maturity suitable to the needs of the Fund, as determined by the Secretary; and

(B) bearing interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration current market yields on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States of comparable maturity.

(e) CREDITS TO FUND.—The income on investments of the Fund under this subsection shall be credited to, and form part of, the Fund.

(f) IN GENERAL.—Amounts deposited in the Fund for each fiscal year shall be used for priority deferred maintenance projects in the System, in the National Wildlife Refuge System, on public land administered by the Bureau of Land Management, for the Bureau of Indian Education schools, and in the National Forest System, as follows:

(A) 70 percent of the amounts deposited in the Fund for each fiscal year shall be allocated to the Service;

(B) 15 percent of the amounts deposited in the Fund for each fiscal year shall be allocated to the Forest Service;

(C) 5 percent of the amounts deposited in the Fund for each fiscal year shall be allocated to the Bureau of Land Management;

(D) 5 percent of the amounts deposited in the Fund for each fiscal year shall be allocated to the Bureau of Indian Education.

(2) LIMITATIONS.—

(A) NON-TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS.—Over the term of the Fund, within each covered agency, not less than 65 percent of amounts from the Fund shall be allocated for non-transportation projects.

(B) TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS.—The amounts remaining in the Fund after the allocations required under subparagraph (A) may be allocated for transportation projects of the covered agencies and any unexpended amounts on unpaved roads, bridges, tunnels, and paved parking areas.

(C) PLANS.—Any priority deferred maintenance project funded under this section shall be consistent with an applicable transportation, deferred maintenance, or capital improvement plan developed by the applicable covered agency.

(D) PROHIBITED USE OF FUNDS.—No amounts in the Fund shall be used—

(1) for land acquisition;

(2) to supplant discretionary funding made available for annually recurring facility operations, maintenance, and construction needs; or

(3) for bonuses for employees of the Federal Government that are carrying out this section.

(E) SUBMISSION OF PRIORITY LIST OF PROJECTS TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary and the Secretary of Agriculture shall submit to Congress a list of projects to be funded for fiscal year 2021 that—

(1) are identified by the Secretary and the Secretary of Agriculture as priority deferred maintenance projects; and

(2) as of the date of the submission of the list, are ready to be implemented.

(F) SUBMISSION OF ANNUAL LIST OF PROJECTS TO CONGRESS.—Until the date on which all of the amounts in the Fund are expended, the President shall annually submit to Congress, together with the annual budget of the United States, a list of projects to be funded from the Fund pursuant to the further Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2020 (Public Law 116–94; 133 Stat. 2534).

(G) ADDITIONAL AMOUNTS.—Amounts made available under subsection (a) shall be in addition to amounts made available to the Fund under section 101 of the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act of 2006 (43 U.S.C. 1331 note; Public Law 109-432) or otherwise appropriated from the Fund.

(h) ALLOCATION AUTHORITY.—

(1) SUBMISSION OF COST ESTIMATES.—The President shall submit to Congress a detailed account, program, and project allocations of the full amount made available under subsection (a).

(2) ALLOCATION BY PRESIDENT.—

(A) NO ALTERNATE ALLOCATIONS.—If Congress enacts legislation establishing alternate allocations for amounts made available under subsection (c) that are less than the full amount appropriated under that subsection, the difference between the amount appropriated and the alternate allocation shall be allocated by the President.

(B) PUBLIC DONATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary and the Secretary of Agriculture may accept public or in-kind donations that advance efforts—

(A) to reduce the deferred maintenance backlog; and

(B) to encourage relevant public-private partnerships.

(2) CREDITS TO FUND.—Any cash donations accepted under paragraph (1) shall—

(A) credited to, and form part of, the Fund; and

(B) allocated to the covered agency for which the donation was made.

(2) OTHER ALLOCATIONS.—Any donations allocated to a covered agency under paragraph (2)(B) shall be allocated to the applicable covered agency independently of the allocations under subsection (e)(1).

(i) REQUIRED CONSIDERATION FOR ACCESSIBILITY.—In expending amounts from the Fund, the Secretary and the Secretary of Agriculture shall incorporate measures to improve the accessibility of assets and accommodate visitors and employees with disabilities in accordance with applicable law.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of chapters for subtitle II of title 54, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to chapter 2003 the following:


(1) T RANSPORTATION PROJECTS .—The amount deposited in the Fund shall be used for—

(1) for land acquisition;

(2) to supplant discretionary funding made available for annually recurring facility operations, maintenance, and construction needs; or

(3) for bonuses for employees of the Federal Government that are carrying out this section.

(2) NON-TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS.—Over the term of the Fund, within each covered agency, not less than 65 percent of amounts from the Fund shall be allocated for non-transportation projects.

(2) CREDITS TO FUND .—Any cash donations accepted under paragraph (1) shall be—

(A) credited to, and form part of, the Fund; and

(B) allocated to the covered agency for which the donation was made.

(3) OTHER ALLOCATIONS.—Any donations allocated to a covered agency under paragraph (2)(B) shall be allocated to the applicable covered agency independently of the allocations under subsection (e)(1).

(4) REQUIRED CONSIDERATION FOR ACCESSIBILITY.—In expending amounts from the Fund, the Secretary and the Secretary of Agriculture shall incorporate measures to improve the accessibility of assets and accommodate visitors and employees with disabilities in accordance with applicable law.

(5) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of chapters for subtitle II of title 54, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to chapter 2003 the following:

In February of 2019, I flew to Arizona from Washington to speak about my bill to permanently protect the Grand Canyon from uranium mining. We wanted to publicly release the legislation on the rim of the canyon to show firsthand that we were attempting to protect. Unfortunately, the weather had other ideas. That night, before the event, it snowed more than it had in decades. But by some small miracle, the roads were clear, and we found an easy pathway into the park. We made it in time and even found some rangers to help us set up in the snow.

To those representing people who have called that land their home for a millennia joined us at the event. Standing there with them on the edge of the amazing canyon millions of years in the making and glistening in the snow, it was hard not to be moved. Looking out over the Grand Canyon, you are reminded why we as a Nation have dedicated ourselves to protecting the unique and enduring landscapes around us. Nowhere else on Earth is there a sight quite like the Grand Canyon, or, for that matter, like Yosemite Valley or Yellowstone National Park. These places are gems of our National Park system, and they show who we are as a people.

We are judged on what we choose to pass on, and today we have an opportunity to reaffirm our commitment to preserving these lands for the future and for future generations. In a few short minutes we will vote on the Great American Outdoors Act, a bill to significantly increase conservation spending in the United States. For too long we have allowed our National Parks to fall into disrepair. We have underfunded maintenance while park visitation has skyrocketed. At the same time, we have failed to meet the full promise of the Land and Water Conservation Fund. We have been diverting half of this conservation funding stream to other uses for which this money was never intended.

Today, we take the opportunity to remedy both those failures. The Great American Outdoors Act provides $1.9 billion per year to maintain our National Parks and public lands, ensuring that those places that the Grand Canyon are accessible to all Americans as they were to me on that February morning.

The law will also make an enduring commitment to protecting green and flourishing open spaces by providing $900 million annually to the Land and Water Conservation Fund. This fund will mean more parks for inner city families. It will allow us to protect forests, wetlands, and marshes from the destruction of climate change. It will help protect lands we have located ourselves to protecting from inappropriate development and will expand recreational access and opportunity for all Americans. Combined, these two major programs amount to one of the biggest wins for conservation in decades.

We all know that not everyone here agrees about the value of these programs. In fact, we disagree almost daily on how best to protect the landscapes of our Nation. But I hope today we can move past those political differences and to honestly consider the value of conservation and the importance of stable, predictable funding.

We have a generational opportunity to ensure America’s crown jewels are protected. We have a unique chance to ensure that every tool is available to help us respond to the climate crisis, so that we can protect those landscapes that best protect clean water, clean air and healthy green spaces.

This bill is a major win for the American people, decades in the making. I might add, I have pursued it for years. Some of my colleagues have pursued it for years. This didn’t happen overnight.

Now, during a time of national disillusionment, it is perhaps more necessary than ever to demonstrate that we can still bridge the divide.

When it comes to passing along this Nation to our children and to theirs, we can still work together to find common ground.

This bill goes beyond politics. It is about ensuring that we pass along a legacy of public lands stewardship and conservation to future generations, so they, too, can marvel at the Grand Canyon covered in snow.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support this important measure.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may construe.

Let’s get a couple of things very clear.

First of all, this is not about the Land and Water Conservation Fund. We reauthorized permanently the Land and Water Conservation Fund in the last Congress, and in doing that, in a Republican Congress, we took the State-side projects—these are the kinds of things like easements and picnic grounds and roads and parks that your constituents are all telling you that they like, those are called the State-side projects—and we actually increased the funding for those programs.

We also put in that act a limitation on the amount of money that could be used to buy more land. This bill is about that concept, the limitation of land acquisition. The special interest groups have been putting pressure on you and are giving you misinformation about this particular thing. They simply want to circumvent the limits that were pushed in that bill that was there earlier.

This is two bills merged together. The first one was the old H.R. 1225, the backlog maintenance bill that Mr. GRIJALVA referred to in his speech. We...
wanted to see if we could actually help parks and other public lands who are having a maintenance backlog that is near $20 billion today.

Many people, 330 people, cosponsored that bill. Obviously, it was popular. But the Democratic leadership failed and refused to move that bill. One of their arguments was, this is key, there is no offset for a bill that scored $7 billion. They refused to move it because there was no offset.

The LWCF's maintenance backlog by taking excess revenue from those that come from all energy development, but primarily oil and gas, off-coast as well as on land, and after we pay our obligations, the first $1 billion of the excess would be used to maintain our parks. That is still a decent bill.

You have added that, or the Democrats in the Senate have added that, to a second bill that is mandatory $900 million of spending. That mandatory spending will go on from now until eternity, but the goal of that is simply to increase the buying power to buy more lands, not to create the State-side projects which we increased.

We are spending trillions of dollars on non-essential emergency spending. We still have to pay for that. If you really think that mandatory increasing of our debt is the right policy, I think there is a problem there because the CBO did say that this new concoction—bill scores at $7 billion. And I want you to notice there is no offset for that in this bill.

Both House Republicans and House Democrats have rules that they will not bring a bill to the floor that is not offset. The Blue Dog Democrats unan- imously wrote a letter to their leadership saying, Do not bring a bill to the floor that is not offset.

This violates the rules of both the Democrats and the Republicans clearly and not allow to the debt, and the reason this is here is, well, because.

Both LWCF, as well as what we want to do with park maintenance, is paid for by royalties from those gas and oil explorations. The excess was to go to parks. We already have obligations with those royalties. GOMESA is an obligation. Historic preservation is an obligation. State reimbursement is an obligation. Those are priorities.

Now, we are also saying in this bill, the taxation of money to buy more land is now also a priority above and beyond what is happening for the parks and what will get there for the parks, which may not be in normal times be a concern, but in this era, CRS has already certified that we are 84 percent lowest in the amount of activity and the amount of royalties coming in from our energy development than we were a year ago. That is 2 million barrels of oil a day less than we were producing and getting royalties from them last year.

So if buying more land is the priority, the maintenance of our backlog could be totally left out.

Now, this is not for wont of what we are trying to do. There were amendments to try and fix this, but they were not allowed to be brought to this floor. There are amendments in the Senate to fix these problems, but they were not allowed to be brought to the floor. There will be things on both sides of the aisle, some on our side, who will support and defend this bill.

I will remind you we are having a heat wave here in Washington, D.C. For the first time in four years we are coming into the summer but the heat index is well into three digits. There are a lot of people suffering from heat stroke.

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CUNNINGHAM), a sponsor of the legislation, companion legislation to the Senate bill.

Mr. Speaker, my bipartisan legisla-
tion gives Congress a chance to deliver a massive win not only for our irreplaceable parks and public lands, but also for this institution as a whole by showing the American people that we can work together and keep our prom-
ises.

The Great American Outdoors Act will honor our Nation's commitment to conservation in two important ways.

First, it fully and permanently funds the Land and Water Conservation Fund, our most important conserva-
tion program. LWCF preserves the best of America, ensuring hunting, fishing, boating, hiking, and other recreational access for all of our constituents.

It is the backbone of our $778 billion economy, which accounts for over 5 million jobs across this country. It protects working forests and the jobs that they support in the woods and the mills. And here is the best part: It does it all without spending a dime of tax-
payer money.

Despite this, we have consistently fallen short in utilizing the full amount of funds in LWCF. Over the past 55 years, we have only spent half the money that we have deposited in the fund, thereby creating an unsustainable backlog of projects in the Lowcountry and across this Nation. This legislation will fix that, ensuring that, at long last that these funds are spent how they were intended.

Second, it will relieve the growing widespread disrepair of our national treasures is only getting worse. The Great American Outdoors Act will ad-dress this as well by making essential investments to reverse the damage, while creating over 100,000 jobs in the process.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is grounded in two basic principles: that Congress should invest funding set aside for conservation towards the public lands and that we should take the maintenance bills we have already ac-crue. It is time that we honor our promises.

In South Carolina, the LWCF has protected the hallowed ground of Fort Sumter, the living outdoor classroom of Congaree National Park, the Pitt Street Bridge in Mount Pleasant, the Folly Beach Boardwalk, and literally hundreds of other local and State parks.

In my district, LWCF protected the ACE Basin, which is the largest undeveloped estuary on the Atlantic Coast, providing a home for the area's incredible wildlife, a source of recreation for sportsmen and -women, and a natural safeguard for our coastal communities from devastating weather events.

Just this past week, I heard from our veterans about the important role that public lands play in the healing process for many men and women transitioning back to civilian life. They told me how access to nature and the outdoors has helped them find a sense of calm and peace.

The power of these places to heal and unite us reaches all the way back here to Washington, where my bill is sup-
ported by the Speaker, by the minority leader, and by a large bipartisan majority. Seventy-three Senators have already voted for this bill, and President Trump has specifically asked for us to send it to his desk.

In this current climate of division and discord, the Great American Outdoors Act is exemplary of the fact that Republicans and Democrats can still come together to pursue commonsense solutions, do right by our public lands, and keep our word.

Mr. Speaker, I invite all my col-
leagues to join me in supporting our communities, families, public lands, and economy by voting to pass the Great American Outdoors Act.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON).

Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend from Utah for yielding. I know that was painful.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in favor of the Great American Outdoors Act. It makes sense to me that, if we are going to have public lands and preserve pub-
lic lands for Americans, we should also take care of it. That is why the LWCF funding and deferred maintenance part of this bill are very important and a perfect combination.

With that in mind, I wrote the LAND Act in 2017, which funded these two
Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Great American Outdoors Act.

My district has 120 projects that benefit from the Land and Water Conservation Fund, from community parks like the Wayne National Forest, to the Hopewell Culture National Historical Park.

Public lands, forests, and parks give folks the opportunity to connect with the outdoors and with each other, especially in this time of the coronavirus. The Great American Outdoors Act expands public lands, including our national parks, but, over the years, LWCF dollars have also created parks, ball fields, and other outdoor recreational spaces.

In my district last year, $1.37 billion was spent on outdoor recreation. And at a time when there is such a backlog in maintenance, this maintenance support will create 100,000 jobs.

During a time when we have 11.1 percent unemployment, Congress should be taking every opportunity it can to create jobs.

Mr. Speaker, this bill isn’t just about conservation, it is about jobs and the economy, and I urge my colleagues to vote “yes.”

It is a Senate bill that passed the Senate 73-25. It is not perfect, but it is a good bill, and it is a bill we should support.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA), the senior member of the Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the bipartisan team of my colleagues to support this bill.

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI).

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Great American Outdoors Act.

Protecting wilderness reflects the best values of Oregon: environmental protection, stewardship of our land, and community partnership.

The Land and Water Conservation Fund represents a bipartisan commitment to safeguarding natural areas and providing recreation opportunities in the parks and other outdoor areas that make places in northwest Oregon, like Ecola State Park and the Tualatin National Wildlife Refuge, so special. Unfortunately, the program has faced significant instability in recent years, limiting the long-term planning needed for meaningful conservation efforts.

Last month, I joined my colleagues on the Select Committee on the Climate Crisis in releasing a bold, comprehensive, science-based climate action plan. cognizant of the climate crisis recognizes the value of public lands and healthy ecosystems in sequestering carbon dioxide and promoting biodiversity, and it calls for a full and permanent funding for the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

The Great American Outdoors Act will help mitigate the climate crisis and protect the natural beauty and robust habitats that fish and wildlife depend on for survival.

At a time when our communities are struggling to recover from the economic consequences of the coronavirus pandemic, a time when there is heightened awareness about the inequities and injustices in our society, including inequitable access to our wild places, this bill will boost rural economies and expand access to public lands for future generations.

I am also pleased that this bill takes steps to tackle our national park maintenance backlog to support treasured places like the Lewis and Clark National Historical Park. Oregonians care deeply about protecting our parks, forests, scenic areas, and wildlife refuges, and this bill takes important steps to solve them for future generations.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman Grijalva for his leadership, and I urge all of my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STIVERS).

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote yes on this bill.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STIVERS).

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote yes on this bill.

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I represent know that better than anyone. Manufacturers in northern Indiana build products like boats, trailers, and 80 percent of the Nation’s RVs. That is why Elkhart, Indiana, is known as the RV Capital of the World.

I am a proud cosponsor of the Great American Outdoors Act because it will support RV and boat manufacturers and their workers, promote conservation, and revitalize our national parks.

By investing in long-delayed maintenance projects, it will ensure our national parks can continue to be enjoyed by all Americans for generations to come.

By enhancing access to our public lands, it will boost tourism, strengthen our economy, and support good-paying jobs.

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA), the senior member of the Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for his efforts to bring this legislation to the House floor.

I rise today to speak on the Great American Outdoors Act and the importance of this legislation and why we should move on a bipartisan effort to pass it.

This bill tackles a tremendous deferred maintenance backlog on public lands, including our national parks, our treasures, the great American national parks.

This funding will contribute towards making our parks safe and enhance the recreational access, such as the great Yosemite National Park, the crown jewel in California, as well as Kings Canyon and Sequoia National Parks and many others—not only in California, but across our Nation—that are
part of America’s heritage and a part of our lasting legacy for future generations to come.

This bill funds the Land and Water Conservation Fund annually at $900 million and creates a $9.5 billion fund for deferred maintenance on public lands. We are way in arrears in terms of deferred maintenance that we need to do not only for our national parks, but for our public lands. That is why this is so important.

Let me respond to the issue of our deficit.

Our deficit is a problem. I am a Blue Dog. But let’s be clear. After 16 years here, I have come to the conclusion that trying to address incremental issues as they relate to our national deficit is not going to get us there.

Until Republicans are willing to address the issues of revenues and Democrats are willing to address the issues of expenditures together and jump off that cliff holding hands to balance revenues and expenditures, we are just not going to get there. Okay?

So we should not use that as an excuse not to do what we should do for today’s generation and future generations. The creation of this permanent funding highlights the need for Congress to address the deferred maintenance backlog.

I will admit that we are not doing more to provide funding for our aging Federal water infrastructure that also needs to be invested on.

So let me close. Let’s take the moment of this bipartisan success to redouble our efforts to address the need for maintenance on federally owned projects.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

This bill is actually extremely poorly drafted. It assumes basic things. But if, for instance, as we said, the royalties don’t come up as we are anticipating, we don’t have that $1 billion to buy more land. How do you solve that? Do you prorate that money? Do you take it from other sources? Do you put this mandatory spending above other mandatory spending, like Social Security?

CRS said those are good questions, and they don’t know because this bill is silent on all those questions.

It says the President is supposed to come up with $900 million of projects. What comes up with the billion? Who gets that extra $100 million? Does that go to the Department of the Interior? Is that a slush fund?

Once again, CRS said, Good questions, and no one knows because this bill is silent on those types of questions.

BLM has no idea of how much money they have spent on this program or where the land is. The State portion is actually—they are okay because they are a percentage. But this is talking about a dollar figure.

So you are going to hear a lot of platitudes, but somebody, at some time, has got to say how much money this is going to actually be funded.

To help us with that, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY), a longtime member of this legislature, who can address those things.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for the time, and perhaps we can continue that discussion in another venue because today I am rising in support of this act. Mr. Speaker, I was at the Library of Congress and I met the famous filmmaker, Ken Burns and he taught me something. He spoke to us about the creation of the National Park System last century and how it represented a singular defining moment for America; our sense of vastness, openness, and endless opportunity, and regenerated for us an understanding of an American ethos, this great ideal of conservation, caring for what we have and transferring it into the future.

Mr. Speaker, our National Park sites are majestic places, great sources of national pride, and a living heritage for all Americans. But here is the problem: We have a backlog of maintenance, but we fix it today.

Along with providing certainty for the future of the Land and Water Conservation Fund, this all is a great boost to communities eager for innovation and conservation ideals.

Ms. HAALAND. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. HAALAND), who is vice chair of the full Committee of Natural Resources and chair of the Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests, and Public Lands. Ms. HAALAND. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Great American Outdoors Act.

From the day I became the chairwoman of the National Parks, Forests, and Public Lands Subcommittee, I have heard from constituents, colleagues, and advocates about fixing the maintenance backlog and fully funding LWCF and making it permanent.

LWCF has helped provide recreational opportunities for underserved and low-income communities in nearly every Congressional district, and last year, we passed an historic permanent authorization.

In my district, LWCF has supported the Valle de la Luna National Wildlife Refuge, Petroglyph National Monument, Tingley Beach recreation area, the Elena Gallegos Open Space picnic area, and Martineztown Park.

The great American Outdoors Act will ensure LWCF’s full $900 million is used every year for conservation and environmental protection, to boost local outdoor economies, and to protect intact ecosystems essential for adapting to climate change.

The bill also establishes the National Park Service and Public Land Legacy Restoration Fund to provide five Federal land management agencies with up to $9.5 billion over 5 years to address the deferred maintenance backlog on our public lands.

These agencies will now be able to aggressively address deferred maintenance, improve visitor services, and support Tribal communities in places like Carlsbad Caverns, White Sands National Parks, Chaco Culture National Historical Park, and El Malpais National Monument.

Repairing the crumbling infrastructure on our public lands today is critical so that future generations can enjoy them. I am proud of the work we did to get this bill to this point, and I urge my colleagues to invest in our National Parks and public lands, and vote “yes” on the Great American Outdoors Act.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HURD). Mr. HURD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Teddy Roosevelt once remarked that: "We have fallen heir to the most glorious heritage a people have ever received, and each one must do his or her part if we wish to show that the nation is worthy of its good fortune."

Passage of the Great American Outdoors Act proves we are worthy of the good fortune and glorious heritage of our National Parks.

Future generations have been counting on us to ensure these treasures can be visited for another 100 years and, with the funding secured in this bill, we aren’t letting them down.

In 1893, Katharine Lee Bates was inspired hiking up Pikes Peak, and she penned the following lines:

"O beautiful for spacious skies For amber waves of grain God shed His grace on thee And crown thy good with brotherhood From sea to shining sea."

Passage of this bipartisan bill is a triumphant act that will benefit countless generations to come.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. NEGUSE), a member of the Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to speak today in support of the Great American Outdoors Act. I would like to thank my colleague from Arizona, the distinguished chairman, Chairman GRIJALVA, for his leadership; and also thank my colleague from South Carolina, Representative CUNNINGHAM, for introducing this bill.

The Great American Outdoors Act, as you have heard today, Mr. Speaker, would provide full and permanent funding for the Land and Water Conservation Fund, and address the significant maintenance backlog on our Nation’s public lands.

Since its inception, the LWCF program has established many of our Nation’s most coveted and incredible public lands. The program has invested in over 41,000 parks, including Rocky Mountain National Park, Arapaho and Roosevelt National Forests, Lory State
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Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. HURD).

Mr. HURD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, for many years, we have been working on issues related to national parks with the Great American Outdoors Act. This act is a significant step forward for the American people, and it will help ensure that our National Parks and other public lands are protected for future generations.

Passage of this act will provide much-needed funding to address the maintenance backlog in our National Parks and other public lands. This is a no-brainer for everyone who loves our public lands.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.
Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK).

I rise in strong support of the Great American Outdoors Act. This historic legislation makes good on our commitment to preserve our Nation's environmental heritage for future generations. This is an emotional moment for me. It provides full permanent funding for the Land and Water Conservation Fund, landmark conservation legislation that my late husband, John Dingell, wrote and helped establish in 1964.

The LWCF funding has protected Michigan and the Nation's critical natural resources, benefiting local economies, creating jobs, and providing opportunities for outdoor recreation throughout the country.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK).

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as the lead sponsor of the Great American Outdoors Act, and this is a very, very big day for this Chamber.

As my colleagues are aware, I have been pushing to both permanently reauthorize and permanently fund the Land and Water Conservation Fund literally since the day I entered this Chamber.

In addition to the LWCF, this legislation tackles the maintenance backlog that needs to be addressed on public lands and parks across our great Nation.

Mr. Speaker, this bill will have a positive impact on nearly every single Congressional District in this country, and the LWCF has already had a positive impact on many sites in my district alone, most notably, Nockamixon State Park.

Hundreds of businesses, recreation, and environmental groups have come together to endorse our legislation, including the Backcountry Hunters & Anglers, the League of Conservation Voters, the Audubon Society, the Natural Resources Defense Council, Ducks Unlimited, Clean Water Action, and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is historic; it is bipartisan; it is bicameral; it has over 250 cosponsors in the House. It overwhelmingly passed the Senate, and it will be signed into law by the President.

Mr. Speaker, for those of us who are strong advocates of our environment, this is a good day. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes."

Mr. GRJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. LEVIN), a valued member of the Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. LEVIN of California. Mr. Speaker, I am extremely fortunate to represent a coastal district with many beloved beaches, lagoons, and State parks. In California's 49th Congressional District, our public lands bring outdoor recreation and joy to our residents, and also to many tourists and visitors looking to catch some of our famous waves or hike our scenic trails.

This defining aspect of California culture continues to make communities in my district not only economically stronger, but also active, healthier, and happier, with locals and tourists alike finding the benefits and spaces that the great outdoors offer.

The LWCF is famously known as America's most successful conservation program. This historic bill is an agreement across all communities, benefiting local economies, and protecting our planet for future generations.

Thus far, California has received approximately $2.5 billion in LWCF funding over the years, which has helped to protect iconic places, such as San Onofre State Beach, Carlsbad State Beach, San Clemente State Beach, Torrey Pines Beach and Nature Reserve, and several flourishing lagoons, all in my district.

We are not just protecting those iconic places with this bill; we are also investing in our fight against the climate crisis. By conserving natural resources across the country, we are safeguarding critical landscapes, fragile ecosystems, and important wildlife habitats, which are all part of the ecosystem we depend on.

As we continue to invest in coastal conservation of wetlands, estuaries, dunes, and reefs, we are contributing to climate change adaptation planning and protecting our coastal communities from extreme weather events, sea level rise, and bluff erosion. These efforts to combat the climate crisis are imperative, with over 50-plus miles of coastline in my district.

I am proud to support the Great American Outdoors Act, and I hope this historic conservation legislation will soon become law, as it is certainly among the biggest bipartisan environmental accomplishments we have had in many years.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. McHENRY).

Mr. McHENRY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for his friendship and his encouragement. Maybe not encouragement on this specific bill, but I am proud to support this bill because it does help with the maintenance backlog in the National Parks, as well as assist with the long-term reauthorization of the Land and Water Conservation Trust, which is something I strongly support.

The permanent full funding in this legislation over 50 years ago, the Land and Water Conservation Trust has done very important things for my State and our Nation in preserving access to public lands and to the great outdoors.

Also, for the maintenance backlog, I am proud to represent a piece of the Blue Ridge Parkway, which runs through my district and was the second most visited National Park last year. I think this year would be the same.

In North Carolina alone, we have over 260,000 jobs that are directly attributable to the great outdoors; and those millions of visitors that come to the State through the Blue Ridge Parkway, they are vital for our economy in western North Carolina.

I rise in strong support of the Great American Outdoors Act. This historic legislation makes good on our commitment to preserve our Nation's environmental heritage for future generations.

This is an emotional moment for me. It provides full permanent funding for the Land and Water Conservation Fund, landmark conservation legislation that my late husband, John Dingell, wrote and helped establish in 1964.

The LWCF funding has protected Michigan and the Nation's critical natural resources, benefiting local economies, creating jobs, and providing opportunities for outdoor recreation throughout the country.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. McHENRY).

Mr. McHENRY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for his friendship and his encouragement. Maybe not encouragement on this specific bill, but I am proud to support this bill because it does help with the maintenance backlog in the National Parks, as well as assist with the long-term reauthorization of the Land and Water Conservation Trust, which is something I strongly support.

The permanent full funding in this legislation over 50 years ago, the Land and Water Conservation Trust has done very important things for my State and our Nation in preserving access to public lands and to the great outdoors.

Also, for the maintenance backlog, I am proud to represent a piece of the Blue Ridge Parkway, which runs through my district and was the second most visited National Park last year. I think this year would be the same.

In North Carolina alone, we have over 260,000 jobs that are directly attributable to the great outdoors; and those millions of visitors that come to the State through the Blue Ridge Parkway, they are vital for our economy in western North Carolina.

We are not just protecting those iconic places with this bill; we are also investing in our fight against the climate crisis. By conserving natural resources across the country, we are safeguarding critical landscapes, fragile ecosystems, and important wildlife habitats, which are all part of the ecosystem we depend on.

As we continue to invest in coastal conservation of wetlands, estuaries, dunes, and reefs, we are contributing to climate change adaptation planning and protecting our coastal communities from extreme weather events, sea level rise, and bluff erosion. These efforts to combat the climate crisis are imperative, with over 50-plus miles of coastline in my district.

I am proud to support the Great American Outdoors Act, and I hope this historic conservation legislation will soon become law, as it is certainly among the biggest bipartisan environmental accomplishments we have had in many years.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. McHENRY).

Mr. McHENRY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for his friendship and his encouragement. Maybe not encouragement on this specific bill, but I am proud to support this bill because it does help with the maintenance backlog in the National Parks, as well as assist with the long-term reauthorization of the Land and Water Conservation Trust, which is something I strongly support.

The permanent full funding in this legislation over 50 years ago, the Land and Water Conservation Trust has done very important things for my State and our Nation in preserving access to public lands and to the great outdoors.

Also, for the maintenance backlog, I am proud to represent a piece of the Blue Ridge Parkway, which runs through my district and was the second most visited National Park last year. I think this year would be the same.

In North Carolina alone, we have over 260,000 jobs that are directly attributable to the great outdoors; and those millions of visitors that come to the State through the Blue Ridge Parkway, they are vital for our economy in western North Carolina.

We are not just protecting those iconic places with this bill; we are also investing in our fight against the climate crisis. By conserving natural resources across the country, we are safeguarding critical landscapes, fragile ecosystems, and important wildlife habitats, which are all part of the ecosystem we depend on.

As we continue to invest in coastal conservation of wetlands, estuaries, dunes, and reefs, we are contributing to climate change adaptation planning and protecting our coastal communities from extreme weather events, sea level rise, and bluff erosion. These efforts to combat the climate crisis are imperative, with over 50-plus miles of coastline in my district.

I am proud to support the Great American Outdoors Act, and I hope this historic conservation legislation will soon become law, as it is certainly among the biggest bipartisan environmental accomplishments we have had in many years.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. McHENRY).

Mr. McHENRY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for his friendship and his encouragement. Maybe not encouragement on this specific bill, but I am proud to support this bill because it does help with the maintenance backlog in the National Parks, as well as assist with the long-term reauthorization of the Land and Water Conservation Trust, which is something I strongly support.

The permanent full funding in this legislation over 50 years ago, the Land and Water Conservation Trust has done very important things for my State and our Nation in preserving access to public lands and to the great outdoors.

Also, for the maintenance backlog, I am proud to represent a piece of the Blue Ridge Parkway, which runs through my district and was the second most visited National Park last year. I think this year would be the same.

In North Carolina alone, we have over 260,000 jobs that are directly attributable to the great outdoors; and those millions of visitors that come to the State through the Blue Ridge Parkway, they are vital for our economy in western North Carolina.

We are not just protecting those iconic places with this bill; we are also investing in our fight against the climate crisis. By conserving natural resources across the country, we are safeguarding critical landscapes, fragile ecosystems, and important wildlife habitats, which are all part of the ecosystem we depend on.

As we continue to invest in coastal conservation of wetlands, estuaries, dunes, and reefs, we are contributing to climate change adaptation planning and protecting our coastal communities from extreme weather events, sea level rise, and bluff erosion. These efforts to combat the climate crisis are imperative, with over 50-plus miles of coastline in my district.

I am proud to support the Great American Outdoors Act, and I hope this historic conservation legislation will soon become law, as it is certainly among the biggest bipartisan environmental accomplishments we have had in many years.
continue that Dingell conservation legacy—I don’t look like the greatest outdoors girl, but I know how important they are—which represents the boldest, most comprehensive conservation effort in decades.

Mr. ZELDIN of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN).

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for yielding. As an original cosponsor of this legislation, I would like to thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in both Chambers for helping lead the charge to get this important victory across the finish line.

I represent the First Congressional District of New York. It is a district almost completely surrounded by water on the east end of Long Island. In my district alone, the Land and Water Conservation Fund has provided funding for over 65 parks, and that is just one example of the impact this program has made all across our great Nation. This supports public access, fishing, hunting, recreation, and our environment.

After securing permanent authorization last year, it is an honor to continue my support. I am not sure about everyone else, but being cooped up over the course of these last few months has probably given just about all of us more appreciation for the great outdoors.

This is an effective program that will go a long way in keeping our magnificent outdoors great for generations to come.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, before I yield to the next speaker, let me echo the words of Mrs. DINGELL. John Dingell was indeed a warrior on behalf of the Land and Water Conservation Fund. Today is a culmination of those efforts that played such a huge role, and I would be remiss in not thanking him and DEBBIE DINGELL.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON), who is a leader in conservation and access to our public lands.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of this historic legislation that I was proud to coauthor. It has been more than 56 years since the Land and Water Conservation Fund was enacted to establish recreation and conservation opportunities. Now is the time to ensure that LWCF is fully and permanently funded.

This bill will create jobs and boost local economies that are currently facing significant financial hardships due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

It also provides urgent funding of $9.5 billion to fix broken park infrastructure and improve facilities. The bill supports parks in every State so hikers and anglers alike can visit and enjoy nature across our beautiful country.

This is desperately needed now for our communities’ emotional and physical well-being.

Mr. Speaker, we need to protect and preserve our lands, and this bill does that at no expense to our taxpayers. I urge my colleagues to vote for this important legislation.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from the State of Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE).

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Utah for letting me weigh in on this important subject.

Mr. Speaker, the hunters and anglers, farmers and ranchers, and hikers and recreationists of central Washington are passionate advocates for access to public lands.

I strongly stand behind my constituents in supporting the restoration of our national parks, our public lands, and the future. That is why I am proud to cosponsor the Restore Our Parks and Public Lands Act to address our country’s deferred maintenance backlog in those areas. If that bill were brought to the floor before us today, I would be a resounding “yes.”

I urge my colleagues to support the bill that we are debating here this afternoon. So while I agree with many provisions within the Great American Outdoors Act, I fear that the sweeping nature of this legislation will have unintended consequences for rural communities like mine in Washington’s Fourth District.

Mr. Speaker, just 2 weeks ago, I was honored to welcome Secretary of the Interior David Bernhardt to the north-central region of my district in central Washington. These were the two main takeaways from the conversations that we had with citizens in that region: one, a lack of trust with the Federal Government; and, two, the need for hope in the face of many challenges facing rural communities.

While I believe the intentions behind this legislation are grounded in the desire to improve our public lands, too many of my constituents think the approach within this bill is indicative of the same tired notion that we have all heard before: I am from the government, and I am here to help.

We have already determined the Federal Government’s culpability in creating a $20 billion maintenance backlog problem on our public lands. So the response is to permanently spend $900 million a year, most of which will be spent on what? Get this, Mr. Speaker: purchasing more Federal land.

The farmers, ranchers, and hard-working men and women of my district support local management and control of our lands. We have seen firsthand the delinquency of the Federal Government, and I think we should work to continue to support our national parks but vote no.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL).

Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL. Mr. Speaker, the Everglades, Dry Tortugas, and Biscayne National Parks are three of our south Floridian national parks that we cherish across our country. They are essential to preserving biodiversity, improving air quality, providing recreational opportunities, and sustaining our physical and mental well-being. They are also essential to our economy, bolstering local economies across the nation, supporting countless jobs, and breathing life into our small businesses.

Unfortunately, our national parks are in need of help. Hiking trails are in disrepair, roads are crumbling, visitor centers are falling apart, and our lands are in need of protection.

That is why passing today’s bill, the Great American Outdoors Act, is so crucial. It will permanently reauthorize the Land and Water Conservation Fund to address the maintenance backlog and ensure that these natural beauties will be there for our children and our grandchildren.

With the passage of this bill, Mr. Speaker, the ecosystems and economies in both Miami-Dade and Monroe Counties are going to take time and targeted effort. We cannot continue to spend as if our debts don’t exist.

This legislation needlessly increases the deficit. The Land and Water Conservation Fund, which is already in place, is well-funded and an additional $900 million a year in perpetuity. With immediate health needs and economic recovery our top priorities, increasing the Federal real estate holding shouldn’t be on anyone’s to-do list.

A recent report showed that 40 percent of LWCF funds went to projects that failed to advance any agency objectives. The oversight and accountability of the fund is laughable, but the latest report is just one in a long list of failures.

Unfortunately, our national parks are in need of help congressional leaders need to work to address the delinquency of the Federal Government; and, two, the need for hope in the face of many challenges facing rural communities.

While I believe the intentions behind this legislation are grounded in the desire to improve our public lands, too many of my constituents think the approach within this bill is indicative of the same tired notion that we have all heard before: I am from the government, and I am here to help.

We have already determined the Federal Government’s culpability in creating a $20 billion maintenance backlog problem on our public lands. So the response is to permanently spend $900 million a year, most of which will be spent on what? Get this, Mr. Speaker: purchasing more Federal land.

The farmers, ranchers, and hard-working men and women of my district support local management and control of our lands. We have seen firsthand the delinquency of the Federal Government, and I think we should work to continue to support our national parks but vote no.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. RICHMOND).

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Speaker, let me say that the goal of the bill is positive, but how it is achieved is just flat wrong.
To pay for this legislation, what we do is go straight to Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Texas and take $1.9 billion a year of potential revenue to those States to uplift their people to pay for this bill.

Let me be specific about Mississippi, Alabama, and Louisiana. They rank 48th, 49th, and 50th in terms of quality of life for their residents. They rank 1, 2, and 5 in terms of their African-American population.

So, what are we doing here, in this time of racial inequity? We are going to Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana and taking $1.9 billion a year without sharing any of that revenue with their States where they can improve education, where all three rank last; they can improve healthcare, where all three States rank last; and they can improve their environment, where all three States are in the bottom one-third.

So, all I am saying is, at some point, equity demands that those States get their fair share.

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Ms. SHERRILL).

Ms. SHERRILL. Mr. Speaker, New Jersey might be the Garden State, but it is also the most densely populated State in this country. So, New Jerseyans know the importance of clean air, clean drinking water, and protecting our natural resources. That is why I am proud to lead the Great American Outdoors Act with my colleagues.

Grant funding from the Land and Water Conservation Fund has helped protect sites in my district and helped expand conservation efforts from the Great Swamp National Wildlife Refuge to Morristown National Historical Park. The Great American Outdoors Act will allow the Land and Water Conservation Fund permanent, ensuring that future generations of Americans are able to access our natural wonders.

For too long, LWCF’s promise of protecting our Nation’s public lands has been broken as the funds have been diverted. The GAOA would, for the first time, mandate that such funds are used as intended to protect public lands and waters, support public access, and provide an economic boost to communities.

I am so glad Congress has stepped up to expand equitable access to the outdoors by investing in our parks and public lands at all levels.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker. I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES), who is an active member of our committee, is ranking member of another committee, and who can actually springboard on Mr. RICHARD’s comments about this particular bill.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the ranking member for yielding.

“Quick, there is a global pandemic. Let’s spend billions of dollars repairing fences, putting up new signs, and fixing toilets at our wildlife refuges, parks, and forests,” said no one ever. Ever.

I have been sitting here listening to this debate over the last several minutes, and I have to ask what planet people are on right now.

There is a global pandemic right now. What this legislation does is it takes everything else and puts it on the back burner. That is right. Unemployment assistance, the needed opportunities go behind this; improving our schools and getting our kids actually educated go behind this; medical care for our seniors goes behind this because this is mandatory spending.

Mr. Speaker, I have heard Members sit here and say that we have a $20 billion maintenance backlog. Do you know why that is? Because we failed to appropriate the money because we have determined it is not a priority in the appropriations process.

Why are we now stepping in and circumventing that whole process again, Mr. Speaker, in the middle of a pandemic to determine that this is the greatest priority?

Mr. Speaker, let me give you an analogy of what this bill really does. This is like someone going over to their neighbor’s house, taking their credit card, and going out there and using that credit card to get a new address sign in their front yard and maybe to get a new paint on their house. Meanwhile, that person who took the credit card has multiple cars and has an expansive real estate holding and never thought about their own financial situation but instead took the credit card of their neighbor who is maybe up to their neck in medical bills because their spouse is on their deathbed. That is what this bill does.

I have heard people say: “Well, oh, this is not taxpayers’ money.” Whose money is this? What dream world are you living in? This absolutely is funds that are taxpayer funds. “Oh, but it comes from energy revenue.”

Where do those go? They go into the general treasury. This isn’t excess money. This isn’t some money tree. This is the revenue this country relies on.

Mr. Speaker, let me tell you about one of the most offensive things about this bill that my friend CEDRIC RICHMOND, Congressman RICHMOND, talked about. And he tried to address this in committee by proposing a bipartisan amendment to make sure that Louisiana, MANUEL SEWELL, with Congressman BENNIE THOMPSON, with Congressman SCALISE, with myself, and others, a bipartisan amendment to fix this.

Virtually all of the money that this bill is spending comes from energy production out of Louisiana. This bill, as many have said, this goes on in perpetuity. In 5 years, we are spending $1 billion a year; in 10 years, $1 billion a year; in 50 years, $1 billion a year in 100 years, $1 billion a year.

Mr. Speaker, do you realize that today 28 percent of this country is owned by the Federal Government—28 percent?

The sensible thing to do is to look at those assets, determine which of, for example, the nearly 75,000 different National Park’s units and assets still make sense today. You just heard my friend talk about how 40 percent of these funds historically have been used for projects that don’t advance the mission of the very agency they are supposed to be advancing.

This is a tone-deaf piece of legislation. It is mandatory spending. It is putting this as a higher priority than everything else, including that we are in a global pandemic. We have record unemployment.

Whose idea was it to do this? This is absolutely crazy.

Mr. Speaker, I urge opposition to this legislation. I urge common sense, and I urge that we sit down and actually address some of the priorities.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the distinguished leader of this body.

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

Mr. Speaker, I came in at the end of my friend from Louisiana’s discussion. I have great respect for Mr. GRAVES and I have great respect for the gentleman spoke. I would perhaps share his opinion. We are waiting for some of those priorities to be attended to by the Senate, even if they defeat them.

We have talked about healthcare. We have talked about equal rights. We have talked about campaign finance reform. We have talked about energy. We have talked about so many subjects that are pending silently untended in the United States Senate. So the work you have been doing with this legislation pressing out other priorities I think is not accurate.

It is accurate that this is an important piece of legislation that will do much good. And I thank Chairman GRIJALVA on the Committee on Natural Resources for steering the legislation before us through his committee and working with the Senate to get it passed through that body.

Mr. Speaker, I also thank the ranking member for his concern about the maintenance and upkeep of our parks. He and I have spoken about that.

I would especially like to thank Representatives Cummings, SHERRILL—
Mr. Speaker, not only that, but the bill creates a new fund that will help address the maintenance backlog in protecting some of our most iconic national parks. The impact of these investments will be felt not only in tourism and improved public access to our public lands, but also in a cleaner and healthier environment over the long term.

In my home State of Maryland, we have used the fund to protect some of our most historic sites, protecting nature so that every American might have the same opportunity to enjoy the sanctity of nature or contact with our history.

I was personally proud to have worked to protect the watershed and the vewshed of George Washington's Mount Vernon through the creation of Piscataway Park on our side, Maryland's side, of the river.

We also used the fund to protect the Patuxent Research Refuge established to support wildlife research, Douglas Point in Nanjemoy, and countless sites throughout the Chesapeake Bay region.

In all, Maryland has received, over the years, almost $150 million from the Land and Water Conservation Fund to protect recreation areas and natural landscapes and historic places.

Mr. Speaker, this bill does not pass the Senate on a strong bipartisan vote, three-quarters of the United States Senate, and I believe we will demonstrate, hopefully, similar overwhelming support in the House later today.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to join in making this critical investment in America's public lands that will conserve them for the enjoyment of generations to come. I ask them to join me, as well, in helping to secure the legacy of our friend John Lewis.

Mr. RISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ to the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. FULCHER).

Mr. FULCHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this legislation. While I understand the merits of the bill and while some of my colleagues support it, I still have concerns.

I spent a lot of time in the rural counties of Idaho. Residents and local governments, understandably, have serious concerns regarding additional Federal land acquisition, especially at a time when Federal resources are stretched so thin.

The Federal Government doesn't have the resources to manage the land and are often prevented from allowing local involvement. Translation: More Federal land equals less land being intelligently managed and, often, more wildlife.

Currently, about two-thirds of Idaho's land mass is controlled by the Federal Government. That means less property tax, more D.C. bureaucracy, reliance on grant programs like Secure Rural Schools, Payments in Lieu of Taxes, and the ramifications of associated strings inevitably attached.

Mr. Speaker, to be a wise steward of the people's money, Congress should periodically reevaluate programs that it authorizes, as we finally permanently fund the Land and Water Conservation Fund at levels that were promised.

Over 55 years, the Land and Water Conservation Fund has provided over $7 billion in funding for over 40,000 recreational and conservation initiatives in every county in the country, creating and protecting America's iconic landscapes like the Grand Canyon and historical sites like the Martin Luther King, Jr. National Historical Park.

Some of California's most treasured natural areas are benefiting from the protection provided by the Land and Water Conservation Fund, including Joshua Tree, Lake Tahoe, and the Golden Gate National Recreation Area in the San Francisco Bay Area.

The Land and Water Conservation Fund also addresses the perennial injustice by creating green spaces near low-income communities and communities of color across the country, permanently. Funding the LWCF will ensure that we preserve our natural heritage in an equitable manner to ensure that all communities can benefit.

The Great American Outdoors Act— I love the title— takes the next step in our pro-conservation agenda, as it boldly protects our country's natural and cultural heritage for our children, our grandchildren, and generations to come. This legislation reflects the energy and expertise of our freshmen, and I particularly salute and thank Congressman JOE CUNNINGHAM of South Carolina. Congressman CUNNINGHAM is a former ocean engineer, now serving on the Committee on Natural Resources, who was the lead author on this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, in passing this legislation, Congress is ensuring that America lives up to its conservation promises, as we finally permanently fund the Land and Water Conservation Fund at levels that were promised.

Over 55 years, the Land and Water Conservation Fund has provided over $7 billion in funding for over 40,000 recreational and conservation initiatives in every county in the country, creating and protecting America's iconic landscapes like the Grand Canyon and historical sites like the Martin Luther King, Jr. National Historical Park.

Some of California's most treasured natural areas are benefiting from the protection provided by the Land and Water Conservation Fund, including Joshua Tree, Lake Tahoe, and the Golden Gate National Recreation Area in the San Francisco Bay Area.

The Land and Water Conservation Fund also addresses the perennial injustice by creating green spaces near low-income communities and communities of color across the country, permanently. Funding the LWCF will ensure that we preserve our natural heritage in an equitable manner to ensure that all communities can benefit.

The Great American Outdoors Act—I love the name, as I said— also makes an urgently needed investment in our national parks, which face a crippling $12 billion deferred maintenance backlog.

Our parks are our connection to the wonder of our natural and cultural heritage, and we must ensure that they can be enjoyed for generations to come.
The Great American Outdoors Act enjoys overwhelming bipartisan support both in the Congress and across the country. Nearly 900 national, State, and local groups representing small businesses, ranchers, sportsmen, veterans, outdoor recreationists, and conservation organizations have written in support of this legislation sharing these thoughts:

“The Great American Outdoors Act will ensure a future for nature to thrive, once passed and signed into law, this bill will secure these vital resources while preserving water quantity and quality, sustaining working landscapes and rural economies, increasing access for recreation for all Americans, protecting where they live, and fueling the juggernaut of our outdoor economy.”

Indeed, the Great American Outdoors Act supports good-paying jobs and grows the economy. Nationally, outdoor recreation supports more than 5 million jobs and adds nearly $780 billion to the economy.

House Democrats are proud to pass this bill and send it on to the President’s desk. We hope to do so in the strongest possible bipartisan way, as it passed the United States Senate. As we do, we will continue our work to protect our environment and natural heritage by including calling on the Senate to take up H.R. 9, the Moving Forward Act, which builds America’s infrastructure, while investing in a clean energy future, including by modernizing our energy infrastructure, boosting our commitment to renewables, building a clean transportation sector to consider.

Also we want to implement the Select Committee on Climate Crisis’ action plan, Solving the Climate Crisis, the most sweeping and detailed climate plan in decades, which sets out a vision of 30 by 30, conserving at least 30 percent of land and ocean in America by 2030 to confront the threats of the climate crisis, which the Great American Outdoors Act advances.

And with the Senate to take up H.R. 9, the Climate Action Now Act, our strong response to the American people who are demanding climate action by keeping us in the Paris Agreement.

That is not in this bill. We have a different bill here. We must invest in the future we want for our children. I just want to put this in a little perspective, Mr. Chairman and Mr. Ranking Member. And thank you for your leadership in so many ways, Mr. Bishop.

When our country was founded and when Thomas Jefferson became President, he tasked Secretary of the Treasury Gallatin to build the infrastructure of America, for an infrastructure plan that would follow the Lewis and Clark Expedition. It was Erie Canal, Cumberland Road, all kinds of things, and build into the Louisiana Purchase that would follow under-taking. Gallatin was the Secretary of the Treasury, and so many things happened at that time to build the infrastructure into the manifest destiny of America and as we moved west.

You wondering that up 100 years later, at the anniversary of that initiative, President Teddy Roosevelt did his own infrastructure initiative called the National Park Service. It was to build and respect and conserve the green infrastructure of America. It was quite remarkable. So much sprang from that initiative of Teddy Roosevelt, the great conservationist. And now, over 200 years later, this is a tip of the hat to all of that. But so much more needs to be done. It is a recognition of the importance of the great outdoors, to the quality of life, but also the juggernaut of our outdoor economy.

So, I hope we will have a strong bipartisan vote. I once again thank the distinguished chairman, Mr. GRIJALVA, for his leadership in all of this over the years and for this bill. And I, again, salute Mr. CUNNINGHAM of South Carolina for bringing his expertise as an ocean engineer to be the lead author of this important legislation, the Great American Outdoors Act.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, the Dingell Act, 2 years ago, was bipartisan. If this were bipartisan, we would not be here.

But to illustrate that, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR).

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, today is a very swampy day, and I am not talking about the weather. Today, Congress will pass a bill that is, frankly, a demonstration of everything that is wrong with Washington.

The Great American Outdoors Act is a product of special interests, written not by committees, but in back rooms, full of special interest provisions, and now being forced through this Chamber without the opportunity for us to amend it.

This is permanent legislation, yet we can’t take an extra hour in the House to consider amendments to make this legislation better? Why? Because the special interests that have paid nearly $100 million in lobbying can’t be denied another day from their victory. Well, I guess they got what they bought.

Are we not allowed to amend this bill because House leadership is afraid to offend the Senate? We can decide that the Senate isn’t perfect, their product isn’t wonderful, that the House can make amendments to make it better.

Let’s be clear. This bill is nearly nothing like the legislation introduced by the supporters in the House.

The gentleman from South Carolina may think he has got a great win, but the repeal of the 100th meridian provision, which is in this bill, allows the U.S. Forest Service to-steer millions of Federal spending away from his State. Once passed and signed into law, the Comptroller of the United States told us in December, left to their own devices, the U.S. Forest Service will spend 80 percent of their funding to the west of the meridian. And that was with Congressional oversight. Once passed under the C中标, this program will only get worse.

If your goal was to expand recreational opportunities to more Americans, then you have failed miserably if you vote for this bill.

But that is not the only problem with this legislation. I proposed a bipartisan amendment that would require the construction done under this act to adhere to Buy American provisions. I worked with my friend the Ranking Democrat to build a bipartisan amendment dealing with the infrastructure challenges facing our Native American reservations, including funding for Indian education and Indian health. In areas where COVID-19 was destructive, they need funds desperately to get back into the 21st century from their current dilapidated state.

Will Congress consider these amendments? No, because the special interests behind this legislation don’t want us to consider those needs on the floor of the House.

Considering this legislation sets the Federal Government on a massive land buying spree like never seen before, I prepared an amendment to protect our counties by ensuring full payment in the Payments in Lieu of Taxes program.

Do you remember that contract? Can we honor it? That won’t even be considered, as well as anything else.

This legislation isn’t a victory for America; it is a loss. Good process builds good policy builds good politics. It is a shame that we didn’t go there. I ask everybody to vote against this legislation to send back into the 21st century from their current dilapidated state.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BARRAGAN) and thank her for her work on environmental justice legislation.

Ms. BARRAGAN. Mr. Speaker, green spaces should be a right for everyone, regardless of where they live or the color of their skin.
Unfortunately, for too many Black, Brown, and Native American communities, parks are considered a privilege. Today, we can change this injustice.

The Great American Outdoors Act will create more local parks in low-income and urban neighborhoods. Minority communities across the country lack access to green spaces.

In my district, in Compton, we only have about half an acre of parkland for every thousand residents, well below the average in the rest of Los Angeles County and the Nation.

Voting “yes” means more outdoor recreation opportunities, including sports fields and trails. Voting “yes” means all kids, no matter their ZIP Code, have the right to play on green grass and explore the natural world.

I am proud to vote “yes” to secure this right for our young people today and for future generations.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. McCINTOCK), one of the ranking members on the committee, who has spent a lot of time on our committee and understands these issues.

Mr. McCINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I represent the Sierra Nevada of California, Yosemite Valley, Sequoia and Kings Canyon, and Lake Tahoe all are within my district.

The Yosemite Land Grant Act signed by President Lincoln in 1864 was the first time the Federal Government set aside land for “public use, resort, and recreation . . . for all time.”

Today, the Federal estate has grown to 640 million acres. That is 28 percent of the land area of our Nation. While the Federal Government owns just seven-tenths of 1 percent of New York State and 1.8 percent of Texas, it owns 46 percent of my home State of California and 93 percent of Alpine County in my district.

Now, we in the Sierra revere our public lands, and we are proud to share them with the world. But the Federal Government now holds far more land than it can take care of. The Federal lands now face a $20 billion backlog of deferred maintenance, which makes tourism less desirable.

Now, this is all land that is off the local tax rolls, denying our local governments vital revenues. Federal restrictions on productive use of these lands can also be detrimental to our local communities, no proceedings for long-term maintenance, and no reforms to protect our people from the scourg of wildfire produced by the continuing neglect of our Federal forests.

Mr. GRJIALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. PANETTA).

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

In my district on the central coast of California, we protect, we promote, and we never put a price on our environment. Partly because it is what drives our local economy, but also we appreciate what it means for those after us.

By fully funding the Land and Water Conservation Fund, this bill ensures the type of necessary care needed for our National Parks, forests, and critical wildlife areas. This is needed today, because those treasures have been put under extreme pressure with this pandemic, but also previously with increased visitors and decreased budgets.

That is why this legislation is so important, as it will not only address needed infrastructure projects and deferred maintenance, but also because it will promote conservation, recreation, and access to the outdoors.

By passing this bipartisan bill that ensures investments in our parks and forests, we are ensuring that our natural treasures, our postcards to the future, actually get delivered to future generations.

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

Mr. GRJIALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. MCCADAMS).

Mr. MCCADAMS. Madam Speaker, Utah is blessed with many treasured national areas, from parks and trails to red rock canyons. Conserving these places is more important than ever, and today, we take landmark action by passing full funding for the Land and Water Conservation Fund. This successful conservation program has given us, at no cost to the taxpayer, decades of vital funding for national and State parks, wildlife refuges, and recreational areas.

State and local officials rely on the money to improve local parks and trails, which see increased demand from unmanaged Forest Service lands. I have three fires going on in my district right now. A lot of this emanates from unmanaged Forest Service lands.

Now, I come from the West, so we are already ravaged by wildfire produced by unmanaged lands that are detrimental to the neighbors, to the private lands. I have three fires going on in my district right now. A lot of this emanates from unmanaged Forest Service lands.

Now, the part of the bill that Mr. BISHOP had authored is a good part, taking care of the backlog that we have in our parks and our lands, if you would listen to him, $20 billion worth of backlog that we haven’t found a way to pay for yet. Yet, instead of finishing our dinner, we are already going for the dessert by buying more lands that we can’t afford and we know we can’t manage.

I will be thinking about this, and my constituents will, as more and more forest lands burn each year and threaten communities. These forests are gatelocked off because they don’t have time to do the maintenance and the work that needs to be done so the public can have access to these lands because of the $20 billion backlog or the funding to take care of the juniper problem that we have in northeast California, the wild horse population that needs to be managed so they don’t die out there of starvation during the drought, the sage grouse habitat so they don’t become endangered, and our local counties, our rural counties, that are already struggling with the lack of PILT funding because the federal government has dictated that they have to come back here and beg every year for the payment in lieu of taxes to get this place to keep its commitments on that and
Mr. Speaker, I say “no” on this bill and get back to managing what we should manage.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close when the gentleman from Utah is done with his speakers.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

We have talked about several of the problems with this particular bill. With this particular bill, we have talked about how the poor reckoning of its sources there do not say what is going to happen if this money does not develop. I think Mr. Graves would be good to talk about where this money is coming and how it is being used at the same time. And we don’t necessarily know what will happen with the lowering of the royalties that we are experiencing this year from next year.

Another consideration I hope that people will understand, especially for all those who are speaking about it who come from the eastern coast. There was a conforming amendment put in the Senate in this particular bill, a conforming amendment. In the good old days, we used to bill them earmarks, but it is a conforming amendment.

The original bill said that on Forest Service land that would be bought, 15 percent of that had to come from west of the 100th meridian and 85 percent had to come from east of the 100th meridian. That was taken out, quietly and surely taken out. The end result of that means that there is a siphoning of billions of dollars that should be and could be going to Eastern States.

I mention that because one of the Democrat speakers did speak about the need for urban recreation opportunities. That was what was supposed to happen, and with this conforming amendment, that is what is taken out of the bill.

In the 1960s, as this bill was being discussed, Orville Freeman was the Secretary of Agriculture for Kennedy. He said at that time that the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission pointed out that the greatest need for recreation opportunities lies in the areas adjacent to the metropolitan centers in the Eastern States.

It would be our purpose under this bill to get 84 percent of what would be available under it for acquisition in the eastern national forest acquired under the Weeks Act.

In fact, that commission went on to say that outdoor opportunities are most urgently needed near metropolitan areas. Much of the West and virtually all of Alaska are of little use to most Americans looking for a place in the Sun for their families on a weekend when the demand is overwhelming.

At regional and State levels, most of the land is where people are not. One-sixth is in the sparsely populated Alaskan. Seventy-two percent of the remainder is in the West, where only 15 percent of the people live. The Northeast, where one-quarter of the people live, only 4 percent of the acreage is there.

But that language was not put in there by happenstance. There was a reason for it. In one iteration of this part time ago, there was the idea of putting a specific percentage that would go to urban recreation so there would be those urban recreation concepts, as was originally designed in the bill. That has been taken out.

What that will mean is that for you who live east of the 100th meridian, basically east of Denver, there will be $1.19 billion less dedicated to you than there would have been if this amendment had not been put in there. That works out to an average of $32 million per congressional district of those living east of Denver.

I am glad that all those who are for this, on this side, will have a good time to explain to their constituents why they are in favor of giving their area $32 million less in recreation opportunity simply because you are going to confirm a conforming amendment that was put in the Senate version of this bill that really hurts this process and is not necessarily positive.

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. Kilmer).

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman and all who worked on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, as someone who grew up on the Olympic Peninsula, I learned how important protecting our parks and our public lands is to driving tourism and growing jobs and supporting rural economies.

This is a big day. Permanently funding the Land and Water Conservation Fund, providing dedicated funding to make much-needed repairs at Olympic National Park and throughout our national parks system, is vital. Ensuring that these natural assets can continue to provide amazing visitor experiences and serve as economic drivers for rural communities that need these jobs and need these opportunities for future generations.

This is a day to also celebrate the extraordinary coalition of environmental groups, outdoor economy groups, and local civic leaders that got involved to move this bill forward today.

I am grateful for all who worked on this. I am proud to be a supporter of this bill, and I am encouraging all of my colleagues to vote “yes” today.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. Graves).

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I want to introduce another dose of reality, something you have not heard many folks talk about today.

Where is this money coming from? How are we paying for this initially—what is it?—$1.9 or $2.9 billion a year in mandatory spending?

This is coming from offshore energy revenues. That is where the majority of these moneys are coming from, from oil and gas production. I want to be clear: from oil and gas production.

Now, the majority at the same time and in the same breath is taking step after step to decimate or eliminate the domestic energy industry, therefore not making us get oil and gas from the United States but getting it from places like Russia, as we have seen over and over again when these drastic policies have been put forth.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the other thing is, any time you have energy revenues like this produced on Federal land under the Mineral Leasing Act, 50 percent of the money goes to those States that host that production, and they can use it for whatever they want. They can use it for whatever they want to use it for.

In this case, the Gulf States, Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, Texas, we get about 4 percent right now. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have a question. I have a question for my friends on the majority. Can they tell me what they are going to say to the residents of Texas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, and Florida next time we have a huge hurricane come through because you have refused, under the bipartisan amendment that the Congressional Black Caucus and others advocated, you have refused to allow for a larger percentage of money to be invested back in the resilience of this ecosystem, the resilience of these communities?

Tell me what you are going to say to them whenever we have another Hurricane Katrina, Rita, Gustav, Ike, Harvey, Irma, Maria, Michael, Florence. Tell me what you are going to say to them because you are taking their money, and you are spending it in other places, and you are saying this is for the environment, these environmental groups out there advocating for this, and you are spending environmental investment to make it in the Gulf.

Mr. Speaker, I urge opposition to the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the record statements from the U.S. Farm Bureau Association and the Cattlemen’s Association in opposition to this, from the American Energy Alliance in opposition to this, as well as the CRS report that analyzes from whence this money comes, whence it is going, and how much we probably won’t have in the future.


Hon. Mitch McConnell, Majority Leader, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

Hon. Chuck Schumer, Minority Leader, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

Dear Senators: We the undersigned western state Farm Bureau organizations write to express our concerns and areas of opposition to the S. 3422, the Great American Outdoors Act (GAOA). While we recognize the significant benefits that the GAOA would
provide in addressing the extensive maintenance backlog for federally-managed lands, we also write to express our collective concerns with funding further expansion of federal ownership in the West.

Farm Bureau members are significantly and directly impacted by federal land ownership, on all levels of production. Throughout the West, our members hold public lands grazing permits, own property adjacent to federal lands and engage in public and private land forestry. For many ranchers, access to public lands grazing is economically and ecologically essential to their operation and provides access to land that may otherwise be available to new or beginning farmers and ranchers.

Legislation or regulation that could be used to curtail viable multiple use access to these public resources is a threat to America’s farming and ranching families. Historical experience illustrates, in many cases, that expansion of public land ownership over time leads to new policies that further limit multiple uses of land such as livestock grazing or create additional restrictions on access and rangeland improvements. Further, additional federal land acquisition does not adequately consider the reduction in economic activity and the loss of jobs in resource-dependent communities. For these reasons, Farm Bureau believes that it is essential for agricultural stakeholders to be represented on any sort of planning and/or advisory board established for federal land expansion especially in those areas where private or state land is proposed for purchase or exchange.

American farmers and ranchers have always demonstrated their fortitude and resilience in adapting to the ever-changing landscape of land and resource ownership. While the resources made available through federally managed lands provide opportunities for ranchers to add value to their businesses, availability of credit is a critical component of the successful business and commerce. The federal government already owns over 640 million acres, which is approximately 28% of the 2.27 billion acres of land in the U.S.

Since enactment of the LWCF in 1965, Congress has appropriated $13.9 billion (not adjusted for inflation), of which $11.4 billion was recaptured. The federal government already owns more land than it can effectively manage and maintain. In the West, the federal government owns roughly every other acre of land and manages as much as 50% of all land and water resources. However, one concern we have is that the LWCF is no longer a dedicated funding source for forest managers.

The second title of the GAOA establishes the Land and Water Conservation Fund as a trust fund with permanent authorization and without annual appropriations oversight. The Congressional Budget Office (CBO) estimated the first year’s disbursement of this legislation could be upwards of $20 billion. In this midst of the current pandemic and related economic crisis, we are concerned with the additional financial burden this legislation would create.

We believe, at this time, that funds allocated to the Land and Water Conservation Act (LWCA) would be better utilized to manage existing federal lands and request Congress amend the GAOA to allow for LWCA funds to be allocated to assist state foresters for their use in fire suppression, fire management and conservation efforts instead of utilizing funds to acquire additional federal lands. We respectfully request you consider the following amendment requests:

1. Sunset in five years. This would allow Congress to evaluate the program and decide whether to reauthorize, modify, or eliminate it. A five-year sunset would conform the Land and Water Conservation Fund with the $45.5 billion maintenance title.
2. Limit land acquisition to states with less than 50% average of those western states with federal owned/administered lands.
3. Require that all federal and acquisitions be subject to approval of state legislature, Governor, and county commissioners.
4. Require notice of any potential land acquisition before title can be transferred to the state legislature, Governor, and county commissioners. Notice should include the annual loss of property tax revenues the bill will result; and if the land is already held by a tax-exempt owner, such as a land trust, the notice should include the tax revenues lost if the property were subject to property taxes.
5. Require that priority be given to the maintenance backlog, forgoing any acquisition requests in those instances when revenues are limited.

Additionally, our organizations would welcome the opportunity for conclusion of additional maintenance and enhancement projects that would benefit critical natural resources to the West. We ask that you consider including the provisions of S. 2044, the Water Supply Infrastructure Rehabilitation and Utilization Act. This amendment would create an aging infrastructure account within the federal Bureau of Reclamation (BOR) to provide loans to local water managers to perform extraordinary maintenance on the federal BOR infrastructure they manage. In fiscal years 2019 and 2020, $2.2 billion total would be provided to this account from the Reclamation Fund. No taxpayer funds would be used to fund the account. Loan recipients would be required to repay the loans received to repair and replace water facilities with interest. The repaid funds would be available to BOR to fund additional extraordinary maintenance projects, essentially creating a revolving fund.

The GAOA provides deferred maintenance for every federal asset agency within the Department of Interior except BOR. Yet, BOR is facing significant issues with deferred maintenance and water supply facilities. 80% of BOR’s facilities are more than 50 years old and are in need of major upgrades or replacement costs beyond regular maintenance budgets. Managers who do not own the infrastructure, they are unable to bond against it and therefore have limited access to other sources of capital for major repair projects. Creating this account within BOR would allow water managers to perform repairs, repay cost over time and ultimately ensure that our aging federal water infrastructure remains viable to serve the billions of dollars of agricultural and other economic activity that depends on it.

Our organizations look forward to further discussing the differences the GAOA, our recommendations and the opportunity for inclusion of additional maintenance projects. We thank you in advance for your consideration and look forward to continuing this important conversation.

Sincerely,

American Farm Bureau Federation, Alaska Farm Bureau Federation, Arizona Farm Bureau Federation, California Farm Bureau Federation, Colorado Farm Bureau Federation, Idaho Farm Bureau Federation, Montana Farm Bureau Federation, Nevada Farm Bureau Federation, New Mexico Farm Bureau Federation, Oregon Farm Bureau Federation, Washington Farm Bureau Federation, Wyoming Farm Bureau Federation.

The American Energy Alliance urges all members to vote NO on H.R. 1957 as amended by the Senate with the text of the Great American Outdoors Act. The federal government already owns far more land than it can adequately manage, which is part of the reason the large majority of the House members that this bill tries to address. However, the Land and Water Conservation Fund is simply a vehicle for buying up even more land for the federal government to mismanage.

By buying up land, the federal government hems in and impoverished local rural communities by removing taxable land and limiting opportunities for economic development through the LWCF that is later placed off limits to development further harms the local communities as well as harming the larger economy. While the LWCF itself is a questionable policy, at least the current structure of the fund allows for congressional input into the land acquisition process through appropriations. Making LWCF funding permanent removes this last Congressional check on federal land acquisition. Permanently funding the LWCF should be opposed.

The AEA urges all members to support free markets and affordable energy by voting NO on H.R. 1957 as amended by the Great American Outdoors Act. AEA will include this vote in its America Energy Scorecard.

From CRS Reports & Analysis

EFFECT OF COVID–19 ON FEDERAL LAND REVENUES, JULY 13, 2020 (R46448)

EFFECT OF COVID–19 ON ENERGY AND MINERAL OPERATIONS AND RECEIPTS

The COVID–19 pandemic and accompanying recession have significantly affected energy and mineral prices, production, and consumption. Many observers expect energy consumption will remain below 2019 levels through at least 2021. These expectations are based on several factors, including lower demand for liquid fuels for the transportation sector and reduced demand for coal and natural gas associated with the reduced demand for electricity and industry. The pandemic and accompanying recession have resulted in reduced demand for oil, gas, and coal, which has resulted in lower prices and lower production for these commodities in recent months, relative to 2019.

For May 2020, ONRR reported offshore oil and gas royalty collections of $100 million, a decline of 84% from royalty collections for the same period in May 2019. The royalty collections for May reflect production and sales in April. ONRR reports new monthly data on an ongoing basis.

The AEA supports federal and state energy and mineral policies that promote energy independence and security. The AEA urges all members to support free markets and affordable energy by voting NO on H.R. 1957 as amended by the Great American Outdoors Act. AEA will include this vote in its America Energy Scorecard.

[From CRS Reports & Analysis]
Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time I actually have left here.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Utah has 3 1/2 minutes remaining.

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

We have heard all sorts of platitudes about this bill today. Whether it passes or not is not relevant. It is not bipartisan, and it has all sorts of flaws. There are questions about the future source of funding.

We have heard speaker after speaker come up and say: We are not talking about taxpayers’ money. This is only royalties that are off there.

One of the problems we have to face is that all the royalties that come from offshore development and onshore development from energy and gas, those royalties are placed in the general fund. In fact, the second largest source of funds that go into the general fund is from these royalties, second only to the IRS taxes that go in there. If these revenues weren’t deposited in LWCF, they would be deposited in the general fund of the U.S. Treasury. If that is not taxpayer money, I don’t know what is.

We have talked about the need for, actually, urban recreation areas. We would like to do it, but unfortunately, this bill diminishes that opportunity and puts it in limbo, which is not good. I have heard speaker after speaker come up here with pretty pictures about our national parks, reservation lands, BLM land, resource lands, all these things that need to be helped. A lot of them talked about all the wonderful programs that are on State lands, that are parks, roads, picnic areas, and all those things which we are already doing.

What we, the Natural Resources Committee, as well as H.R. 1957, the Great American Outdoors Act, did was reauthorize the LWCF last Congress, that is when we put more money into those types of things everyone says is wonderful.

What we didn’t put more money into is buying Federal land, buying more land to put into the Federal estate. As everyone talks about how important it is actually to now start putting money into conservation, into maintenance of the backlog, what this bill does is put that at the very lowest rung on priorities of where this royalty money is spent.

You will spend it first on GOMESA. You will send it to the States. It will go to historic preservation. You will spend it on buying up more land before you ever come to anything that helps the parks and helps the public lands. That is because we have disproportionately done that the SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Arizona has 7/8 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. Speaker, you ever come to anything that helps federal lands, BLM land, resource lands, all these lands, all things that need to be helped. A lot of them talked about all the wonderful programs that are on State lands, that are parks, roads, picnic areas, and all those things which we are already doing.

What we, the Natural Resources Committee, did was reauthorize the LWCF last Congress, that is when we put more money into those types of things everyone says is wonderful.

What we didn’t put more money into is buying Federal land, buying more land to put into the Federal estate. As everyone talks about how important it is actually to now start putting money into conservation, into maintenance of the backlog, what this bill does is put that at the very lowest rung on priorities of where this royalty money is spent.

You will spend it first on GOMESA. You will send it to the States. It will go to historic preservation. You will spend it on buying up more land before you ever come to anything that helps the parks and helps the public lands. That is because we have disproportionately done that the

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Utah has 3 1/2 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. Speaker, you ever come to anything that helps federal lands, BLM land, resource lands, all these lands, all things that need to be helped. A lot of them talked about all the wonderful programs that are on State lands, that are parks, roads, picnic areas, and all those things which we are already doing.

What we, the Natural Resources Committee, did was reauthorize the LWCF last Congress, that is when we put more money into those types of things everyone says is wonderful.

What we didn’t put more money into is buying Federal land, buying more land to put into the Federal estate. As everyone talks about how important it is actually to now start putting money into conservation, into maintenance of the backlog, what this bill does is put that at the very lowest rung on priorities of where this royalty money is spent.

You will spend it first on GOMESA. You will send it to the States. It will go to historic preservation. You will spend it on buying up more land before you ever come to anything that helps the parks and helps the public lands. That is because we have disproportionately done that the
as the House Appropriations Committee, will work to improve funding outcomes for coastal states under the Land and Water Conservation Fund. Per-capita, coastal states receive approximately forty cents on the dollar compared to funding received by inland states. Rhode Island’s coastal economy generates more than $2 billion annually and supports more than 41,000 jobs, while New England as a whole supports nearly a quarter of a million jobs through its coastal economy. As a result of geography, coastal states face a number of challenges which many inland states do not face, such as beach erosion, migrating fish stocks which impact commercial fisheries, and vulnerability to tropical storms and other weather-related disasters. All of these challenges are further exacerbated by the effects of climate change.

Congress needs to be able to support critical programs like the Land and Water Conservation Fund and also ensure that coastal communities are able to receive necessary funds to preserve their coastlines, protect wildlife, and support workers who rely on jobs supported by ocean economies. I look forward to working with Chairwoman GRISALVA to discuss ways in which we may be able to achieve this going forward.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support the bipartisan Great American Outdoors Act, which among other things, would end the National Park Service’s (NPS) deferred maintenance backlog, a problem that disproportionately affects the National Capital Region and, especially, the District of Columbia. Twenty percent of the District consists of parkland, but most 98 percent of which is under the jurisdiction of NPS.

National parks are some of America’s greatest treasures, yet NPS, the agency that maintains our federal parks, has a $12 billion maintenance backlog. One-sixth of all projects in the backlog are in the National Capital Region, with $1.3 billion in D.C. itself. The National Mall and Memorial Parks have the highest number of deferred maintenance projects in the nation, with more than $840 million in needed repairs still outstanding, according to Pew Charitable Trusts. The most significant deferred maintenance projects involve refurbishing memorials and making necessary repairs for supporting infrastructure. Although these parks are located in D.C., they are of national significance. The National Mall and Memorial Parks accommodate more than 36 million visits each year and roughly 30,000 people use their 15 softball fields, eight volleyball courts, two rugby fields and the Washington Monument grounds for sporting events nearly year-round. This heavy use has caused a $13 million repair backlog for the Mall grounds.

In addition to the National Mall and Memorial Parks, NPS owns most of D.C.’s neighborhood parks, including 156 small green spaces and many circles, squares and fountains throughout D.C. Also included in the backlog are historic sites such as Ford’s Theatre, the FDR Memorial, East and West Potomac Parks, the Carter Barron Amphitheatre and the Belmont-Paul Women’s Equality National Monument. I support passage of the Great American Outdoors Act so that NPS can properly maintain all of our incredible national parks.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support Senate Amendment to H.R. 1957. The Great American Outdoors Act is landmark legislation that will clear the maintenance backlog at our National Parks, protect our country’s ecosystems, and permanently fund the Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF). The permanent funding of the LWCF has been one of my longstanding goals. As Chairman of the Natural Resources Committee, I introduced the Conservation and Reinvestment Act (CARA) with my dear friend, the late Chairman John Dingell by my side. Today marks the culmination of our work, and I am proud to have been accompanied by my son, Congressman DEBBIE DINGELL. My enthusiasm for permanent LWCF funding is as strong now as it was then. In recognition of this day, Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the following op-ed that I authored in the Fairbanks Daily News-Miner on July 4, 2000 in support of CARA.

[From the Fairbanks (Alaska) Daily News-Miner, July 4, 2000]

LEGISLATION BESTOWS LASTING ALASKA RETURNS

By Don Young

There’s been a lot of interesting speculation about my legislation called the Conservation and Reinvestment Act. Numerous stories and editorials have been written about what I do and why I led the effort to pass such a major conservation package.

Even Alaska’s own columnist Fred Pratt has devoted a significant amount of attention to CARA and my participation in this process. In his most recent column, he speculated that I wrote the bill to benefit Alaska Native corporations. This was a new and novel theory, but unfortunately, not accurate.

The truth is actually very simple—CARA is good for all Alaskans. In Alaska and throughout the nation, CARA will increase funding for federal and state conservation and recreation programs, urban parks, historic preservation, and wildlife conservation. The bill also resolves a major inequity regarding the distribution of funds generated from Outer Continental Shelf activities.

Currently, states receive 50 percent of the revenues for onshore oil production but nothing for revenues six miles and beyond a state’s coast. CARA corrects this problem by creating new programs that benefit coastal states with the OCS revenues, which have averaged between $4 to $5 billion annually. Under CARA, $2.8 billion of this funding will go toward important recreation, wildlife and conservation programs each year.

In addition, CARA creates new private property protections which go beyond existing law. Alaska will receive about $2.5 billion during the 15-year period included in CARA for these programs. Each year, Alaska would receive: $9 million per year for recreation programs; $38.5 million for state and federal land conservation under the Land and Water Conservation Fund; $17.5 million for wildlife conservation; $9 million for Native and Native land restoration; and about $1.5 million for historic preservation and endangered species programs.

In previous years, the LWCF has helped fund several popular Alaska projects including Alaskaland in Fairbanks, the Coastal Trail in Anchorage and Eagle Crest in Juneau. The increased funding for the state programs under the LWCF will allow for local communities to determine how these funds are spent in their own communities based upon their local priorities, rather than federal dictates.

Despite inaccurate claims by fringe groups like the American Land Rights Association, CARA also includes new private property protections that go beyond existing law. No federal land can be acquired under CARA without the specific approval of Congress. The federal government can only purchase land from willing sellers—condemnation is specifically allowed under CARA unless it is specifically approved by Congress. CARA also created new requirements to protect land owners who do not want to sell their land from new regulation.

Additionally, the administration must seek to use land exchanges and conservation easements as alternatives to acquisition. These protections were included to enhance private property rights in all 50 states.

Despite the noisy opposition by some fringe groups, CARA is supported by thousands of organizations and officials throughout the nation. Last month, CARA was overwhelmingly approved by the U.S. House by a 315 to 102 vote with a majority of both Republicans and Democrats voting for passage of the bill. CARA is supported by all 50 governors, the U.S. Conference of Mayors and the National Association of Counties. CARA has also been endorsed by more than 1,000 organizations including numerous conservation, hunting, fishing, and recreation groups like the National Rifle Association, and organizations like the National Marine Manufacturers Association, Commerce and the National Association of Realtors.

Alaskans know that over the past 27 years, I have lead the effort for the authorization of the trans-Alaska pipeline, oil development in Prudhoe Bay and the Coastal Plain, a strong mining industry, and numerous other economic programs in every region of the state. During this same period, I have also authored numerous important conservation bills including the reauthorization of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation Act and a comprehensive improvement of America’s national wildlife refuge system.

In addition, I have authored and supported dozens of bills to promote hunting, fishing and outdoor recreation in our state and the entire nation.

Fred Pratt is correct. CARA and its expanded conservation, wildlife and recreation programs is consistent with my 27-year congressional record of working for Alaskans.

Don Young has been Alaska’s sole representative in Congress since 1973.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 1053, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRISALVA).

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the ayes.

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

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

PERMISSION TO EXTEND DEBATE TIME ON H.R. 7573, REPLACING BUST OF ROGER BROOKE TANEY WITH BUST OF THURGOOD MARSHALL

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that debate...
under clause 1(c) of rule XV on a motion to suspend the rules relating to H.R. 7573 be extended to 1 hour.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

REPLACING BUST OF ROGER BROOKE TANEY WITH BUST OF THURGOOD MARSHALL

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 7573) to direct the Architect of the Capitol to replace the bust of Roger Brooke Taney in the Old Supreme Court Chamber of the United States Capitol with a bust of Thurgood Marshall to be obtained by the Joint Committee on the Library and to remove certain statues from areas of the United States Capitol which are accessible to the public, to remove all statues that would formerly have served the Confederate States of America from display in the United States Capitol, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 7573
Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-tives of the United States of America in Congress assem-bled,

SECTION 1. REPLACEMENT OF BUST OF ROGER BROOKE TANEY WITH BUST OF THURGOOD MARSHALL

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) While sitting in the United States Capit-ol, the Supreme Court issued the infamous Dred Scott v. Sandford decision on March 6, 1857. Written by Chief Justice Roger Brooke Taney, whose bust sits inside the entrance to the Old Supreme Court Chamber of the United States Capitol, this decision declared that African Americans, whether free or slave, were not citizens of the United States and could not sue in Federal courts.

(2) Chief Justice Roger Brooke Taney’s au-thorship of Dred Scott v. Sandford, the effects of which would only be overturned years later by the Thirteenth, Fourteenth, and Fifteenth Amendments to the Constitution of the United States, renders a bust of his likeness unsuitable for the honor of display to the many visitors to the United States Capitol.

(3) As Frederick Douglass said of this deci-sion in May 1857, “This infamous decision of the Supreme Court, which was rendered on the 6th of this month, all but destroys the Constitution of the United States, property; that slaves are property in the same sense that horses, sheep, and swine are property; that the old doctrine that slav-ery is a creature of local law is false; that the right of the slaveholder to his slave does not depend upon the local law, but is secured wherever the Constitution of the United States extends; that Congress has no right to prohibit slavery anywhere; that slavery may go in safety anywhere under the star-spaed banner; that colored persons of African descent can not be citizens of the United States; that colored persons of African descent have not rights that white men are bound to respect; that colored men of Afri-can descent are not and cannot be citizens of the United States; that colored persons of African descent are not and cannot be citizens of the United States of America from display in the United States Capitol does not relieve the Congress of the historical wrongs it committed to pro-\text{tect} the institution of slavery, it expresses Congress’s recognition of one of the most noxious wrongs to have ever occurred in the history of the United States, if the Supreme Court issued the Dred Scott v. Sandford decision.

(b) REPLACEMENT.—The Joint Committee on the Library shall remove the bust of Roger Brooke Taney in the Old Supreme Court Chamber of the United States Capitol.

(c) REPLACEMENT WITH BUST OF THURGOOD MARSHALL.

(1) OBTAINING BUST.—Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Joint Committee on the Library shall enter into an agreement to obtain a bust of Thurgood Marshall, under such terms and conditions as the Joint Committee considers appropriate consistent with applicable law.

(2) PLACEMENT.—The Joint Committee on the Library shall place the bust obtained under paragraph (1) in the location in the Old Supreme Court Chamber of the United States Capitol where the bust of Roger Brooke Taney was located prior to removal by the Architect of the Capitol under sub-section (b).

SEC. 2. REMOVAL OF CERTAIN STATUES AND BUST.

(a) REMOVAL.—Not later than 45 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Joint Committee on the Library shall remove the statue of Charles Brantley Aycock, the statue of John Caldwell Calhoun, the bust of James Paul Clarke, and the bust of John Cabell Breckinridge from any area of the United States Capitol which is accessible to the public.

(b) STORAGE OF STATUES.—The Architect of the Capitol shall keep any statue and bust removed under subsection (a) in storage until such time as the Architect determines the statue or bust is appropriate consistent with applicable law.

SEC. 3. REQUIREMENTS AND REMOVAL PROCEDURES FOR STATUES IN NATIONAL STATUARY HALL

(a) REQUIREMENTS.—Section 1814 of the Revised Statutes (2 U.S.C. 231) is amended by inserting “(other than persons who served as an officer or voluntarily with the Confederate States of America or of the military forces or government of a State while the State was in rebellion against the United States)” after “military services”.

(b) STATUTE BIBLICAL PROCEDURES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—

(A) IDENTIFICATION BY ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL.—The Architect of the Capitol shall identify all statues on display in the United States Capitol that do not meet the requirements of section 1814 of the Revised Statutes (2 U.S.C. 231), as amended by subsection (a), and

(B) REMOVAL BY JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE LIBRARY.—The Joint Committee on the Library shall remove any statue identified by the Architect of the Capitol under subparagraph (B) from the Capitol by not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) REMOVAL AND RETURN OF STATUES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (C), the Architect of the Capitol shall arrange for the return of any statue that is removed under this subsection to the Smithsonian Institution.

(B) STORAGE OR DISPLAY OF STATUES.—The Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution shall follow the policies and procedures of the Smithsonian Institution, as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act, for the storage and display of any statue transferred under subparagraph (A).

(C) STATE REQUESTS.—A statue provided for display by a State that is removed under this subsection shall be returned to the State, and the ownership of the statue transferred to the State, if the State agrees to pay any costs related to the transportation of the statue to the State.

(3) REPLACEMENT OF STATUES.—A State that has a statue removed under this subsection shall be able to replace such statue in accordance with the requirements and procedures of section 1814 of the Revised Statutes (2 U.S.C. 231) and section 335 of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2001 (2 U.S.C. 2132).

(4) AUTHORIZATION AND APPROPRIATIONS.—(A) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2021, out of any money in the Treasury not other-wise appropriated, $5,000,000 to carry out this section, including the costs related to the re-moval, transfer, security, storage, and display of the statues described in paragraph (1)(A), of which—

(i) $2,000,000 shall be made available to the Architect of the Capitol; and

(ii) $3,000,000 shall be made available to the Smithsonian Institution.

(B) RELIABILITY.—Amounts appropriated under subparagraph (A) shall remain avail-able until expended.

SEC. 4. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

In addition to the amounts appropriated under section (b)(4), there are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this Act, and any amounts so appropriated shall remain avail-able until expended.

SEC. 5. DETERMINATION OF BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purposes of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be deter-mined by reference to the latest statement submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the House Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may con-sume.

Mr. Speaker. I bring this legislation to the floor today on behalf of the Committee on House Administration. I thank our chair, Congressman ZOE LOFGREN, for her leadership. I thank Ranking Member RODNEY DAVIS for his friendship and leadership on our committee. I thank Mr. Davis, and as I said to him privately, I thank him for the spirit in which he has approached this important but delicate issue.
Recognizing the issue of removing Confederate statues from the Capitol has been simmering for years. Since I recognize that, I will now approach the issue today with the utmost respect for those who are opposed to the goal of the legislation. But I ask the dissenters to consider the country has been divided nation since its founding, and it is past time for us to close this chapter of American history by removing statues that depict an era that caused enormous pain to African-American citizens.

Mr. Speaker, as you, I grew up in the rural, segregated South. Commonplace were Confederate flags and monuments on public property, honoring Confederate soldiers and the Confederacy. Many Southern jurisdictions are now voluntarily removing these statues.

President Abraham Lincoln won the 1860 general election by winning 18 of 29 States. The 11 States that Lincoln failed to carry were slaveholding States. These States were fearful that Lincoln would find a way to end slavery and deprive slave owners of their so-called property.

Eleven Southern States, after Lincoln was elected, immediately seceded from the Union, forming the Confederate States of America. The CSA elected its leadership. They printed a currency and stood up a military.

At Fort Sumter on April 12, 1861, the Confederate States of America took military action against the United States of America. For the following 4 years, more than 600,000 Americans lost their lives on the battlefield, including, I might say, African-American soldiers who fought for the Union.

This was not a war between the States; it was a war against the United States of America by 11 Southern States.

When the Union finally won the war, and both sides buried their dead, 4 million slaves were granted their freedom by the signing of the Emancipation Proclamation and passage of the 13th Amendment.

In 1864, each State was granted the privilege to donate two statues of deceased persons to be displayed in the Capitol that depict the history of their State. These statues are now known as the National Statuary Hall Collection. Approximately 18 of these statues depict men who volunteered to fight against the United States in the Civil War.

All of these statues were donated many decades after the Civil War. Like many others around the country honoring members of the CSA, and particularly those erected in the South, these 10 statues were not donated and installed in the Capitol until the 1900s, during the height of Jim Crow.

Many Americans see these statues and the timing of their placement as a means to intimidate African Americans and to perpetuate the notion of white supremacy. We must not continue to honor these combatants by allowing their images to be on display in the Capitol.

The bill before us today also identifies several other statues for removal or replacement that are not part of the National Statuary Hall Collection, including Chief Justice Roger B. Taney, who authored the 1857 Supreme Court decision of Dred Scott v. Sandford, which ruled that slaves could not be considered citizens and that Congress did not have the ability to end slavery. The opinion, Mr. Speaker, is regarded as possibly the Supreme Court’s worst decision of all time, and the 7-2 decision was a major factor contributing to the war.

Another bust not part of the collection is of Vice President John Breckinridge, 1857 to 1861. In 1860, Mr. Speaker, Breckinridge ran for President on the Southern Democratic ticket and he lost.

During the Civil War, Breckinridge served in the United States Senate from Kentucky but became a traitor and enlisted in the Confederate military, and he was assigned to the army of Mississippi stationed in Jackson, Mississippi, achieving the rank of major general. He was expelled from the Senate. Jefferson Davis then appointed him as Secretary of War. After the war, he fled the country for several years.

So I ask my colleagues, I ask America: Does this bust deserve to stand outside of the Senate Chamber? I would hope that your answer to that question will be no.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to answer the summons of our time by voting to remove all of these offensive statues from the Capitol of the United States of America.

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

In my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his leadership in bringing us together today, along with our distinguished leader, Mr. HOYER; our distinguished whip, Mr. JIM CLYBURN; Congressional Black Caucus Chair KAREN BASS; Chairman BENNIE THOMPSON; Congresswoman BARBARA LEE; and Mr. BUTTERFIELD. I thank Mr. BUTTERFIELD for leading this critical effort, so important.

Mr. Speaker, as our country knows, nearly 2 months after the murder of George Floyd, America remains gripped by anguish as racial injustice continues to kill hundreds of Black Americans and tear apart the soul of our country.

Last month, inspired by the activism of the American people and led by the Congressional Black Caucus, the House passed the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act to fundamentally transform the culture of policing, to address systemic racism, curb police brutality, deliver accountability, and save lives.

On Juneteenth, I had the privilege as Speaker of the House, by my authority as Speaker of the House, to remove four paintings of Speakers of the House who were in the Speaker’s lobby, to remove them because they were part of the Confederacy, three of them before they came to the Congress and one who came after his participation in the Confederacy.

It was long overdue. When we were checking out the statues, we found out about the paintings, and on Juneteenth we said good-bye to those four. Now in Congress and in the country, we must maintain a drumbeat to ensure that this moment of anguish continues to be transformed into action.

That is why, today, the House is proud to pass legislation to remove from the U.S. Capitol the 12 statues of Confederate officials and four other statues honoring persons who similarly exemplify bigotry and hate.

Mr. Speaker, again I thank Leader WHIP HOYER, Whip CLYBURN, CBC Chair KAREN BASS, Chairman BENNIE THOMPSON, Congresswoman BARBARA LEE, and Chairman G.K. BUTTERFIELD for leading this effort.

As I have said before, the Halls of Congress are the very heart of our democracy. The statues in the Capitol should embody our highest ideals as Americans, expressing who we are and what we aspire to as a nation. Memorials to men who advocated barbarism and racism are a grotesque affront to those ideals. Their statues pay homage to hate, not heritage.

Among the Confederate statues in the Capitol—can you believe this?—are Jefferson Davis and Alexander Stephens, president and vice president, respectively, of the Confederacy, both of whom were charged with treason against America. Both were charged with treason against America, and they have statues in the Capitol.

Now, think of this about Stephens—I hate to even use his words, but it may be important for people to know why the statues have to go in clearer terms. The infamous words of Stephens make clear today as they did in 1861 the aims of the Confederacy.

In his so-called Cornerstone Speech, Stephens asserted that the “prevailing ideas” relied upon by the Framers included “the assumption of the equality of races. This was in error,” says Mr. Stephens.

Instead, he laid out in blunt and simple terms the awful truth of the Confederacy. He said: “Our new government is founded upon exactly the opposite idea.”

Imagine, exactly the opposite idea of equality of races.

“Its foundations are laid, its cornerstone rests, upon the great truth”—and then here are his words: “I hate to even use them, but we have to face this reality—‘the Negro is not equal to the White man; that slavery, subordination to the superior race, is his natural and normal condition.’”

He has got a statue in the Capitol of the United States.

How can we seek to end the scourge of racism in America when we allow...
the worst perpetrators of that racism to be lauded in the Halls of Congress?

This bill also removes the statue of John Calhoun, the unapologetic leader of the Senate’s pro-slavery faction, who, on the Senate floor, celebrated slavery as ‘good.’

Mr. Speaker, I know Mr. Clyburn supports removing this South Carolinian.

On the floor, John C. Calhoun made this vile assertion that “in few countries is so much left to the share of the laborer, and so little exacted from him, or more kind attention paid to him in sickness or infirmities of age.”

What could he have been talking about?

It removes from the old Supreme Court Chamber the bust of Justice Roger Taney. And this is because of the persistent leadership of Mr. Hoyer, who has been on this case for a long time.

Justice Taney was the author of the Dred Scott ruling, which Mr. Butterfield very clearly laid out as reflecting the highest ideals as Americans. The Dred Scott ruling, which Mr. Marshall, two Baltimoreans.

Mr. Speaker, 7 years ago, I stood on this floor and I referred to this Chamber, this great Hall, as America’s classroom. And it is in that spirit that I think of this building as America’s schoolhouse. And what is taught in this building, what is the message that the people who visit this building ought to be about the uplifting of this great Nation.

What people see when they come here, who people see lauded, glorified, and honored when they visit this building ought to be people who are uplifting to history and the human spirit.

It is in that light that I recall the writings of one great writer who wrote that if we fail to learn the lessons of history, I think one of the greatest writers, George Santiano—we are bound to repeat them.

There are a lot of lessons to be learned from history. I study it every day. Hardly a day goes by when I don’t spend some time looking at some facet of American history.

We did not come to this floor with this legislation to get rid of this history. A lot of it we don’t like; a lot of it we do like. And I think that what we need to do is discern between what should be honored and what should be relegated to the museums and to other places to commemorate that history. That is not eradicating history. That is putting history in its proper place.

And for those who did not do what I think they should have done, they have got a place in the history books, but it is not to be honored, and it is not to be glorified. It ought to be put in its proper perspective.

So I don’t have a problem with the fact that one of the statues in here, John C. Calhoun—he was a historical figure. He died in 1850, if my memory serves, 10 years before the war broke out. So we aren’t talking about John C. Calhoun as a Confederate. We are talking about John C. Calhoun as one of the Nation’s biggest proponents of slavery and the relegation of human beings.

I want to thank my home State of South Carolina, because the people of Charleston. Mayor Tecklenburg and this City Council. He was. Considered several weeks ago, the John C. Calhoun statue should be taken down, and they did it.
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disagreement but in unity of purpose, recognizing that our conscience and the conscience of America has also been pricked by the loss of John Lewis, who all his life fought for equality.

Mr. Speaker, the Capitol Building is a sacred space for our American democracy. It is where we write our laws, inaugurate our Presidents, and say a somber farewell to great Americans who earned our respect, like Dwight Eisenhower, other Presidents, and Rosa Parks.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot erase the difficult history and painful truth that this temple to liberty was built using the labor of enslaved people. But we can, Mr. Speaker, do more to uphold a system of white supremacy, wrote an opinion that twisted the very meaning of America’s founding.

After quoting the Declaration of Independence, “We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal,” Taney wrote this: “The general words above quoted would seem to embrace the whole human family, and if they were used in a similar instance at this day,” meaning 1857, “would be so seldom quoted.” He went on to say: “But it is too clear for dispute that the enslaved African race were not intended to be included and formed no part of the people who framed and adopted this declaration.” Of course, neither did women.

In short, Mr. Speaker, Taney argued that, in his day, in 1857, people of African descent had come to be seen as human beings, but because our Founders did not view them as such, Black people could never truly be citizens of our country. Think of that, the blindness and schizophrenia of 1787 repeated 80 years later in 1857.

One of the great facets of America is that we can grow. We change, and we can accommodate to better knowledge, better insight, and better inclinations. The past, Taney argued, bound those in the present to follow the errors of their forebears in perpetuity. Let us reject that premise out of hand lest the more perfect Union will never be attainable.

What he could not or would not accept is that the passage of time allows us to see our forebears as individuals, as States, and as a country so that we may see our faults and correct them, not repeat them.

In Maryland, we have grappled with that difficult history of our State with regard to slavery and the Civil War. While our State did not secede from the Union, many Marylanders sympathized with slavery in the South and fought for the Confederacy.

Mr. Speaker, I recall what was the largest voting area of the State of Maryland. We grew tobacco and some cotton, but mainly tobacco. Early Maryland was built on the profits of slavery, and it sent individuals like Taney to serve in America’s earliest institutions. Indeed, in his infamous decision, he drew on his home State’s ban of interracial marriage as justification for his views.

One of the ironies, Mr. Speaker, is that was the largest voting area of the State of Maryland. We grew tobacco and some cotton, but mainly tobacco. Early Maryland was built on the profits of slavery, and it sent individuals like Taney to serve in America’s earliest institutions. Indeed, in his infamous decision, he drew on his home State’s ban of interracial marriage as justification for his views.

One of the ironies, Mr. Speaker, is that was the largest voting area of the State of Maryland. We grew tobacco and some cotton, but mainly tobacco. Early Maryland was built on the profits of slavery, and it sent individuals like Taney to serve in America’s earliest institutions. Indeed, in his infamous decision, he drew on his home State’s ban of interracial marriage as justification for his views.

Our bill removes the bust of Chief Justice Taney from the Old Supreme Court Chamber and replaces it with a bust of Thurgood Marshall, a son of Baltimore. The irony is the Taney statue was unceremoniously pulled from the Capitol 10 years ago, 15 years, if you went through about 500 feet and walked out on the west front, you walked into Thurgood Marshall Memorial, as you would today. He was our first African-American Justice.

How appropriate it is that we honor him in place of Roger Brooke Taney. Thurgood Marshall is the face of our Nation in 2020, not Roger Brooke.

Second, our bill no longer allows States to display statues in the Capitol of individuals who voluntarily served the Confederacy against our Union during the Civil War.

Let me just say as an aside that none of us are perfect. Our Founders weren’t perfect, but what our Founders did was create a union. The statues we are removing tried to destroy a union.

Third, there are three specific statutes that constitute the collection of individuals who did not serve in the Confederacy but whose careers were built on the perpetuation of White supremacy and segregation. Our bill would require those statues to be removed and replaced as well, as my friend, Jim Clyburn, said, not destroy or tear down statues—to remove them, yes; to destroy them, no.

They do not reflect the diversity and inclusivity of our Nation today, nor do they comport with our values as a nation that has reached a greater understanding of the principles enshrined in the Declaration of Independence, that all are created equal, and humankind.
Taney admittedly in 1857, would have been the understanding of that phrase. There are still, sadly, a lot of people in our country in 2020 who do not understand that our diversity is our strength or recognize clearly that Black lives matter.

Taney forcefully argued they did not. He was willfully wrong. They do, and they must. I believe that most Americans are deeply distressed by racial injustice and want to see the progress of the civil rights movement continue. They want our nation and our democracy to grow, mature, and become more perfect. Part of that process is making it clear through our symbols and public displays of honor what our country stands for and, as importantly, what it must never stand for again.

So, Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join us not as an expression of partisan opinion but an expression of America’s values and our commitment to the history of this Nation. Let us not tear down, not destroy statues, but support the resolution and support the removal of statues.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), a passionate advocate for underserved communities.

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, let me first thank the gentleman for yielding and for his tremendous leadership and for always reminding us of the accurate accounting of the United States’ history. Also, I thank our Speaker; our majority leader; our whip, Mr. CLYBURN; Chairwoman BASS; Chairwoman BRINIE Thompson; and of course, Congressman BUTTERFIELD for moving this legislation forward with the urgency that it requires.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 7573, which would remove shared reminders of slavery and segregation from the United States Capitol.

Now, in 2017, in the wake of the white nationalist rally in Charlottesville, I introduced the Confederate Monument Removal Act to remove all statues of people who voluntarily served the Confederacy from the Capitol building. So, thank you for including this in this current bill.

Venerating those who took up arms against the United States to preserve slavery is an affront to the human dignity of all Americans. These painful symbols of bigotry and racism have no place in public places—certainly should not be enshrined in the United States Capitol.

It is past time for Congress to stop glorifying the men who were traitors and committed treason against the United States in a concerted effort to keep African Americans in chains.

The movement to honor Confederate soldiers was a deliberate act to rewrite the very history of the United States and humanize acts designed to dehumanize African Americans. They are symbols of hatred and defiance of Federal authority and should not be held in a place of honor in the United States Capitol.

It is past time for Congress to stop glorifying the men who were traitors and committed treason against the United States in a concerted effort to keep African Americans in chains.

The movement to honor Confederate soldiers was a deliberate act to rewrite the very history of the United States and humanize acts designed to dehumanize African Americans. They are symbols of hatred and defiance of Federal authority and should not be held in a place of honor in the United States Capitol.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois has 21 minutes remaining.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN), a member of the House Committee on Administration and a great constitutional scholar and friend.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. BUTTERFIELD for his really exemplary leadership here.

Mr. Speaker, it is a proud day for Marylanders as we prepare to replace the bust of Roger Brooke Taney with the bust of Thurgood Marshall.

One Marylander wrote the infamous Dred Scott decision, hundreds of pages of argumentation about how he has the Constitution is, and should forever be a White man’s compact and that African Americans have no rights that White people have to respect.

The other, Thurgood Marshall, whose bust will replace that of Justice Taney, argued Brown v. Board of Education, argued Shelley v. Kraemer, argued Smith v. Albright, became the first African-American Associate Justice of the Supreme Court. He made equal protection come alive in our country. So it is a proud day for Marylanders.

I was delighted to hear the gentleman from Illinois’ remarks, but I was amazed to hear another colleague in the minority defending the bust of John C. Breckinridge on the grounds that we don’t honor him for his service as secretary of war in the Confederacy but we, rather, honor him for what he did before that in his prior service as United States Senator and Vice President of the United States.

That is just precious. Think about that for a second.

Breckinridge was serving as a U.S. Senator from Kentucky when he defected to the Confederacy, signed up to become their secretary of war, and betrayed the Union. And they still have his bust outside of this United States Senate saying ‘‘Vice President’’ on it, despite the fact that, on December 4, 1861, he was convicted of treason by the Senate and stripped of all of his titles—including Senator; President of the Senate; and Vice President—just because.

So we may as well put up a statue of Benedict Arnold to honor him for his service to the Continental Army before
Alexander Hamilton Stephens—It is interesting that he secured the name of Alexander Hamilton—has a statue in Statuary Hall. It says—

I am not fearful of anything on Earth. I am not fearful of anything above, except to do something wrong.

That is what Alexander Hamilton Stephens said.

Well, this is wrong. It was wrong to enslave so many human beings and for that slavery to last over 200 years.

I am delighted with the gentleman from Illinois for his congenial and historic moment today, and we do it in unity. I offer peace to this Nation and to this body that we remove these by bringing America together.

I know the family of George Floyd, who struck a chord in the hearts of all Americans and Black Lives Matter, who welcomed this magnificent decision today. Let us do it together, under this flag. In God we trust.

Mr. ROdney Davis of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. Butterfield. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 1/2 minutes time to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. Mfume), my friend, who is not only the representative of a district in Maryland, but also the former national president of the NAACP.

Mr. Mfume. Mr. Speaker, 33 years ago, I stood near this spot and watched Thurgood Marshall come through these doors as a member of the Supreme Court at a State of the Union address. And as a Marylander and as a Baltimorian, I had a great sense of pride. I got to know Mr. Marshall. All he ever said by his eloquence and his example was this is how we ought to be as Supreme Court justices.

I must tell you, I was dismayed, though, years earlier, to learn as a young student at Morgan State University the history of Roger B. Taney, who did just the opposite to my spirit and just the opposite, I think, to what we believe Supreme Court Justices should advocate and how they conduct themselves.

A gentleman from the other side earlier said that Mr. Taney rendered the worst Supreme Court decision ever. And he is exactly right. That decision said that Black people had no rights, and therefore that the Negro might be reduced to slavery for his own benefit. It also said that Black people were nothing more than animals.

Well, this is wrong. It was wrong to enslave so many human beings and for that slavery to last over 200 years.

I am delighted with the gentleman from Illinois for his congenial and historic moment today, and we do it in unity. I offer peace to this Nation and to this body that we remove these by bringing America together.

I know the family of George Floyd, who struck a chord in the hearts of all Americans and Black Lives Matter, who welcomed this magnificent decision today. Let us do it together, under this flag. In God we trust.

Mr. ROdney Davis of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. Butterfield. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 1/2 minutes time to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. Mfume), my friend, who is not only the representative of a district in Maryland, but also the former national president of the NAACP.

Mr. Mfume. Mr. Speaker, 33 years ago, I stood near this spot and watched Thurgood Marshall come through these doors as a member of the Supreme Court at a State of the Union address. And as a Marylander and as a Baltimorian, I had a great sense of pride. I got to know Mr. Marshall. All he ever said by his eloquence and his example was this is how we ought to be as Supreme Court justices.

I must tell you, I was dismayed, though, years earlier, to learn as a young student at Morgan State University the history of Roger B. Taney, who did just the opposite to my spirit and just the opposite, I think, to what we believe Supreme Court Justices should advocate and how they conduct themselves.

A gentleman from the other side earlier said that Mr. Taney rendered the worst Supreme Court decision ever. And he is exactly right. That decision said that Black people had no rights, and therefore that the Negro might justly and lawfully be reduced to slavery for his own benefit. It also said that Black people born in America, like Dred Scott, were not citizens and that the Missouri Compromise of 1820. So replacing the statue of Taney with one instead of Thurgood Marshall...
seems to me the way we ought to go as a Chamber. I hope in a bipartisan fashion, not only for ourselves, but to say to all the visitors that come through this building that we will continue to hold high real American heroes that sought to keep us together, and we will not honor those who sought to divide us.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time, and I will close.

Mr. Speaker, it is great to follow our new colleague, Mr. MUFUNE.

Because of COVID and the restrictions we have in getting together and getting to know each other like we did before this pandemic, I have not had a chance to meet you yet. Welcome to this institution. Thank you for your service here. Thank you for your service leading the NAACP.

I did not know Mr. MUFUNE is aware, but many say that the birthplace of the NAACP is also in Springfield, Illinois, because of the 1908 race riots that took place in my district.

We are trying to honor those who suffered during instance in our Nation's history, still centuries after we saw the scourge of slavery come to our shores.

We still have a lot of work to do. But I welcome Mr. MUFUNE. Come to my district and see the artifacts from those race riots that have been dug up and displayed for all to see, to be honored. That is what education and history is.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he deems appropriate. Mr. MUFUNE, are you ready to yield?

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield.

Mr. MUFUNE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's kind and overly gracious remarks. I appreciate also his sense of history and for what I think today is being displayed as a bipartisan effort to focus, get attention to and to reconcile a very real problem.

So I will be more than happy to do that. And Lincoln was one of my heroes in many respects, not just because he signed, as Mr. BUTTERFIELD said, an executive order in 1863, but that he reminded us of what we were supposed to be as a Nation. Was he flawed? Yes. Are we flawed? Yes. Do we increase our ability to grow together? The absolute answer is yes. So I do appreciate the gentleman's comments, and I appreciate him yielding.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I will reclaim my time.

That is exactly why we still, as a Nation, have so much to learn about each other. We have so much to learn as to why we live together. We are blessed to live in what I consider the greatest country on God's green Earth.

The opportunity for every American to do what we do, to serve in this great institution, is something that should be cherished.

Those issues that seemingly divide us more in a Nation of prosperity, we need to educate the youth, we need to educate America, and how we can come together, not just correcting some of the awful, evil parts of our Nation's history, but let's continue to correct the division that exists today, not just on this floor, but in this country.

And if we can stand together in this instance we stand together and make this country, at a time and place of civil unrest, a better place for every single American in this country.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I thank again all of my colleagues. I respect their opinions, their ideas. But today is a day of history. Today is a day that we are going to band together in a bipartisan way.

And I commend my good friend and look forward to hosting him in Springfield, Illinois.

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

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time. I thank all of the speakers for their eloquent words.

Mr. DAVIS, we have talked a lot about President Abraham Lincoln. There is one thing I failed to mention, and the other speakers failed to mention as well. And that was, before the ratification of the 13th Amendment. Lincoln was actually assassinated on April 14, as I recall, of 1865, and did not live to see the full ratification of the 13th Amendment, which was the culmination of a lot of his work. So I just wanted to put that into the RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased with the tone of this debate. I don't even want to call it a debate. I would call it a discussion for the last few minutes. I feel the bipartisanism in the air, and I thank Mr. Davis so very much. It is appreciated.

History teaches us that there are times in our history where eras must be closed, and we must begin a new era in this great Nation.

We need to continue to strive for a more perfect union, and today is a good example of that.

I ask my colleagues to vote "yea" on this legislation. I ask for an unanimous vote. Hopefully, we can do this by voice vote. That is my prayer and that is my hope that we will show the world that we are united on this issue.

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

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 7573, as amended.

H.R. 7573 directs the Joint Committee on the Library to remove the bust of Chief Justice Roger B. Taney, the author of the Dred Scott decision in the Old Supreme Court Chamber with a bust of Justice Thurgood Marshall, and requires the Joint Committee on the Library to remove statues of Charles B. Aycock, James P. Clarke, and John C. Calhoun, as well as a bust of John C. Breckinridge. H.R. 7573 would also amend section 1814 of the Revised Statutes (2 U.S.C. 2131) to change the criteria for those eligible for inclusion to prohibit those who enabled and protected the practice of holding human beings as property deserve no place of honor in the halls of our nation's Capitol. Slavery is the "original sin" of our country, and its disastrous effects are felt to this day.

It is long past time to remove these symbols of bigotry and cruelty from the halls of Congress, and it is long past time to repair the lasting damage their hatred and racism has visited on the fabric of this country. The removal of these symbols from the People's House is a necessary step in this long-overdue work. I urge my colleagues in supporting H.R. 7573 and in working to right the wrongs of the past to better perfect the promises of our country.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 7573, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.
The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on concurrence in the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 2486) to reauthorize mandatory funding programs for historically Black colleges and universities and other minority-serving institutions, with the amendment specified in section 4(a) of House Resolution 891, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on concurrence in the Senate amendment to the bill.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Speaker, I was unable to vote on July 22, 2020, due to delayed arrival to the floor. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows: “no” on rollcall No. 153.
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So the second portion of the divided question was adopted.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 865, 116TH CONGRESS

TAXPAYER FIRST ACT OF 2019

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the motion to concur in the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 1857) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modernize and improve the Internal Revenue Service, and for other purposes, offered by the Senate from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA), on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk redesignated the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion to concur.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 310, nays 107, not voting 13, as follows: [Roll No. 155]
REPLACING BUST OF ROGER BROOKE TANEY WITH BUST OF THURGOOD MARSHALL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi), Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 7579) to direct the Architect of the Capitol to replace the bust of Roger Brooke Taney in the Old Supreme Court Chamber of the United States Capitol with a bust of Thurgood Marshall.

REPLACING BUST OF ROGER BROOKE TANEY WITH BUST OF THURGOOD MARSHALL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi), Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 7579) to direct the Architect of the Capitol to replace the bust of Roger Brooke Taney in the Old Supreme Court Chamber of the United States Capitol with a bust of Thurgood Marshall.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to direct the Joint Committee on the Library to replace the bust of Roger Brooke Taney in the Old Supreme Court Chamber of the United States Capitol with a bust of
Thurgood Marshall to be obtained by the Joint Committee on the Library and to remove certain statues from areas of the United States Capitol which are accessible to the public, to remove all statues of individuals who voluntarily supported the Confederate States of America from display in the United States Capitol, and for other purposes.”

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.
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GOD BLESSED AMERICA WITH JOHN LEWIS

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

Mr. SWALWELL. Mr. Speaker, God blessed America and this Chamber when we were sent John Lewis. We will miss his character, his conviction, and his kindness; and this place feels a lot emptier without him.

There is so much that will be said about our colleague, but I will never forget, just right before us in this well, after the country had gone through mass shooting after mass shooting after mass shooting, and we were so troubled about what to do next, our colleague told us, if we were willing to cause a little bit of good, necessary trouble, we could make a difference.

We will miss John. He brought his experience from movements to a moment where his country needed him. His work continues and, because of that, the next generation will march on.

God bless our colleague.

RECOGNIZING CAPTAIN CANDICE BOWEN

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

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Captain Candice Bowen who, this week, became the first woman to lead a Virginia National Guard infantry company. On Saturday, she took command of the Woodstock-based Bravo Company, 3rd Battalion, 116th Infantry Regiment, 116th Infantry Brigade Combat Team.

After being deployed to Qatar in 2016, Captain Bowen then volunteered for an assignment in Afghanistan, where she earned a Combat Action Badge. Her superiors say that she has “demonstrated the absolute ability to lead soldiers in close combat.”

Captain Bowen had already earned the distinction of becoming the Virginia National Guard’s first female infantry officer in 2019, and when she spoke after accepting her command, Bowen encouraged other women to follow in her footsteps and join an infantry unit. In short, she said to jump in there, do it aggressively, and give it everything you’ve got.

I wish Captain Bowen the best of luck in this new endeavor and know that those under her command in Bravo Company are in good hands.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF JOHN LEWIS

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

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, great women and great men have served in this Chamber and on the House floor.

One of the greatest was our friend and colleague, John Lewis.

A civil rights icon, responsible at a young age for lasting progress and remarkable courage in the face of violence and injustice. He was the conscience of our Congress. The room quieted and people listened when he spoke. It was a true honor to serve with him in the House and, for me, on the Ways and Means Committee.

It was surreal to walk with him over the Pettus Bridge in Selma on the 50th anniversary of Bloody Sunday. And constituents thank me to this day for inviting him to my district.

Our great country is better because of John Lewis, and we should all work to be just a little more like John Lewis.

John, we miss you. Rest in peace, my friend.

REMEMBERING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF CHARLES EVERS

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

Mr. GUEST. Mr. Speaker, this evening, I rise to honor the life of Charles Evers, who passed away earlier today.

Charles and his brother, Medgar, dedicated their time on this Earth to the advancement of civil rights for all Americans. Following the tragic murder of his brother, Charles assumed Medgar’s position as head of the NAACP in Mississippi, to continue his efforts to expand civil rights for African Americans in the Magnolia State.

In 1969, he became the first African American mayor elected in Mississippi. He served as an adviser and mentor to many public officials, to local governments, to the President of the United States.

Today, I join our Mississippi family in thankful prayer for his time on Earth and that he returned to our Heavenly Father having accomplished his goal of creating a better nation for all people.

Please join me in a moment of silence as we remember his service to our State and our Nation.

MEMORIALIZING THE HONORABLE JOHN LEWIS

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of our friend and colleague, John Lewis.

John will be remembered as one of the pioneers of the civil rights movement, and his example of courage will be talked about for generations to come.

John Lewis was loved on both sides of the aisle. Even when we disagreed, John never failed to be kind and professional.

John loved this country and never stopped his pursuit of a perfect union for all Americans. Even in the last few weeks of his battle with cancer, John was still partaking in violent activism and advocating for equal justice.

When I was a freshman here in Congress, I was touring the Smithsonian with my sons and daughter. One of my sons asked who the bleeding man in the picture was. I told him it was a photo of John Lewis during the civil rights movement and that I now have the privilege of serving with him in Congress. I am lucky to have been able to call John Lewis a colleague and a friend.

His passing is a loss for American democracy and advocacy. My wife, Shannon, and I send our deepest condolences to John’s family, friends, and staff. He will truly be missed. The House will miss John Lewis greatly.

FUNDING NEVADA’S PRECIOUS PUBLIC LANDS

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

Mrs. LEE of Nevada. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of Nevada’s Third District, I rise today in support of the Great American Outdoors Act. This bill, which I co-sponsored, will finally secure full, dedicated funding for the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

This fund helps to conserve some of southern Nevada’s most precious public lands, like Red Rock Canyon, Sloan Canyon, and Lake Mead.

Coming together on such a vital issue is a reminder that Congress has the
ability to rise above partisanship and find solutions that benefit us all. There is no issue more universal to all Americans and all people than protecting our planet. We can’t keep kicking this can down the road. This is the time to fully fund the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

In closing, my time was short with Congressman John Lewis, but I will forever be impacted and am eternally grateful for his leadership.

OPENING OUR SCHOOLS
(Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, as August approaches, reopening schools is now at the forefront of the American agenda.

The American Academy of Pediatrics strongly advocates that we should start the process of having students back physically in the classroom. As an experienced physician of more than 30 years, I concur with the AAP, and I believe that the science and the data point toward reopening our schools in America.

This is why I introduced the Open Schools Responsibility Act yesterday, which provides liability protection to schools that adhere to CDC and State guidelines. As we want to open schools again, then educational administrators need to have a go-ahead confidence that they will not face the brunt of frivolous lawsuits.

Obviously, schools that reopen without taking the proper precautions should be held accountable, and this legislation will still ensure that is the case. We want to protect everyone, from exceedingly low-risk students up to our higher-risk older teachers.

We simply cannot allow our children, especially our higher-at-risk children, to fall further behind in their education. So, it is Congress’ duty to pass liability protection to let our kids get back to school and get back on track.

KEEPING KLAMATH RIVER RENEWABLE ENERGY
(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission for the decision the other day to not accept the proposal by an entity called the Klamath River Renewal Corporation, which seeks to remove four very important hydroelectric dams on the Klamath River in northern California and southern Oregon.

These dams produce enough renewable hydroelectric power to power 70,000 homes. The problem with renewing them, thinking it is going to help the fish, is that it would unleash at least 20 million cubic yards of silt with who knows what all is in it. This is the time to fully fund the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

In closing, my time was short with Congressman John Lewis, but I will forever be impacted and am eternally grateful for his leadership.

REMEMBERING THE LIFE OF CONGRESSMAN JOHN LEWIS
(Mr. NEWHOUSE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise with a heavy heart to honor the life of the distinguished Congressman from Georgia’s Fifth District, John Lewis.

Few members of this body have had such a profound impact on the fabric of our Nation as John Lewis. He was a man of honor, a freedom fighter, and one of the truly great leaders of the civil rights movement.

From the Edmund Pettus Bridge in Selma, Alabama, where he marched with the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., to demand an end to segregation to the Halls of the Congress of the United States of America where he dutifully and faithfully served his constituents, Representative Lewis spent a lifetime showing Americans what it means to stand up for what is right, even at great personal cost.

He understood something that all too often forgotten: that the work of creating a more perfect union and the pursuit of liberty and justice for all is never finished, but it is an ongoing and often frustrating process. Nevertheless, he demonstrated both to the Members of this body and to the American people the value of compassion, dedication, and civility.

The world is a better place because of John, and it was an honor to serve alongside him in Congress. May he rest in peace, and may we always honor his example.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO CONGRESSMAN JOHN LEWIS
(Mr. GUTHRIE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of Congressman John Lewis.

Our Nation mourning his loss. An icon of the civil rights movement, John Lewis dedicated his life to fighting for equality. He was an American hero who never waivered in his pursuit to make our country a more fair and just place.

During my first term in Congress, I met John Lewis when we sat near each other at the President’s State of the Union Address my first time. We became friends after that and often spoke on the House floor and in his office. While we served on different sides of the aisle, he was always willing to hear and consider the perspectives of others.

He understood something that all too often forgotten: that the work of creating a more perfect union and the pursuit of liberty and justice for all is never finished, but it is an ongoing and often frustrating process. Nevertheless, he demonstrated both to the Members of this body and to the American people the value of compassion, dedication, and civility.

The world is a better place because of John, and it was an honor to serve alongside him in Congress. May he rest in peace, and may we always honor his example.

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO TRANSNATIONAL CRIMINAL ORGANIZATIONS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 116–137)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BUTTERFIELD) laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:
Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days before the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in

It was amazing to watch everything I had learned about in history class with someone who had experienced it. After the movie, as we were all kind of feeling empty in our stomachs and just the feeling from seeing the movie, I walked up to Mr. Lewis, and I asked him: What is it like to have your life portrayed upon the screen such as that?

If you remember, the actor resembled him when he was younger. Mr. Lewis looked at me and he said: All I was thinking is that I had a lot of hair back then.

That was Mr. Lewis for you, a giant in our history, but unaffailingly humble and kind. I am grateful I had the opportunity to know him, and I will miss him dearly.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF CONGRESSMAN JOHN LEWIS
(Mr. KATKO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of Congressman John Lewis.

Our Nation mourning his loss. An icon of the civil rights movement, John Lewis dedicated his life to fighting for equality. He was an American hero who never waivered in his pursuit to make our country a more fair and just place.

During my first term in Congress, I met John Lewis when we sat near each other at the President’s State of the Union Address my first time. We became friends after that and often spoke on the House floor and in his office. While we served on different sides of the aisle, he was always willing to hear and consider the perspectives of others.

He understood something that all too often forgotten: that the work of creating a more perfect union and the pursuit of liberty and justice for all is never finished, but it is an ongoing and often frustrating process. Nevertheless, he demonstrated both to the Members of this body and to the American people the value of compassion, dedication, and civility.

The world is a better place because of John, and it was an honor to serve alongside him in Congress. May he rest in peace, and may we always honor his example.

It was amazing to watch everything I had learned about in history class with someone who had experienced it. After the movie, as we were all kind of feeling empty in our stomachs and just the feeling from seeing the movie, I walked up to Mr. Lewis, and I asked him: What is it like to have your life portrayed upon the screen such as that?

If you remember, the actor resembled him when he was younger. Mr. Lewis looked at me and he said: All I was thinking is that I had a lot of hair back then.

That was Mr. Lewis for you, a giant in our history, but unaffailingly humble and kind. I am grateful I had the opportunity to know him, and I will miss him dearly.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF CONGRESSMAN JOHN LEWIS
(Mr. KATKO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of Congressman John Lewis.

Our Nation mourning his loss. An icon of the civil rights movement, John Lewis dedicated his life to fighting for equality. He was an American hero who never waivered in his pursuit to make our country a more fair and just place.

During my first term in Congress, I met John Lewis when we sat near each other at the President’s State of the Union Address my first time. We became friends after that and often spoke on the House floor and in his office. While we served on different sides of the aisle, he was always willing to hear and consider the perspectives of others.

He understood something that all too often forgotten: that the work of creating a more perfect union and the pursuit of liberty and justice for all is never finished, but it is an ongoing and often frustrating process. Nevertheless, he demonstrated both to the Members of this body and to the American people the value of compassion, dedication, and civility.

The world is a better place because of John, and it was an honor to serve alongside him in Congress. May he rest in peace, and may we always honor his example.

It was amazing to watch everything I had learned about in history class with someone who had experienced it. After the movie, as we were all kind of feeling empty in our stomachs and just the feeling from seeing the movie, I walked up to Mr. Lewis, and I asked him: What is it like to have your life portrayed upon the screen such as that?

If you remember, the actor resembled him when he was younger. Mr. Lewis looked at me and he said: All I was thinking is that I had a lot of hair back then.

That was Mr. Lewis for you, a giant in our history, but unaffailingly humble and kind. I am grateful I had the opportunity to know him, and I will miss him dearly.
the Federal Register and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the Federal Register for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency with respect to transnational criminal organizations declared in Executive Order 13581 of July 24, 2011, is to continue in effect beyond July 24, 2020.

The activities of significant transnational criminal organizations have reached such scope and gravity that they threaten the stability of international political and economic systems.

Such organizations are becoming increasingly sophisticated and dangerous to the United States; they are increasingly entrenched in the operations of foreign governments and the international financial system, thereby weakening democratic institutions, degrading the rule of law, and undermining economic markets. These organizations facilitate and aggravate violent civil conflicts and increasingly facilitate the activities of other dangerous persons.

In accordance with this provision, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13581 with respect to transnational criminal organizations.

DONALD J. TRUMP

HONORING CONGRESSMAN JOHN LEWIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. Bass) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Ms. BASS. Mr. Speaker, it is with great honor that I rise today to co-anchor the Congressional Black Caucus Special Order hour. For the next 60 minutes, we have a chance to communicate to the American people our great love for an American hero, Representative John Lewis.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from the great State of California (Ms. Pelosi), my colleague and the honorable Speaker from the city of San Francisco.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding and appreciate her calling us together for this Special Order for a very special person.

This big picture of John Lewis was just put up here, “Rest in Power,” it says. You can’t see from the TV, but over here in the front row is a big bouquet of white flowers. It is in a place where John usually sat in the front row of a section that many of the Members of the Congressional Black Caucus held fort, conspired sometimes, plotted, and made progress for the American people.

It is appropriate that we have those flowers there where John sat for so many years.

Jon Meacham, who is writing a book on John Lewis, told us yesterday on a Caucus call that when John was born, he was born into a garden. He loved to be in the garden. He loved to be with the chickens, as we know, the little chickens, and he loved to see things grow. He loved to see things grow.

He lived his life in that way. He loved to see progress grow. He loved to see love and peace grow. He loved to see ideas grow, and he loved to see a more perfect Union grow.

Many of our colleagues will have many things to say this evening, and because it is a Special Order, I don’t have my usual 1 minute, which is endless, so I will save some remarks for another time. But here is what I will say.

John has always been about nonviolence. That was his spirit in everything that he did. He was respectful of others and respectful of other people. In the spirit of nonviolence, Reverend Lawson taught that to him, to Dr. King, and the rest, and much of it was in the spirit of Mahatma Gandhi and much of the nonviolence that he put forth.

In Sanskrit, Mahatma Gandhi’s language, the word for nonviolence is “satyagraha.” That word means two things: Nonviolence, and insistence on the truth.

And John Lewis, nonviolently, always insisted on the truth. Whether it was a lunch counter, the truth of our Founders, in everything that he did, it was about truth in peace and love.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD my statement, because, again, I am not used to not having endless time as the Speaker of the House, and I do know that our colleagues have a great deal to say.

I will say one more thing: At the end of his life, end of his time in Washington, D.C., right before he was preparing to go back to Atlanta, just a couple of weeks ago, in the middle of June 1986, Captain John then joined the effort, the Voter Education Project, where he directed. That was sponsored by the Southern Regional Council. And as he served as the director of the Voter Education Project in Atlanta, I became the chair of the Voter Education Project in Charleston, South Carolina, and we continued that relationship.

He got married to a librarian, I got married to a librarian—though I did so before he did—and they became fast friends. Lillian and Emily became fast friends. Lillian and Emily became fast friends. Lillian and Emily became fast friends.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from the State of South Carolina (Mr. Clyburn), the majority whip.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I cringe often when I hear people talk about the 1960s as the civil rights movement. I always put an “S” on that.

The Stono Rebellion was in 1793. It was a civil rights movement. Denmark Vesey’s insurrection was in 1822. It was a civil rights movement.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from the city of San Francisco.

Ms. BASS. Mr. Speaker, the Nation lost an icon; the House lost its most respected Member; and the Congressional Black Caucus lost the most senior member of our family.

The Congressional Black Caucus is known as the conscience of the Congress, but John Lewis was known as the conscience of our Congress. One of the many highlights of John Lewis in his time here in Congress was that I had the possibility of serving with him.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from the State of South Carolina (Mr. Clyburn), the majority whip.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I cringe often when I hear people talk about the 1960s as the civil rights movement. I always put an “S” on that.

The Stono Rebellion was in 1793. It was a civil rights movement. Denmark Vesey’s insurrection was in 1822. It was a civil rights movement.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from the city of San Francisco.

Ms. BASS. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD my statement, because, again, I am not used to not having endless time as the Speaker of the House, and I do know that our colleagues have a great deal to say.

I will say one more thing: At the end of his life, end of his time in Washington, D.C., right before he was preparing to go back to Atlanta, just a couple of weeks ago, in the middle of June 1986, Captain John then joined the effort, the Voter Education Project, where he directed. That was sponsored by the Southern Regional Council. And as he served as the director of the Voter Education Project in Atlanta, I became the chair of the Voter Education Project in Charleston, South Carolina, and we continued that relationship.

He got married to a librarian, I got married to a librarian—though I did so before he did—and they became fast friends. Lillian and Emily became fast friends. Lillian and Emily became fast friends. Lillian and Emily became fast friends.
succeeded where I failed. It was a tactic for me. It was a way of life for John Lewis.

Ms. BASS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unambiguous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of this Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California? There was no objection.

Ms. BASS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON), the state of the District of Columbia.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from California, KAREN BASS, for leading this Special Order to our good colleague and friend, John Lewis.

John and I were elected to the House of Representatives about the same time. Actually, he was elected a couple years before I was. But we were colleagues before either of us could have hoped to become Members of Congress. We were kids together in the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, the young guns of the Southern Civil Rights Movement.

The difference between John and me is I was in law school so I went in the summer, and John was a full-time member, who left school in order to join and extend their remarks and in order to participate in this tribute to an American icon: Congressman John Lewis.

Words cannot convey the loss to this body as well as to the Nation, but very few can claim to have altered the course of American history the way that John did. He was a guiding light to all of us and was a leader trying to make America a more perfect Union. His steadfast moral leadership will be deeply missed, particularly at this complex time in our history.

Those of us here today are standing on his shoulders. His historic life and legacy will undoubtedly live on, but we must be sure to continue his life's work, particularly when it comes to voting rights and restoring the Voting Rights Act. We must make some “good trouble” to honor his enormous legacy.

Ms. BASS. Mr. Speaker, Congressman John Lewis spent his life fighting racism and injustice wherever he confronted it, from Boy Scout sit-ins and other protests in the streets to championing bold, progressive policies in Congress, including the Voting Rights Act.

1845

Ms. BASS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS).

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker,

to every man there is a way, a ways, and a way,

And the high souls take the high way,

And the low souls take the low way.

While all the rest on the misty flats drift to and fro,

But to every man there is a way, a ways, and a way,

And each man decided which way his soul shall go.

John Lewis always took the high road, always giving of himself in such a way that you knew that he was gracious and kind.

John had faith.

Like John, I grew up in rural America, went to a one-room school, never had a new schoolbook. But John had the faith of a mustard seed and said: If you want to move a mountain, just say to the mountain be moved. And if it wouldn’t, then you get you some dynamite, nitroglycerin, TNT, and blow that sucker down.

That was John Lewis. May he rest in peace.

Ms. BASS. Now that he is no longer with us, we have to live up to his legacy and protect the right to vote for all Americans. As we continue to face challenges due to the coronavirus and issues of systemic racism, we must protect our democracy and elections, even in the midst of adversity. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, we are all heartbroken. We are all speechless. We all are committed to John Robert Lewis’ beloved community.

Each of us has been touched without ceasing for the spirit he led us in acknowledging, even in anger, that there was the beloved community. We loved his wife and his family and his extended brothers and sisters, all the way from Alabama to Georgia. I am reminded of his ability to love Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. It is a testament only that is able to extend love and not to show envy but to learn and to seek knowledge. John did that, which allowed him to carry that all the way to the fights of today.

Dr. King said: “I am the boy from Troy!” He loved to tell that story. He loved to tell that he preached to the chickens, but his voices were heard by kings and queens.

John Lewis was a saint walking on Earth.

I am reminded of our days in front of the South African Embassy, arrested, against genocide, or fighting against the children in cages. John never stopped his fight.

And so I come today to honor him in this brief moment that we have to be able to say, Isn’t it good that a saintly man walked on this Earth and reminded us of the beloved community?

I am very glad to say that I knew, and the world knows John Robert Lewis, “the boy from Troy.”

Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of this body and the Committee on the Judiciary, as a colleague of a great and beloved man, and as a member of a generation that directly benefited from and was inspired by his work in the Civil Rights Movement, I am proud but heartbroken to participate in this tribute to an American original, our friend and colleague, the late John Robert Lewis who died last Friday, July 17, 2020, in Atlanta, Georgia at the age of 80 years old.

But what amazing things my friend John bore witness to in those eight decades. John Robert Lewis was a lifelong warrior for a more just, equitable, fairer, and better America, one of the Original Big Six, and a giant of the Civil Rights Movement.

John Lewis was one of the original Freedom Riders who challenged segregated interstate travel in the South.

He was a founder and early leader of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, which coordinated lunch-counter sit-ins.
He helped organize and was the last surviving person who addressed the multitude at the March on Washington, where Dr. King delivered his immortal "I Have A Dream" speech on the steps of the Lincoln Memorial.

John Robert Lewis was born on February 21, 1940, in Troy, Alabama, to John Robert and Louise (Jones) Lewis. He had 10 children, 2 of whom died in infancy. He was the middle child of the three for whom Dr. King named the 1963 March on Washington. His family moved to Dothan, Alabama, when John was 14 years old, where he attended the segregated school that his parents had to leave in order to attend the all-black Dothan High School.

John Robert Lewis was a dancer by age 2, a minister by age 8, and a leader by age 15. He was a member of the Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, a civil rights organization that helped organize and was the last survivor of the 500 civil rights activists who took part in the Selma to Montgomery March of 1965.

In 1966, John Lewis was elected to the United States House of Representatives from Georgia's 5th District and served in that role until earlier the evening when the sun set on his heroic and extraordinary life.

John was the conscience of the Congress, widely believed to have revered on both sides of the aisle and the Capitol. His moral authority was colossal because he had seen the worst of us but he always appealed to the best of us and never ceased to inspire us to strive to create the beloved community.

It is no exaggeration to say he was a man, the likes of which we shall not see again. As news of John's passing reverberates across the United States and around the world, John would want us to reflect not on his death, but his life and the unfinished necessity work ahead of us.

John never took his eyes off the prize and to his last days, continued to march and stand in solidarity with those protesting injustice and inequality.

I remember getting arrested with John, Congressman McGovern, former colleagues Jim Moran of Virginia and John Olver of Massachusetts, and our late colleague Tom Lantos, for protesting the genocide in Darfur at the Embassy of Sudan on April 28, 2006.

John Lewis led us in the interim demonstration on the House floor to protest the Republican Congress' refusal to take up gun violence prevention legislation in the face of the tragic mass shootings that plague our country.

And in his final act of civic engagement and civil disobedience, John Lewis stood in the middle of Black Lives Matter Plaza showing solidarity and the continuity with the now global movement fighting galvanized by the horrific murder of George Floyd to peacefully protest for justice and equal treatment in the criminal justice system.

Mr. Speaker, John Lewis was among the finest Americans this country ever produced. He lived a consequential life and his legacy is all around us, in the realization of talent and opportunity of millions of people who walked through the doors of progress that John Lewis helped open.

I hope it is comfort to John's family and loved ones, that people the world over are mourning his death but celebrating his life.

A fitting and proper means of paying tribute to John Lewis's extraordinary life is for the Senate to immediately take up and pass the John Lewis Voting Rights Advancement Act, landmark legislation to protect the precious right to vote for all persons and to ensure that our democracy has the tools needed to remain strong.

I ask the House to observe a moment of silence in memory and thanks of John Robert Lewis, the boy from Troy, who became a leader who helped change the world.

Ms. BASS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS).

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, John Robert Lewis was short in height, yet he was a giant. John Robert Lewis was a humble man but fierce for justice.

John Robert Lewis talked softly, but roared like a lion when it was time to fight for freedom, justice, and equality for all humankind. He said there was one race—the human race.

He is an individual that compelled a Nation to change, to make it better. His voice will echo in this Chamber forever.

It was my honor and pleasure for 22 years to serve with the Honorable John Robert Lewis. May he rest in peace and rise in power.

Ms. BASS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. David Scott).

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, John Lewis' mother and his grandmother named him John after John the Apostle, the disciple, the Beloved. The Bible says, John Jesus loved, John the Beloved.

And John Lewis dedicated his life to building the beloved community.

And one more thing. John Lewis, being named after John, Jesus' Apostle, it must be noted that the Apostle John was the youngest of the disciples. John Lewis was the youngest of our civil rights leaders who spoke at the momentous March on Washington.

God bless John Lewis and we thank God for sending him our way.

Ms. BASS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN).

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to say thank you to a friend and a great warrior.

I thank you, dear brother, for being the sermon you preached. You walked your talk. It is said that a great person will always rise to the occasion, but it is also said that the greater person makes the occasion.

He was an occasion-maker, and he rose to the occasion on the Edmund Pettus Bridge. And for this, many of us who are here tonight are here because he marched into brutality.

So tonight, I thank you, dear brother, for being able to withstand what many of us could not and would not. I rise just to say thank you and to let you know that we will never forget you, and we will always make it perspicuously clear that we are here because you were there.

Ms. BASS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. CLARKE).

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor a great man, Representative John Lewis.

This past Friday, July 17, our country lost one of its greatest heroes, a true patriot, who literally put his life on the line in the pursuit of justice and fairness in our society.

I am so honored and privileged to have served with John Robert Lewis—John Robert Lewis, who was a dancer, a true patriot, who literally put his life on the line and the people above his own self-interests.

I am so honored and privileged to have served with John Robert Lewis—John Robert Lewis, who was a dancer, a true patriot, who literally put his life on the line and the people above his own self-interests.
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And I will forever hold dear the moment that we landed in Ghana together, invited by the President of Ghana for the Year of Return, and to see the wonderment in his eyes of visiting a space where it all began for all of us 401 years ago.

May he rest in peace and rise in power. The Honorable John Lewis will never be forgotten. We all hold onto his legacy.

Ms. BASS. To honor Mr. Lewis, the first thing we need to do is pass legislation restoring the Voting Rights Act and get it signed. We know the credibility of our elections has already shown early signs of concern during several State primaries and voter suppression cases, coupled with the fact that people are going to have to vote in dangerous conditions, cannot be ignored. I know that if Mr. Lewis was still with us, he would be leading that fight.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, much has been said about my friend, teacher, and mentor, John Lewis.

He was a family man, married to Lillian for 44 years, and to that union bore a son, John-Miles, who is with us today.

Along with John Lewis’ brothers and sisters, he was number three of ten. He has a large extended family. And that family continues to shine. And for 33 years, he was our colleague.

For 14 years, he was mine. And for 33 years, he was our colleague.

I just want to say to the family that we here in Congress feel your pain. We appreciate your sacrifice in allowing John to do what he did for the world and for Congress. I want you to know that we stand with you, feel your pain, and we will never forget your dear brother, uncle, cousin, whoever he was to you. We will never forget him. We love you and missed you.

He would depart this place to go to the family reunion during the summer down in Alabama where the family still owned hundreds of acres of land that they farmed even when his two sharecropping parents gave birth to John. And so he was a family man. Thank you, family, for entrusting him to us.

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

Mr._scenarioB. Of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, there are no words to describe the pain that many Americans are feeling right now as we grapple with the loss of our conscience, our friend, our inspirational leader, John Lewis.

I am heartbroken. I am honored and humbled to have served alongside him, to have had him as my mentor. He has done so much for so many Americans in the Faith and Politics movement through a historic march in Selma, across the Edmund Pettus Bridge.

During one of those trips I was lucky enough to have seen my daughter Laura and son Ray join the march. Because of school obligations, they had to leave early and were going to miss the march across the Edmund Pettus Bridge. John wasn’t about to let that happen.

He took the three of us in his car with him and we drove through Selma, as he told them what it was like and what he went through. They were both entranced by him and the story he was telling that was filled with graphic violence of what they endured as they fought for equal rights.

At the end of it, my daughter Laura, who was about 14 years old at the time, struck by what he had just told her, rather innocently asked him, “Mr. Lewis, did you ever have fun?”

There was a pregnant pause and then John got the biggest smile on his face. He told us that yes, they did. “And in fact, at night, we’d pitch our tents and sit around campfires and we’d sing and dance,” he said. His smile then got broader as he remembered. “I can still see Andy Young doing the jitterbug in his coveralls. And he could dance . . . he could dance.”

Despite everything John endured, they were still young and full of life.

One of the most inspiring memories I have of John was when we were fighting to pass the Affordable Care Act. The day before we passed the bill, hateful protestors spat racial slurs and spit on John Lewis, ANDRÉ CARSON, and EMMANUEL CLEAVER. Tensions were high after that. The next day at Caucus, I asked John to speak. He brought the Caucus to its feet, evoking the Civil Rights movement.

He said: “Pay no attention to what went on yesterday. We have to learn, as we did in the Civil Rights Movement, to look past this and keep our eyes on the prize. So, I ask you to stay calm. As he was walking away from the mic, he paused, and then he stepped back up and said, “Forty-five years ago, I walked across the Edmund Pettus bridge arm in arm with fellow citizens who believed strongly in Civil Rights. We faced far more difficult crowds than we are facing out here today. Let’s lock arms and go across the street and pass this bill.” And we did. We marched across the street, through the protestors and passed the bill.

In 2016, I worked with John to take another stand. This time, we were calling for a vote on the House floor on a bill to address the epidemic of gun violence in America. After the 2012 shooting at Sandy Hook Elementary, the House didn’t take a single vote to address gun violence, until Democrats took the majority in 2019. In 2016, after the shooting at Pulse Nightclub in Orlando, John and the rest of the Democratic Caucus had had enough. He called on the Caucus to join him in causing some ‘good trouble.’ With that, we held a sit-in on the House floor demanding justice.

Most recently, together to strengthen Social Security. Social Security is our nation’s number one anti-poverty program and is a lifeline for millions. It needs to be strengthened so it’s there for future generations too. Last summer we stood together outside the Capitol highlighting how important these benefits are for seniors, especially for Black seniors. He said: ‘I grew up in rural Alabama, 50 miles from Montgomery, outside a little town called Troy, and I remember how seniors lived before they had Social Security. Most of the seniors in my district in Georgia depend on Social Security for the majority of their income. Without it almost half of Black and Latino seniors in this country would be living in poverty. That’s not right, that’s not fair, and it’s not just. Social Security is more than a right, it is a promise. A promise people paid into to secure their future. We can do better, we can do much better.’

This year, even when battling cancer, he continued this fight.

I’ve been proud to call John Lewis a friend over my time in Congress. In 2016, I was honored to work with the Bipartisan Policy Center and Representative Tom Cole to establish the Congressional Patriot Award. John Lewis and Senator Johnson, who passed away earlier this year, were the first recipients. They were both authentic heroes. One held in captivity by the Viet Cong and tortured and nearly beaten to death; the other held captive by the Alabama Police, clubbed and beaten. They both had a genuine focus on doing for others, not themselves. They were humble, gracious, and kind, yet warriors for their cause.

John Lewis has forever changed our country. His legacy will live on in the policies and lives he changed. We must continue to follow his lead and cause good trouble.

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the heroic life of Congressman John Robert Lewis and his historic contribution to the nation we know and love today.

September 1957, the Little Rock Nine walked into history as they walked up the front steps of Central High School. It was a pivotal moment in history.

John said this moment inspired him in his own leadership as an active member of the Civil Rights Movement.

I had the pleasure of calling John a friend, as did many of my colleagues, and will cherish the time we had together in the people’s House.

John joining me as legislative cosponsors to expand the Little Rock Central High National Park boundary is a highlight of my congressional service.

John will truly be missed, but long remembered. As the USNS John Lewis sets sail as a new class of naval vessel, we are reminded to carry on his legacy of dignified leadership.

I join all Americans in honoring the remarkable life of John Lewis. Martha and I offer prayers for his family and for all those he inspired and who thus grieve over his loss.

Ms. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, our country lost Congressman John Lewis, an inspiring individual who stirred so much important change.

I would like to extend my deepest sympathies to Congressman John Lewis’ family, friends, and staff. Congressman Lewis will always be an icon of courage to promote equality and freedom. I will always cherish his thoughtful and cheerful encouragement during our time serving in Congress together.

Congressman Lewis was especially appreciated by his neighbors—the people of South Carolina.

We will always remember Congressman Lewis for his many significant accomplishments. And although he is no longer with us, his legacy will always live on. My prayers are with the Lewis family during this incredibly painful time.

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in the passing of Congressman John Lewis, I have lost a dear friend, Georgia has lost a true leader, and our nation has lost a civil rights icon.

John Lewis and I first met upon my arrival to Congress nearly three decades ago. Yet, by
the time of that meeting, he had already made a profound impact on my life. It was because of his early work on the advancement of the Civil and Voting Rights Acts that I can stand here and address you today.

His grasp of the nuances and complexities of public opinion, his understanding of the electorate, and his ability to articulate his views with clarity and passion, made him a dynamic presence in this Chamber. When he spoke, everyone—regardless of party or politics—listened. When he sang—like he did when we were jailed together following a nonviolent protest at the Embassy of Sudan—peace ensued. His stories captivated, his advice educated, his passions inspired, and his speeches motivated. He brought the same passion he had as an activist to the halls of Congress, where he spent his career representing Georgia’s 5th district.

It is impossible to properly eulogize John Lewis with only words— for he was a man of action. We would therefore all do well to reaffirm our commitment to the preservation of equality and justice in his honor, which is necessary now more than ever before.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to offer my condolences to John Lewis’s family and to thank the Congressman for a life full of “good trouble.”

Miss GONZALEZ-ColON of Puerto Rico.

Mr. Speaker, for so many of us, serving in the U.S. Congress is the achievement of a lifetime. The opportunity to serve in this Chamber, he had already built a historic legacy, as one of the Greats of the Civil Rights Movement. A man of inspiration and hope, committed to the struggles of freedom and justice, John had to put himself on the line and defend social justice throughout his whole lifetime.

America has lost one of its great leaders. John never relented in fighting for what he felt was right, yet he always sought the good in others. Having suffered bigotry and violence, he would not let himself be dragged down by hate.

It is a privilege to me, to have been able to know and serve in Congress with such a champion of equality and civil rights. Humble as the truly great are humble, serene and kind, but John was strong in his convictions. In his office he displayed mementos of our nation’s crude history of segregation and the events of the struggle that he still remembered as if it were yesterday. I was privileged to have conversations with him asking about his experiences, in which he gladly spent much longer time than the usual congressional meeting. In his gaze as he spoke you could see an inner peace that filled the room and seemed magical.

John Lewis always supported the right of Puerto Ricans to choose their own future and achieve full equality as American citizens, and I was able to count on him as cosponsor of the Puerto Rico Statehood Admission Act (H.R. 4901). He also joined in our effort to recognize the valor and sacrifice in battle of the Puerto Rican soldiers of the 65th Infantry Regiment as cosponsor of the measure to establish the 13th of April as National Borinqueneers Day.

In the same spirit of justice and equality, he asked me to be the Republican co-lead for the Every Child Deserves a Family Act (H.R. 3114). This legislation that seeks to end discrimination in adoption and foster care agencies across the nation, forbidding discrimination against children, youth, families and individuals on the basis of religion, sex (including sexual orientation and gender identity) and marital status in the management and delivery of child welfare services. I did not hesitate to say yes. Discrimination is discrimination whether you are talking political or social issues.

Representative Lewis’ gallant defense of equality and justice extended to the struggle for the rights of the LGBTQ community. I was proud to join him in the Equality Act, which would extend by law the protection against discrimination under the 1964 Civil Rights Act to LGBTQ individuals. The march towards true justice on which John Lewis spent his life goes on: it is up to us to continue it. There will be other bridges to cross, and his courage should inspire us to cross them, but always with love and care for all people.

May John’s loved ones be comforted by the knowledge that his memory will continue to inspire many generations who are learning from his words, about inclusion and about fighting hatred with love. I thank John (he never wanted me to call him Congressman or Mr. Lewis).

HONORING CONGRESSMAN JOHN LEWIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker’s announced policy of Jan-uary 4, 2019, Ms. CARSON from Georgia (Mr. Bishop) is recognized for the remainder of the hour as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, we are here to honor Congressman John Robert Lewis, our hero, our colleague, our brother, our friend.

Having known John for 52 years, I can tell you honestly that even in his humanity, he lived his life in the image of Jesus.

John was a voice of the voiceless—African Americans, for women, for LGBTQ people, for the least and the left out, for anyone mistreated by society.

His unwavering sense of right and wrong, his North Star for this Nation, which is why we call him the conscience of the Congress.

People as good as John don’t come our way very often. Despite all of the accolades and recognition he received, John remained humble, unfailingly kind, and always fueled the capacity of people to be better, despite their past transgressions.

Where would America be today if it were not for John Lewis? Without his activism, without his courage, without his perseverance for voting rights, I doubt if I would be here today.

Thank you, John, for your lifetime of advocacy, for sacrifice of friendship and counsel.

And thank you, God, for the life of John Robert Lewis.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. CARSON).

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, John Lewis was certainly a leader among men. He was a mentor. We would call him up, and he would speak to the Muslim community. We would call him up, and he would speak to the folks in Indiana who were there when it was announced that Dr. King had passed, because he was in Indianapolis at the time.

□ 1900

He was a true servant. Mr. Speaker. Jesus was mentioned. John was like Jesus. I am reminded of a Scripture when Jesus was having a conversation with his disciples about this notion of leadership, and Jesus looked at his disciples and said: He who wishes to be chief among you shall first be your servant.

John was a servant. He wasn’t the kind of leader who looked at the protesters today and said: Oh, what you are going through is nothing compared to what we went through.

He stood in solidarity with those young folks and embraced those young folks like a real leader. John is an example to all of us, what true public servants should be.

We love you, John. God bless.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, we make our living by what we get. We make a life by what we give. John Lewis certainly made a life.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Alabama (Ms. SEWELL).

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and outstanding legacy of our colleague, friend, mentor, and my hero, Congressman John Robert Lewis.

Growing up as a little girl in Selma, Alabama, John’s incredible legacy was a hero’s tale as familiar to me as any Bible story or family lore.

As a little girl singing in the choir, the children’s choir at Brown Chapel AME Church, my home church, it was the church where John and so many wonderful foot soldiers would come time and time again to honor the legacy of the Bloody Sunday march.

But to know John was to know a man without ego, who, despite his many well-deserved accolades and successes, loved every person he met. He looked in the eye. Can’t you hear him? "My brother, my sister," he would say.

John loved this country more than any person who I have met, and it was his deep-seated patriotism that will live on.

His legacy, indeed, was the Voting Rights Act. And, we, in this body, can do something about that. Yes, we can
Mr. SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia has 15 minutes remaining.

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Speaker, as we mourn our friend, a civil rights icon who was driven to make some good trouble. He was purposeful. He was making a difference. He was determined to fight for justice and fairness at the ballot box. So, my colleagues, there is no greater real-life hero. He gave us the road map. Can't you hear him? Never give up, never give in. The voice of history, a voice that helped stir the conscience of America at a time of ugliness and struggle, but also at a time and in an era of hope and accomplishment.

My colleagues, there is no greater time for us to stand up against injustice that we are facing, no greater time for us to fight for justice and fairness at the ballot box. So, my colleagues, let us make some noise. Let us get in trouble, good trouble. God bless you. Rest in peace. Rest in power, my friend. Good trouble.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. BEATTY).

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, America has lost a national treasure, one of the world’s greatest fighters and defenders of freedom and justice. Congressman Lewis’ words and work and legacy will live forever.

I am so fortunate to have traveled to Africa with him and to have marched in my hometown with him. You see, Mr. Speaker, when Mr. Lewis spoke, you heard the voice of history, a voice that helped stir the conscience of America at a time of ugliness and struggle, but also at a time and in an era of hope and accomplishment.

My colleagues, there is no greater time for us to stand up against injustices that we are facing, no greater time for us to fight for justice and fairness at the ballot box. So, my colleagues, let us make some noise. Let us get in trouble, good trouble.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. KELLY).

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank you for your letter to Congressman John Robert Lewis.

Dear John, I hope you knew how incredibly honored I was to call you colleague and to serve with you. It was such a great privilege to watch you in action and listen to your stories. When we planned the sit-in, being a part of the Fab 5 made me so proud. It took a while to get the bill out of the House, but we finally did it. I promise you, when I encounter a situation that is just not right, I will stand up, speak out, and get in the way.

I place your courage and perseverance by your side for eternity. I know I will be a better person for it.

I hope you, C.T. Vivian, Martin, Rosa, Edgar, Robert Kennedy, and others are having a fabulous reunion.

Rest in power, my friend, until we meet again.

Love, Robin.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, how much time remains?

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. LAWRENCE).

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, just this year, I remember John urging Americans to “get in good trouble, necessary trouble, and help redeem the soul of America,” as we combat some of the most hateful messages and priorities driven by this current administration.

Today, I stand here and, John, I promise that I will continue to carry out your legacy, to get into good trouble and to ensure that the fight for equality and justice lives on, and to challenge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to do the same and pass the Voting Rights Act.

John, rest in peace. Rest in power. You have been a good and faithful servant.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. EVANS).

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor a truly great American and a real-life hero.

I was fortunate enough to have him as a colleague for 4 years. Congressman Lewis inspired me with an inspiration to me at a very young age.

I remember the first time I saw him was on the evening news. He was walking across the Pettus Bridge. I felt very strongly about him and what he was doing. I was 10 years old, and I found him to be inspiring. He was purposeful. He was driven to make some good trouble. Now, we must carry on with the work of civil rights and equal opportunity. Remember John Lewis. Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. DEMINGS).

Mrs. DEMINGS. Mr. Speaker, on June 12, 2016, a lone gunman walked into the Pulse nightclub in Orlando, Florida, and opened fire with a semi-automatic rifle. That night, the shooter killed 49 people and injured 53 others. At the time, it was the largest mass shooting in American history.

I saw the Members of Congress taking to the floor and holding a sit-in. I was not surprised that the person leading the way was Representative John Lewis. To him, the victims were a part of the big family John Lewis often spoke about.

Thank you, John, for never discriminating. Thank you, John, for never leaving people behind.

Galatians 5 defines the fruit of the spirit as love, peace, long-suffering, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, gentleness, and self-control. John Lewis was all of that to the House, to the Nation, to the world, and I am grateful for his friendship and his counsel and grateful for a life well-lived. Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Georgia (Mrs. McBATH).

Mrs. McBATH. Mr. Speaker, tonight, we stand in this great Chamber and mourn our friend, a civil rights icon and the conscience of Congress.

John Lewis towered over his era, and his loss is deeply felt across this country and across the globe. From marching for freedom in Montgomery to being beaten and bloodied on a bridge in Selma, John’s life showed us all the fundamental need for good, necessary trouble.

As John would often say: We have a moral obligation, a mission, and a mandate to do what we can to make our country and our world a better place and to help usher in a loving community where no one is left out or left behind.

His words and his life ring through eternity.

We will honor John’s legacy with an unshakeable determination to fight for what is right and what is just. He served the Nation in love. Rest in peace, my friend. We love you. I love you.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, may I request the amount of time remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlemen from Georgia has 15 minutes remaining.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. MFUME).

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Speaker, as we have been hearing and continue to hear, the passing of John Lewis represents a loss for America of one of our greatest heroes and, for many of us, a dear and old friend.

John and I were sworn in together in this Chamber 33 years ago as classmates in the 100th Congress. There were only four African Americans elected to Congress that year. He, myself, Floyd Flake of New York, and Mike Espy of Mississippi. We huddled with John here on the floor, and he made all of us hug each other. He said: We got here in different ways, but we are one band of brothers now.

The passion and the equality that he carried with him throughout his life, as we know, never waned. His unerring quest for justice never faltered. With a bold heart for compassion, John, like his mentor, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., was unawed by opinion, unseduced by flattery, and undismayed by disaster.

Birthing in an area of Jim Crow and vile and vicious segregation, he defied the limitedness of others’ expectations. John knew that politics changed people, so he set out early to change politics.

We are sad today, but heaven is receiving a new hero in John Lewis. The passion and the legacy that he carried with him throughout his life, as we know, never waned. His unerring quest for justice never faltered. With a bold heart for compassion, John, like his mentor, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., was unawed by opinion, unseduced by flattery, and undismayed by disaster.

Birthing in an area of Jim Crow and vile and vicious segregation, he defied the limitedness of others’ expectations. John knew that politics changed people, so he set out early to change politics.

Everything about him pointed to the fact that he was emblematic of that great band of freedom fighters who realized that freedom wasn’t free.

In this era where everyone seems to be searching for the next big thing or the next great thing, isn’t it odd, Mr. Speaker, that the greatness of John Lewis was with us all along? We needed only to look as far as the latest movement for social change to find it.

We are sad today, but heaven is receiving and John has claimed his final reward.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it has been said that service is the rent
we pay for the space we occupy on this Earth. John Lewis paid his rent, and he paid it well.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HURD).

Mr. HURD. A Freedom Rider unshaken by threats and violence, a leader in the struggle for voting rights who kept fighting even after a broken skull, a courageous American undeterred by more than 40 arrests after standing up for what is right. John Lewis spent his life fighting injustice and racism.

If it weren’t for the bravery of John and men and women like him, many of us wouldn’t be in this Chamber today. And as a Black man, I am not sure I would have had the same rights as my fellow countrymen.

John shaped this country in inmeasurable ways. He never sat by when he saw injustice. He never stopped fighting.

At a time when America is so divided, we should look at John’s courage for inspiration; we should look at John’s bravery for imitation; and we should look at John’s words and follow them.

I lost a mentor. John’s family lost a father, son, brother, and husband. Our country lost an American hero.

Rest in peace, my brother.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

What a splendid evening. I rise to honor the life and legacy of a great warrior for peace and justice, a kind and gentle human being, the conscience of the Congress, Congressman John Lewis.

As a giant of, as our whip indicated, a civil rights movement, John’s leadership and his courage continued as an extraordinary congressional leader. Every year, I joined John on his annual pilgrimage to Selma, Montgomery, and Birmingham, Alabama. I brought young people from the Martin Luther King Jr. Freedom Center in my district and my grandchildren each year to learn about and give thanks to the foot soldiers of the civil rights movement.

John always took time to meet with these young people. Even this year, with his failing health, he pulled them aside. He met with them. He always wanted to, and he did, inspire them to take that baton and to run the next lap of the race for justice and equality.

And, yes, like with so many, he blessed my community by coming to my district to continue these efforts with my young people.

Last year, Speaker PELOSI and Chairwoman Bass led a delegation to Ghana, West Africa, to observe the 400th anniversary of the first enslaved Africans brought to America. John said that Ghana was one of the most moving trips of his life. He said: “To see and behold the humanity during another period of our history, it tells each and every one of us to never let this evil happen again.”

Now, John was welcomed in Ghana as royalty, which he was. He was honored as a son of Africa who had come home. John and I would compare notes on tough votes, such as on matters of war and peace and defense spending. I will miss his wisdom, his advice, and, really, admonition—to do the right thing as he told all of us to keep our eyes on the prize.

Now, Members know how we get agitated when poached by our staff members. Well, John poached a brilliant and wonderful young woman from my office Jamila Thompson. When he told me about it, believe it or not, for the first time, I was thrilled that one of my staff members had been poached by John Lewis. What an honor.

John’s presence in the people’s House will be deeply missed, but one of the greatest tributes to Congressman John Lewis would be to restore the Voting Rights Act.

I would not be standing here as the 100th Black Member of Congress had it not been for the Honorable John Robert Lewis.

My deepest condolences and love and gratitude to John’s family, Michael Collins, Jamila Thompson, his entire phenomenal staff, and his constituents, and to all those whose lives he touched.

Let us continue to build the beloved community that he so eloquently spoke of.

In closing, I am reminded of a Scripture, 2 Timothy 4:7: I have fought the good fight. I have finished the race, I have kept the faith.

As John leaves his soul returns to his Creator, may he rest in peace, may he rest in power.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The SPEAKER pro tempore.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, as we come to the close of this first hour of tribute to our friend and our colleague, John Robert Lewis, I leave you with the words of Douglas Malloch, who wrote:

The tree that never had to fight
For sun and sky and air and light,
But stood out in the open plain
And always got its share of rain.
Never became a forest king
But lived and died a scrubby thing.
The man who never had to toil
To gain and farm his patch of soil,
Who never had to win his share
Of sun and sky and light and air.
Never became a manly man
But lived and died as he began.
Good timber does not grow in ease;
The stronger wind, the stronger trees;
Good timber does not grow in ease.
Lewis, I leave you with the words of a colleague and our hero, John Robert Lewis.

As John Lewis’ soul returns to his Creator, may he rest in peace, may he rest in power.

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

CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF CONGRESSMAN JOHN LEWIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Ms. CHENENY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. CHENENY. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor this evening to manage the time that we have on the Republican side to celebrate and remember the life of our tremendous colleague, Mr. John Lewis.

Mr. Speaker, I was very moved, having the opportunity to watch my colleagues on the other side of the aisle discuss and describe the impact that Congressman Lewis had on their lives, on all of our lives, and on this Chamber. I am struck by the fact that as we honor tonight in this chamber, we rise not as representatives of two different political parties, but we rise as elected representatives of this great Nation, a Nation that is mourning the loss of a great American, and as honored colleagues of a man, John Lewis, who dedicated his life to and to the fight for justice and freedom.

John Lewis taught us: “Nothing can stop the power of a committed and determined people to make a difference in our society. Why? Because human beings are the most dynamic link to the divine on this planet.”

John Lewis understood that one man or woman can make a difference—indeed, that it is only the determined and principled action of committed men and women that brings change.

He knew the blessings of this Nation, and he knew what it took to secure those blessings for all Americans. He knew that the fight was unfinished.

Mr. Speaker, the day that I was sworn into this body for the first time, I was standing just outside these doors in the Speaker’s lobby. I had just arrived with my dad, who joined me on the floor that day. By chance, as we were coming in, we met John Lewis standing in the lobby. The three of us had the chance before the ceremony to spend some time together.

The two of them didn’t agree on much, but they did agree on certain critical things. They agreed on the exceptional nature of this country, on the magnificent blessing, on the people’s House, and on the incalculable blessings of freedom.

I am blessed by the memory of that day, and I am blessed that at that moment when I was about to be sworn into this House, I was able to spend time with those two men.

Writing of his experiences fighting for civil rights, John Lewis said this: “Freedom is not a state; it is an act. It is not some enchanted garden perched above the clouds where its distant inhabitants can finally sit down and rest. Freedom is the continuous action we all must take, and each generation must do its
part to create an even more fair, more just society.'

Great men and women like John Lewis in every generation have known this, that we all have an obligation to defend our freedom, to fight for it, to do our part to be worthy of the sacrifices of those who have gone before.

One of the greatest gifts we can give to young people today is to teach them that lesson, to teach them our history, to convey to them the duty, the obligation, and the incredible blessing of being an American and of working to make sure that we pass this Nation to our children and our grandchildren more perfect than it is today.

Our colleague, Congressman John Lewis, dedicated his life to that ideal. His memory will be a blessing and an example to us all, our colleagues, his colleagues, here in the House, to his family, to his constituents, and to his fellow Americans.

God bless John Lewis, and God bless the United States of America.

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

MEMORIALIZING THE HONORABLE JOHN LEWIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WALKER) is recognized for the balance of the hour as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to participate in this Special Order, and I will look forward to hearing from our speakers in honoring the great John Lewis.

Over this past weekend, America lost not only a civil rights icon but also a loving father, a loving husband, a caring friend to this entire House body, Congressman John Lewis.

Mr. Lewis' courage and strength in the face of oppression are unmatched. His contributions to America's soul are paramount to the progress that we have made in our histories.

His experience on Bloody Sunday left him battered, covered in blood, and on the side of the road in Selma, Alabama, yet he carried on with his unifying message for America.

Many years ago, John Lewis crossed the monumental Edmund Pettus Bridge, fighting for freedom and a path toward achieving what our Founding Fathers had pledged but fell short to uphold.

I was extremely honored to have the opportunity 51 years later to walk across this very bridge in Selma, and we all honored the brave steps he led, rallying an entire Nation. The fact that I was asked to give the closing remarks at Dexter Avenue King Memorial Baptist Church in Montgomery is something, frankly, I will always treasure.

John Lewis' protest inspired our Nation to not only do better but to reflect on all of our actions. Through his grace and humility, he made monumental progress. He liked to refer to these acts as "good trouble."

While we don't share many of the same political opinions, there was never a doubt in my mind that Congressman John Lewis lived his entire life fighting for our country and the American people.

He gave us all hope, hope that we could get over this partisan divide, hope that we could get over the divisions of the past to paint a brighter future.

May we never lose that spirit and forever honor his legacy by never letting the forces of division, hatred, and evil tear down those bridges that so many of us have sacrificed to build.

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

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend and colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WALKER), for yielding.

I join with my colleagues, both Republican and Democrat, who mourn the loss of John Lewis.

We have so many honors to be able to serve in a job like this where we get to represent the people of this Nation, especially here in the people's House where we truly do bring all of the different elements of what makes America great into one body with people who represent every different type of background and every different kind of community, the kinds of people we get to serve with.

There are giants among the people we have the honor of serving with. John Lewis was at the top of that list, and you knew it when you served with him.

I remember telling colleagues years ago that, while we have our differences, it is really important to go get to know especially the legends, the giants we serve with in this body.

I remember talking about two Members in particular: it was John Lewis and Sam Johnson, one Democrat, one Republican, two people who were just giants. Unfortunately, we have now lost both of them in the last year.

Our institution is better because John Lewis was a part of this great body, but it is what John fought for his whole life.

I know my colleague from North Carolina as well as my colleagues in the Congressional Black Caucus talked about, earlier, his mantra of "good trouble." What John experienced in his life, there are so many people who have lived great into one body with people they would never have if John hadn't gone through that.

I had an honor, like so many of my colleagues, to go with John. He invited Members from both parties to go to Selma to be a part of reliving that history, which was a dark side of our history.

But I remember, as we were walking, we would round the corner, and he would point to different buildings. And he said: That is where we gather. That is where some of the people who were trying to stop us would be.

He helped organize the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, SNCC. He started at a young age in the civil rights movement, at a time when it was not only difficult, but it was possibly life-threatening. And for many, they did lose their life in that battle.

I remember talking about with the president of the university of Tennessee that, while we have our differences, we had an honor to go with John Lewis and he invited us to go to the campus and see some of the people who were trying to stop us and what we can learn from John.

And I remember him telling me about the Johnson-Cutler Bridge. I got to walk arm in arm with John. It was one of the great honors I have had as a Member of Congress to be able to do that.

The whole time we were walking with him—and this could be a moment that John would want you to remember—there was a moment where he was so brutally beaten, but he wanted to share the experiences. And as we were walking, we would round the corner, and he would point to different buildings. And he said: That is where we gather. That is where some of the people who were trying to stop us would be.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in honor of a beloved colleague and wonderful friend, John Lewis.

I first met John when my husband, Bob Matsui, was a Member of Congress. Bob loved John. He admired him for his humanity, his conviction, and the fact that he was a total human being.

I had heard so much about John because he was a historic figure, but I saw another side of him, too, when Bob brought him to Sacramento. He met many people. And I remember his walking across a university campus with the president of the university when he ran across, Bob and he and John, a bunch of chickens that the students were advocating to keep on campus. The president was saying: No. We have got to get the chickens out.

The president said: Excuse me, Mr. Lewis, but we are going to get rid of those chickens.

And John said: No way are you going to get rid of those chickens. I learned to preach by preaching to chickens.

That is the part of John that I really loved, too, that humorous part, the part you can laugh with.

But this gentle giant lived also every single day to overcome injustice, eradicate racism, and give hope to all who...
walked beside him. He is a total person.

At this moment in our history when speaking truth to power is so vital, it is more important than ever to follow John’s words, to ‘stand up, speak out, and join the people in the struggle.’

John taught us all that America is greater than the sum of its parts. When you weave a rich, colorful tapestry, the weaving itself makes it strong. His impact will forever be felt in our Nation’s conscience, and we are all better for it.

At this difficult time, my prayers are with the Lewis family and all his friends. He will be sorely missed.

I love you, John.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. FERGUSON), our deputy whip. It only makes sense to go first to John Lewis’ colleagues in the delegation from Georgia.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WALKER) for allowing me to do that.

I rise tonight to honor the life and legacy of John Lewis.

John dedicated his life to equality and justice, and the Nation we are so blessed to live in is better because of his work and his sacrifice.

John was driven by his deep faith, his servant heart, and his love of his fellow human being. While John was always right to fight for legal changes to make America better, he ultimately knew that how you treated your fellow human being was a matter of the heart.

John led by example. He led by showing love and grace to all people. He showed love and grace even to those people who disagree with him or showed him contempt.

John was always willing to offer forgiveness to those who had done him wrong, knowing that forgiveness was fundamental to building a relationship built on trust and love.

Two of my most vivid memories and treasured experiences here in my time in Congress involved John.

One was a dinner at his house. He invited the Georgia delegation over, and he retold the story of his life and experiences in the civil rights movement. What a cherished memory and experience.

The second was the night that we honored another Georgia giant here, former House Member and former U.S. Senator Johnny Isakson. I remember the night that JOHNNY ISAKSON and John Lewis met in the center and embraced in true love, friendship, and respect. It was truly an amazing moment.

John was an amazing man, and I believe that the only thing John Lewis ever hated was hate itself.

Rest in peace, our dear friend.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY).

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the memory of Congressman John Lewis, an American hero, a dear friend.

He taught us what patriotism is, that to love our country is to acknowledge and work to repair its imperfections. Congressman Lewis endured angry mobs, death threats, and so much violence with endurance, persistence, and even warmth and optimism. Surely we can honor his remarkable life by coming together to reauthorize the Voting Rights Act, to ensure our laws reflect that Black lives matter.

Advocating for the Nation’s marginalized throughout his life, acting as the conscience of Congress during his 34 years of service, he inspired generations of Americans to get in “good trouble.”

I remember sitting on the floor with John. Rather than sitting in the chair, we were proving our point and all sitting on the floor.

He has taught us so much with his sweet, sweet manner, but the strength of his conviction.

We must honor Congressman Lewis’ legacy by striving to achieve the equitable and just society for all that he fought so hard to attain. In the words of John himself, “If not us, then who? If not now, then when?”

Dear, sweet, kind John, we will miss you. We love you. May you rest in peace.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT) of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WALKER) for yielding to me to speak about my friend and colleague, Congressman John Lewis, a man that I loved.

I will miss dearly him saying, “I love you too, brother.”

There is no telling how many times John Lewis told the people of this House, “I love you too, brother.” He looked at everybody, no matter who you were, as a brother.

I selfishly thought about how much I was going to miss him and seeing him and Michael Collins on a Delta ready to head out to the next kick up here. I kicked up the facts that people from my district would sit down next to me and say: Did you see John Lewis on the plane? And, by the way, what do you do?

That was just the way people loved John Lewis.

There is not a person walking in this country today who didn’t benefit from John Lewis and what he did for mankind, and I would venture to say that the majority of the people in the world benefited from his love and what he did.

I thought about a few passages. We have talked about him preaching to the chickens, and maybe we are the chickens he was preaching to his whole life. I remember the Beatitudes.

Blessed are the peacemakers, for they should be called the children of God.

If there was ever a peacemaker that I met, it was John Lewis.

Following from there:

Blessed are they which are persecuted for righteousness’ sake, for theirs is the kingdom of Heaven.

A little further into the book of Matthew:

Let your light shine before men that they may see your good works and glorify your Father, which is in Heaven.

There is no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that John Lewis was a special man. He was a special man of God. And his life and his bones may rest, his legacy will live on forever in this body.

I, for one, look very forward to the day that a statue of John Lewis rests in the Halls of this Congress representing not only the great State of Georgia and the people of the State of Georgia, but all of the men and women of the United States.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative SCOTT for his comments tonight.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS).

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, with John Robert Lewis’ passing, we lose and deeply mourn a great friend, mentor, and the world loses the most respected “good trouble” maker of our time.

John’s standing will only grow as his legacy endures.

Mr. Speaker, every year since I have been in Congress, I asked John to speak to entering high school seniors from San Diego who visited our Capitol as part of an in-depth civics and leadership program; and for 20 years, with each new group of 45 very diverse students, he gave his time, his energy, and his wisdom, graciously answering their many spirited questions. They, too, will never forget him and how he changed them. Here is just a brief example:

Alejandra Cordova, from 2001, said Mr. Lewis taught her “not to be afraid to rock the boat every once in a while.”

David Hickman, from 2015, said he “truly showed us what it meant to be a change-maker, to live through our actions and speak up against injustice.”

He taught our children well:

John, you taught and changed me and everyone you touched. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Michael Collins and all of John’s staff, who had the hardest task of all to say to visitors captured by John’s words: “I am sorry, but the Congressman must depart now.”

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. HICE), a fellow pastor.

Mr. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WALKER), my good friend, for yielding to me.

There is no question that all of us who have served with John Lewis marvel at the passionate figure who devoted his life to fighting for freedom and equality.
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An interesting perspective of his life, as a son of Alabama sharecroppers, John Lewis demonstrated that, in America, a single individual, even one
coming from the most humble of backgrounds, can have an enormous impact in this country.

We all know that he rose to be a powerful leader in the civil rights movement; worked very closely with Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., and so many others that he sacrificed their lives to ensure that Americans of all races live in liberty in this country. But he did so peacefully.

He once wrote this, and this has a great, powerful meaning. He said: "Release the need to hate, to harbor division, and the enticement of revenge. Release all bitterness. Hold only love, only peace in your heart, knowing that the battle of good to overcome evil is already won.

John Lewis knew that it was necessary to fight the sins of this country; but he understood also to fight those in a nonviolent way.

I just have the deepest respect for John Lewis, and I am honored to have considered him a dear friend.

I want to thank all my colleagues this evening for joining in this time to honor such a great man and an icon, obviously, particularly in the civil rights movement.

My wife, Dee Dee, and I continue to pray for the Lewis family. Again, I thank all my colleagues for joining tonight.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE).

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from North Carolina for allowing me several minutes to pay my respects to a great man.

And it is not remiss that I see the Speaker pro tempore; it is very appropriate that you are in the seat tonight, sir.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor John Lewis. He was an American icon, civil rights legend, and dear friend and an inspiration to millions. Yet, these words truly fail to describe the difference he made in our country.

He always spoke of "getting into good trouble," and I know that has been echoed here on numerous occasions, but it sums up what Mr. Lewis was all about.

His efforts led to the Civil Rights Act. His efforts led to the Voting Rights Act. And his efforts led to the Congressional Black Caucus, and even the election of President Barack Obama.

But his loss is more than his legacy. For me, once again, I have lost one of my fathers on the floor of Congress. He was a role model for what makes a great Congressman, and I constantly watched as he moved about his business: Like the way he always fought for the right thing; the way he could convey such power and strength through such a gentle demeanor.

But when he was committed, there is no one else on this floor you would rather have with you going into that fight.

And the way he stood up to abuse to make this country a better place. One of my greatest honors was to be a part of the sit-in he led on the House floor to fight for gun control legislation after the terrible, dreadful Florida issue. We got into some good trouble that day.

He inspired us then, and his words and deeds will inspire new generations; whether they are civil rights pioneers, elected officials, or any American with a dream or cause.

"Good trouble" was Mr. Lewis. Your life made our country and our world a better place.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, may I get a time remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 32 minutes remaining.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ALLEN. I thank the gentleman from North Carolina for this privilege. Mr. Speaker, Americans learned about the civil rights movement in the news or read about it in history books. John Lewis lived it.

One of my greatest memories here was to have dinner with Congressman Lewis at a time when he shared with the entire Georgia delegation his experience in leading the civil rights movement.

He shared with me that Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. prayed with them on those buses before the demonstrations and urged everyone to remain at peace to ensure lasting change.

I know we can all learn from the example Congressman Lewis set as a civil rights icon. We must meet injustice with humility and perseverance to do what is right.

Pride and fear are the opposite of humility. John Lewis and all those in this movement demonstrated perfect love while being persecuted. Perfect love cast out all fear and only comes from God and obedience to His word and was perfectly demonstrated at the cross of Jesus Christ.

My wife, Robin, and I pray that his family finds peace during this difficult time. And this is a lesson for this body as we honor those like John Lewis, who have come before us and fought for an America that is stronger and is unified.

He shared with me that day. It made me feel much greater than I ever could become.

I had the great honor to travel with him to South Africa for the 50th anniversary of Robert F. Kennedy’s Ripple of Hope speech in Cape Town. I saw and I sat across from him and Bishop Desmond Tutu, and I knew I was seeing two angels together, two special souls united.

Mr. Lewis loved two people in life that were his heroes; one was Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., and the other was Robert Kennedy. The purpose of that speech on that trip was to honor Robert Kennedy and the 50th anniversary of that speech.

In that speech, Robert Kennedy said: "It is from numberless diverse acts of courage and belief that human history is shaped. Each time a man stands up for an ideal, or acts to improve the lot of others, or strikes out against injustice, he sends forth a tiny ripple of hope, and crossing each other from a million different centers of energy and daring those ripples build a current which can sweep down the mightiest walls of oppression and resistance."

Robert Kennedy might as well have been speaking about John Lewis that day in 1964, because that is what John Lewis did; and he was more than a ripple of hope, he was a tsunami of hope.

He was in every good cause there was, and he sacrificed himself physically in South Carolina, in Alabama, in Mississippi, for civil rights. And he sacrificed himself even when he was a Member of Congress for different causes, getting arrested.

And when he was on death’s doorstep, he got himself to Washington, D.C., to appear at Black Lives Matter Plaza. But when he had only support to the young people that were striving for the causes that he had strived for his whole life.
I value every single moment I spent with Congressman Lewis. It was an honor to know him. I miss him.

And just the other day, I looked up at the scoreboard, and when I didn’t know quite how to vote on some issues, I would look at John Lewis and see how he voted. And he wasn’t there.

He was my hero.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER), another one of Mr. Lewis’ colleagues.

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, in our lives there are people and places we remember. I will always remember John Lewis.

There are some people that you feel especially honored to have met. You feel like you are one of the lucky ones who had the opportunity to hear their stories, to learn their convictions, and to feel their triumphs. I believe just about anyone who had the opportunity to meet John Lewis would agree that he is one of those people.

He was born the son of sharecroppers. He grew up on his family farm, and he attended segregated public schools in Alabama. He told the story often, and I remember him telling us this story, about how he used to preach to the chickens.

He went on from that humble beginning to be called one of the most courageous persons the civil rights movement ever produced, a title he rightfully deserved.

John Lewis dedicated his entire life to securing equality and justice for all people, while remaining a devoted advocate for nonviolence. It must have been an incredible blessing for him to see how his fight changed our Nation and the entire world with his own eyes.

For me, it was a blessing to know him. His office was over in the Cannon Building for many years, and my office was in the Cannon Building. And oftentimes when I was walking over there, I would get to walk with him. I hung on every moment, on every word, just to have the opportunity to spend time with someone like John Lewis. I will always be grateful for those walks.

Many of my colleagues in the Georgia Delegation have mentioned the time that he invited us to dinner at his home here in Washington. What great stories he told that night; truly, one of the greatest experiences I have had while I have been up here in Washington, D.C.

John Lewis was a giant among men. He will be deeply missed, but his legacy will live on forever.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. McGovern).

Mr. McGovern. Mr. Speaker, sharing a jail cell with John Lewis was one of the greatest privileges of my life.

When we were arrested for protesting the genocide in Darfur a few years back, we were put into a police van, booked, and fingerprinted. John had been arrested over 40 times for peaceful protests by that point, so let’s just say he had some advice.

John made trouble like this because he knew that words aren’t enough and that real change requires action. He called it the struggle of a lifetime, but it was never his struggle alone. He challenged all of us to fight injustice and oppression and to stand up for civil rights and for human rights.

Mr. Speaker, you were in great man. He was an American hero who called our country to a higher standard. But perhaps more importantly, he was a very good man. He treated every single person he met, no matter who they were, with dignity and respect. When he saw wrong in this world, he did his best to make it right.

Lisa, Patrick, Molly, and I miss you already. John, we love you, and we will never stop making good trouble in your name.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TURNER).

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, John Lewis was a giant in great man. He was an American hero who called our country to a higher standard. But perhaps more importantly, he was a very good man. He treated every single person he met, no matter who they were, with dignity and respect. When he saw wrong in this world, he did his best to make it right.

Lisa, Patrick, Molly, and I miss you already. John, we love you, and we will never stop making good trouble in your name.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TURNER).

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, John Lewis is a title he rightfully deserved.

John Lewis dedicated his entire life to securing equality and justice for all people, while remaining a devoted advocate for nonviolence. It must have been an incredible blessing for him to see how his fight changed our Nation and the entire world with his own eyes.

For me, it was a blessing to know him. His office was over in the Cannon Building for many years, and my office was in the Cannon Building. And oftentimes when I was walking over there, I would get to walk with him. I hung on every moment, on every word, just to have the opportunity to spend time with someone like John Lewis. I will always be grateful for those walks.

Many of my colleagues in the Georgia Delegation have mentioned the time that he invited us to dinner at his home here in Washington. What great stories he told that night; truly, one of the greatest experiences I have had while I have been up here in Washington, D.C.

John Lewis was a giant among men. He will be deeply missed, but his legacy will live on forever.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. McGovern).

Mr. McGovern. Mr. Speaker, sharing a jail cell with John Lewis was one of the greatest privileges of my life.

When we were arrested for protesting the genocide in Darfur a few years back, we were put into a police van,
Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Ms. STEVENS).

Ms. STEVENS. Madam Speaker, Congressman John Lewis was the embodiment of a human prosperity as measured by loves. Not only was he the richest man I have ever known, but he was absolutely the most generous. John Lewis gave out love and, boy, did love come back. He was always showering people in love.

When I saw him in Kentucky long before I knew I would ever join this Chamber at the encouragement of a friend from Georgia, he was talking about Comic-Con and that his new book with pictures, "March," had just come out.

We have so much work to do. John Lewis, we will heed your words. We will not despair. We will look up. We will keep moving and marching forward. We will pass that Voting Rights Act. And we will remain dedicated to your pur- suits.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. CRAIG).

Ms. CRAIG. Mr. Speaker, last week, our country lost a fearless fighter and hero for civil rights, and we in this Chamber lost a colleague and a friend.

Representative John R. Lewis’ sense of fairness and of right and wrong was always ahead of his time. That sense of fairness extended to all civil rights issues.

His willingness to support opening up the 1964 Civil Rights Act to add protections for the LGBTQ community was critical and personally incredibly meaningful to me. My colleague and I, over my term in Congress, found that we had something very important in common. We both were adoptive par- ents.

His bill, the Every Child Deserves a Family Act, is another example of his commitment to fairness, eliminating discrimination against the LGBTQ community in foster care and adoption.

He took time to listen to my story of my fight to keep my son, Josh, in a community in foster care and adoption. He was not just a friend, but he was my friend, because he understood that right is always right.

When I saw him in Kentucky long before I knew I would ever join this Chamber at the encouragement of a friend from Georgia, he was talking about Comic-Con and that his new book with pictures, "March," had just come out.

We have so much work to do. John Lewis, we will heed your words. We will not despair. We will look up. We will keep moving and marching forward. We will pass that Voting Rights Act. And we will remain dedicated to your pur- suits.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, as we approach this July 4, I ask my colleagues to pause and reflect on who we are as a country and what John Lewis represented.

There are so many who have spoken today and will speak tomorrow about the life and legacy of John Lewis. "March" has been described as a book that is not just about the author, but also about the nation’s history. John Lewis was a person who loved his fellow human beings.

So many of you have heard me refer to John Lewis as the most Christlike person I have ever met. He was human, and he represented the best of humanity and all the positive attributes that humanity can summon. That is why his words are still there on the other side of the aisle, from all ideologies, from people of different colors, different races, different genders, different nationalities, and perhaps even different languages—certainly, different languages—for he was not just an American—though proud he was of that—but was a citizen of humanity.

Jim Clyburn said a little earlier today that we hear about Gandhi, and we talk about Christian values, but no one we know has lived and breathed the values that he embodied. He embodied the best attributes that are in us all.

We have a short time because time is limited, and so many want to speak because they were touched by John Lewis, because they were inspired by John Lewis, and because they were motivated and uplifted by John Lewis.

Mr. Speaker, how lucky we are to be able to say that John Lewis was our friend. I knew John Lewis. John Lewis made a personal difference in my life and the lives of millions of other people who may not even know the name of John Lewis.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas (Mrs. FLETCHER).

Mrs. FLETCHER. Mr. Speaker, John Robert Lewis was one of the most courageous and committed citizens that our country has ever known. With unparalleled courage, with deep faith, and with profound hope, he personified a dream, or that one, or the one down the street. And he represented the best of human- ity.

Through his life, he gave all of us a gift: a chance to see the world as it should be and a way to make it so.

At this pivotal time in our country’s history, his faith in America and in Americans must guide us now. We have the opportunity and the responsibility as Members of Congress and as citizens to honor him by believing, as he did, in an America as good as its promise and by working to make it so.

We have many more to go to build the beloved community, but he showed us the way. How lucky we are, and how we must miss him so.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, as we conclude this Special Order, I am most reminded by my colleagues this evening of the immense impact of a life that was John Lewis.

In our current House, who can we think of that has more of an impact in the civil rights movement than John Lewis?

His legacy is not simply of humility and kindness in the pursuit of equality, but one in which we should all aspire
to replicate. We have talked many times tonight of his nonviolent approach, but do not hesitate for one second to think that John Lewis was not a strong man, a strong man with a lion’s heart.

America is the greatest country in the world, but let’s be transparent. It took us a few years to really act out that all men were created equal. John Lewis dedicated his life to making sure this country lived up to the ideals of our Founding Fathers in making this Nation for everyone.

John was a man of faith. He grew up as a young preacher and later became an ordained Baptist minister, and I can relate to that. It was under this background that he began this fight for equality. Had the church joined him, I am convinced there would be less division today.

As a member of the Freedom Riders, John and his fellow Riders were subjected to mob beatings and arrested for his efforts. Despite this opposition, he remained steadfast in his conviction and continued onward with his courageous message as he pressured our Federal Government to do the right thing.

Mr. Speaker, 25 years ago, John Lewis ascended to a seat in the U.S. Congress and continued to make “good trouble,” as he would deem it. During this distinguished time as a Member of the United States House of Representatives, John left no stone unturned in his fight for American people.

As you can see this evening, Congress has felt this impact resoundingly. It has been made clear: John Lewis’ kindness and humility in the many faces of oppression and adversity have lifted up Congress and America for decades.

To say he will be sorely missed is a vast understatement.

Let us continue to tell the story of John Lewis for generations to come. Remember his guidance, and let his presence live on in our hearts. In other words, let’s keep on a walkin’ and keep on a talkin’.

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

HONORING CONGRESSMAN JOHN LEWIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 3, 2019, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES) for 30 minutes.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the topic of tonight’s Special Order hour.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as we honor the life and legacy of the Honorable John Robert Lewis. I am thankful for my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, Republican Conference Chair Liz Cheney and Republican Conference Vice Chair Mark Walker, for their dual participation here on the House floor today, which is a recognition that, yes, John Lewis was a Democratic hero; he was a progressive hero; he was a civil rights hero; but above all else, John Robert Lewis was an American hero.

So we are here today on the House floor, not as Democrats or Republicans, not as progressives or conservatives, not as the left or the right, but as Americans.

John Robert Lewis meant to all of us: to our communities, to the country, to the Constitution, to the principle of liberty and justice for all, equal protection under the law, to the principle of the righteous cause of nonviolence as a pathway to the beloved community, as he would share with all of us.

John Robert Lewis was the connective tissue between the civil rights movement and the Black Lives Matter movement.

John Robert Lewis was the connective tissue between the dream of Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., and the Presidency of Barack Obama.

And John Robert Lewis was the connective tissue between the tragedy on the Edmund Pettus Bridge and the tragedy that occurred in Minneapolis, Minnesota.

John Robert Lewis’ life journey is the American journey, and he has guided us toward equality and marched toward a more perfect Union; and through the sheer will of his morality, he has helped to bend the arc toward justice.

And so we are all thankful for his life and his legacy, honored by the privilege to have been able to call him “colleague.”

We learned from John Lewis how to be a good American, a good patriot, a good neighbor, a good leader, a good league. And so we are all thankful for this opportunity just to humbly communicate what John Lewis meant to all of us.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from the great State of Florida (Ms. Wasserman Schultz).

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, few of us will ever leave the mark on history and every human we encounter the way our dear friend Congressman John Lewis did. His profound generosity and goodness was so beautifully balanced by his courageous, unyielding demands for justice.

I saw it as we sat on this House floor demanding gun safety reforms after the Pulse nightclub shooting. I saw it as young and old met him, sensed his moral bearing, and he patiently made each one the world’s most important person in that moment.

We saw it plain as day as he bravely crossed the Edmund Pettus Bridge to confront America’s racist sins, knowing that batons and beatings blocked the pathway to justice.

I saw it when he traveled to my district, and the outpouring of joy and reverence overflowed for this truly good man.

And I saw it when he took the time, 5 seconds of his time, in that room off the House floor, when he recorded a campaign video to help my then high school-age daughter win her student government campaign, which she did. That is a memory that she will treasure—and does treasure—throughout her life.

His lifetime of “good trouble” is a model for us all, especially now as we must carry on his work of racial justice. The more perfect Union John Lewis lived in and risked his life for is what our Founders expressed but did not necessarily exemplify and one that future leaders must aspire to. His courage and generosity are strengths we must all draw upon now.

Rest in power, my friend.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO), the distinguished chair of the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise today with a heavy heart to honor the passion of a dear friend, a colleague, a personal hero of mine, Congressman John Lewis.

Mr. Lewis often spoke of building a beloved community, one that required us to get into “good trouble” to achieve. His vision for America and her world was one of justice, equality, and compassion for one another.

During dark times, his strength and his optimism lit the way to a path forward that brought us closer to justice. During doubtful times, his words and his wisdom inspired confidence that progress was still in reach.

And during this difficult time for our country, as we mourn his death, may the dream and the legacy he left behind inspire us to keep building that beloved community.

John Lewis, you taught me that optimism is a moral duty, and now that you are gone, sir, I will no longer have you around to remind me to keep the faith. I will have to do that all by myself.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BUSTOS).

Mrs. BUSTOS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to mourn and also to celebrate a historic life, a man I was honored to know, privileged to serve with, and to call my friend.

Congressman John Lewis has been called home to God. I met Mr. Lewis right after I was elected to Congress, but over the years, I had the pleasure of getting to know him, a civil rights icon, and the American hero.

Too rarely are the most powerful also the most humble, the most caring, and the most kind. But Mr. Lewis had that...
rare combination and more. He was the best among us.

In one moment, he would fearlessly stand in harm’s way to stand up for what is right, and in the next, he wouldn’t hesitate to take a minute to share his insights, his lessons, his personal stories with those lucky enough to cross his path or to walk into his office.

In 2015, so many of our colleagues and I for him for the 50th anniversary walk across the Edmund Pettus Bridge in Selma, Alabama, to honor the moment that young John Lewis forever changed our Nation.

As we all gathered to follow in his historic footsteps, the magic and the power of John Lewis’ action on that fateful day in 1965 could be felt by all of us. Our country is better, our Congress is better, and I am better for having known him.

I will miss you, Mr. Lewis, but I will forever celebrate and honor the impact you made on our Nation and on me.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. REED).

Mr. REED. Madam Speaker, I rise today to join with my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to express my condolences and express the spirit that John Lewis represented to all of us.

John Lewis was a humble man. I knew John serving on the Ways and Means Committee with him.

I traveled with my colleague, Mrs. Brescia, down to Selma, Alabama, on that 50th anniversary day. And I will tell you, one of the moments that inspired me the most in my tenure here in Congress was not just that day, when we walked across the Edmund Pettus Bridge arm in arm in celebration of his victory over hatred, but it was the following day, when we sat at the doors of the Montgomery, Alabama, State Capitol, and I saw the daughter of Governor Wallace express to John an apology for the sins of yesterday. And John, in typical John Lewis fashion, stood up and embraced her when she said: “I’m sorry.”

John Lewis epitomizes the best of the human race. John Lewis was an inspiration to all of us.

My predecessor, my mentor, Amo Houghton, who served in my seat for 18 years, expressed to me early on in my tenure: “Get to know John Lewis. Get to know his story. Listen to his story.” And I will tell you, that is some of the best advice I received from his friend, Amo Houghton.

And so I come here tonight to express my grief, but most importantly, my hope that the spirit of John Lewis, his legacy, his lessons, his personal stories with those lucky enough to cross his path or to walk into his office. So to my colleagues on the other side, I join you in your grief, but we are united in our love for the great John Lewis.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RUPPERSBERGER).

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Madam Speaker, I rise to recognize the life and legacy of Congressman John Lewis.

I first met John at a church event in Maryland 20 years ago in Anne Arundel County when I was a candidate running for Congress. And John was there to support me but also there to speak to a junior day event.

At that time, I first saw John speak and talk about his relationship with Dr. Martin Luther King. He recounted many brutal beatings and arrests that he endured during the height of the civil rights movement. From that point on, I considered John a mentor.

I am fortunate to have served with many inspiring people, but John stands out as one of the finest leaders I have ever known.

John encouraged us to get into good trouble, to make a difference. Though not typically my style, I was proud to participate in a sit-in on the House floor, led by John, to protest gun violence in 2016. He told me that by sitting down, we would be standing up for thousands of Americans who have lost their lives in mass shootings after mass shootings. And so I sat.

The best way to honor John’s life and legacy is by continuing the fight against gun violence, against police brutality, against veteran disenfranchisement, against systemic racism.

We will carry the torch for you, John.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. WILD).

Ms. WILD. Madam Speaker, shortly after I came to Congress, I learned through grapevine that a couple of my staff members wanted nothing more than to meet the great John Lewis in person.

So with some trepidation, and very cognizant of the demands on his time, I approached him as a freshman Member on the House floor to inquire whether I could make an appointment with his staff. And in his usual warm and gregarious manner, Mr. Lewis said: “Of course. Of course.”

A few days later, I took these staffers on a mystery field trip to the Cannon House Office Building. And the look on their faces when they realized we were about to enter John Lewis’ office was priceless.

I figured it would be a quick handshake and a photo op, and then we would be on our way back to our office. But no. Mr. Lewis greeted my 6-foot-4-inch legislative counsel Zach and my speechwriter Yann with: “Hello, young brothers” and took them into his office to give them a tour of the history of the civil rights movement with the aid of large photographs that were stacked all over his office.

Zach and Yann and Sara, another member of my team, asked many questions, and he answered them all. We took the obligatory photos for which I am thankful, because now they have the treasure of those memories forever. An hour and a half elapsed, and our meeting with him ended only because my team needed to get back to work, so we had to break away. I am convinced he would have gladly spent the rest of the afternoon speaking with them. That is just one example of the rare combination of spirit of the great John Lewis.

Rest in peace, Mr. Lewis. I hope you are starting a whole lot of good trouble wherever you are. It is the greatest honor of my life to have served with you.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Madam Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. AXNE). The gentleman from New York has 14 minutes remaining.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

Mr. CICILLINE. Madam Speaker, John Lewis, an American hero, a civil rights icon, a movement leader, a peacemaker, a teacher, a drum major for justice, a mentor, a colleague, and a friend.

I want to begin by thanking John’s family for sharing him with us and with our country.

As I listened to my colleagues tonight speak about John, I realize that he made each one of us feel like a very special person to him. I also realize that words can’t really capture John Lewis and what he meant to us, to our country, and to the world.

I had the privilege, like so many of my colleagues, of walking across the Edmund Pettus Bridge with John and listening to him speak about his work in the civil rights movement; to be a part of an effort to organize a sit-in here on the House floor to demand action on gun violence; to work with John when we played a really critical role in our right for passage of the Equality Act and made the case that LGBTQ Americans were entitled to full equality in this country; on his visit to Newport News, Rhode Island; or traveling to South Africa to celebrate Robert Kennedy’s “Ripple of Hope” speech.

And most importantly, he reminded us all to be optimistic, because he believed in the fundamental decency of every human being. And even in the darkest moments, he would encourage us: “Keep the faith, brother. Keep fighting.”

And I think that belief in the fundamental goodness of everyone, that optimism, that John left with us.

And so, John, knowing you, serving with you, has been the greatest honor...
of my life. I thank you for all that you have done for me and for our country, and we promise you that we will keep the faith and keep up the fight.

Rest in peace, my friend.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT).

Mr. CHABOT. Madam Speaker, the word “hero” is used a little too often these days. But make no mistake, John Lewis personified the word. He was, without question, a true American hero.
The fearlessness he demonstrated throughout the civil rights movement, but especially on the Edmund Pettus Bridge in Selma on March 7, 1965, demonstrated to people across the globe how to stand up for equality, justice, and basic civil and human rights in the face of overwhelming odds. Quite simply, his heroic actions transformed our Nation and our world.

Early on in my time in Congress, I had the pleasure of meeting Congressman Lewis for the first time. When he found out I was from Cincinnati, he immediately asked me a question that I would hear from him many times in the coming years, how was his friend and fellow civil rights leader, Reverend Fred Shuttlesworth, doing.
The two men had worked together throughout the 1960s, along with Dr. Martin Luther King, organizing marches, sit-ins, and freedom rides. Like John Lewis, Reverend Shuttlesworth remained committed to civil rights throughout his life and worked diligently to improve conditions in Cincinnati.

Not surprisingly, when I would see Reverend Shuttlesworth back home, he would ask how John Lewis was doing up here. As a result, I was kind of a messenger between these two—larger-than-life civil rights icons, and they will always be inextricably linked in my memory.

Madam Speaker, the world needs more heroes like John Lewis and the Reverend Fred Shuttlesworth. Now, more than ever, their dedication to overcoming inequality and changing hearts and minds through nonviolent protests points the way forward. As I we continue to strive to come together and achieve a more perfect Union.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Virginia (Ms. SPANBERGER).

Ms. SPANBERGER. Madam Speaker, I rise tonight to remember Congressman John Lewis.

And for me, the best way to honor the memory of this beautiful man, this kind soul, our colleague, our friend, and for so many of us, our teacher, is to share his best lessons.

And in his 2017 book, Congressman John Robert Lewis said the following: “Freedom is not a state; it is an act. "It is not some enchanted garden perched high on a distant plateau where we can finally sit down and rest. “Freedom is a continuous action we must take, and each generation must do its part to create an even more fair, more just society.”

These are words to drive our work and our lives. And he spoke them to the world.

But to us, on June 4, on a call with so many of our colleagues, he told us: “Be brave. Don’t get weary. Let’s continue to work.”

And I wrote those words down, because like everything John Lewis said, they struck me as powerful and important and worth remembering. And in his memory, I hope we should all do just that, continue to work.
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Mr. JEFFRIES. Madam Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL).

Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL. Madam Speaker, it is difficult to express the immense loss and pain that not just myself but that this body feels at the passing of our good friend, John Lewis.

It has been one of my greatest honors and privileges to be able to serve alongside him in my short time here in this body and to get to know him. He brought us unadulterated love and gave us optimism in some of the most difficult times.

He worked with joy in his heart, with courage and faith, and without fear. He was a fighter against injustice to anyone. I remember him saying that he was inspired to see the young men and women of all backgrounds, creeds, and religious backgrounds rise up in nonviolent protest, demanding justice. I wonder if he knows that he started that back in 1965 in Selma, Alabama.

My kids, Jude and Siena, every time they came to Washington, they always sought out John Lewis because they looked up to him, just like all of us did.

It is silly that I am crying, Madam Speaker. I just met him a year ago. I think it is because, during some of the most difficult moments in our country, we can’t afford to lose someone like him.

But I am so inspired today to hear my colleagues stand together in unity, and I know, and I am filled with optimism, that we will be able to exemplify his work, continue his work, and carry his dream of a better America forward.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. KILMER).

Mr. KILMER. Madam Speaker, when you meet your hero and they turn out even more amazing than you expected, it is really cool. That was my experience getting to work with John Lewis. In fact, sometimes when he spoke in Caucus, I would find myself texting a colleague, saying: You work with John Lewis.

The last time many of us heard his voice was early this summer on a Caucus conference call. He spoke up and said that he was sad because he was reminded that we weren’t as far on the path to justice as any of us want our country to be. But then he said he was hopeful because people, and particularly young people, were speaking up, standing up, and working for change.

In 2019, I brought one young person, my daughter, Sophie, to Selma, Alabama. We crossed Edmund Pettus Bridge with him. We listened to his stories. He was so kind to her and so patient with her questions. At the end of the trip, Sophie approached him at the airport, and she thanked him.

She said: I have one more question.

He said: Go ahead.

And she said: Were you ever scared?

And he said to her: You know, I was scared. But I knew I was doing the right thing, and I knew there were others who were depending on me standing up for them, too.

He stood up for so many for so long. One of the honors of my life was to get to serve with this extraordinary man, even watching him preside over the House as we passed a new Voting Rights Act.

His legacy of peace and love, of fighting for justice, fighting for voting rights, and of causing good trouble will live on.

Rest in peace and rest in power, Mr. Lewis.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN).

Mr. LANGEVIN. Madam Speaker, from the moment I arrived in Congress, the aura of John Lewis loomed large. He will rightfully be remembered as a giant of the civil rights movement and the conscience of the Congress.

To me, though, he will always be remembered as a man who I felt privileged and honored and humbled to call colleague and friend. He will always be remembered as the kind, humble, approachable gentleman from Georgia, a tireless fighter who rallied our Caucus at pivotal moments to make positive change, to stand for what is right, to give a voice to the powerless, to protect the rights of the disenfranchised.

Of course, he was well-known for making noise and getting into good trouble, necessary trouble.

It was one of the great privileges of my life to join John Lewis in making some good and necessary trouble when he organized a peaceful sit-in on the House floor to demand action on gun violence.

John Lewis made a difference in the lives of millions, and his presence was always felt in Congress, but his absence will be felt even more.

Rest in peace, my friend.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Madam Speaker, how much time do we have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore, The gentleman from New York has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Madam Speaker, let me simply close this portion of our special hour in honor of our friend, our colleague, our mentor, our hero, the legendary John Lewis, by simply recounting his words: Never give in. Never give up. Keep the faith. Keep your eyes on the prize. And make some good trouble.
Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO CONGRESSMAN JOHN LEWIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL) for 30 minutes.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I very much appreciate the time tonight to honor one of Georgia's favorite sons.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAUKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAUKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, one of the greatest honors of my life has been to serve alongside John Lewis in this House of Representatives. John was my friend, and I know that thousands of people say the same thing, and guess what? They are all right.

John was my leader. I sat down in the well of this House with him in the morning, and we didn't get up again until the next morning because we were fighting, with him in the lead, to end gun violence. I got arrested with John Lewis, he probably for the 60-something time and me for the first, because we were fighting for immigration reform.

My husband and I had the honor of walking behind John to cross the Edmund Pettus Bridge three different times at a place where the State troopers in Alabama nearly took his life.

Over the years in our Democratic Caucus meetings, there was a tone that would get gloomy sometimes, and those were John Lewis moments. John would stand up and, in no uncertain terms, he would remind us of our mission. What people really wanted to hear from us, he told us, was hope. And I know John is walking hand-in-hand just what an extraordinary person he was. To know John was a blessing. To get to work with him on so many important issues on the Ways and Means Committee, including the IRS reform in over two decades, making important improvements to Medicare for our seniors and those who need our help the most, that was an honor of a lifetime.

I served with him on the Ways and Means Committee for many years. He was a warm, needed, inspirational presence in that storied committee room. When I look down the dais, I will be sad to miss my friend. But I will always be proud to have had the privilege of working with a remarkable spirit.

Each day he walked in these halls, we all witnessed firsthand his remarkable integrity, his intelligence toward the complex policy issues we debate, and his willingness to work across the aisle if it means Americans will have greater dignity, opportunity, and equal rights.

God loved this remarkable servant, and I know John is walking hand-in-hand with God and his beloved Lillian home just what an extraordinary person he was. To know John was a blessing. To get to work with him on so many important issues on the Ways and Means Committee, including the IRS reform in over two decades, making important improvements to Medicare for our seniors and those who need our help the most, that was an honor of a lifetime.

I served with him on the Ways and Means Committee for many years. He was a warm, needed, inspirational presence in that storied committee room. When I look down the dais, I will be sad to miss my friend. But I will always be proud to have had the privilege of working with a remarkable spirit.

Each day he walked in these halls, we all witnessed firsthand his remarkable integrity, his intelligence toward the complex policy issues we debate, and his willingness to work across the aisle if it means Americans will have greater dignity, opportunity, and equal rights.

God loved this remarkable servant, and I know John is walking hand-in-hand with God and his beloved Lillian today.

I miss you, John. Cathy and I will miss you, John. We will miss him dearly. We will miss you, John. Cathy and I will miss you, John. We will miss him dearly.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SCHNEIDER).

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Madam Speaker, I count among my life's greatest blessings the distinction of being able to call John Lewis my colleague and my friend.

Martin Luther King said the moral arc of the universe bends toward justice. John Robert Lewis spent his entire life working to accelerate and complete that bend fully committed to justice, to nonviolence and, in his own words, to good trouble.

John Lewis' incredible capacity for love, his steadfast belief in nonviolence, and his limitless humility inspired all of us, Democrat and Republican, to be better. His singular characteristic, though, defined him as the conscience of the Congress.

I have too many personal stories to share in a short 1-minute speech, enough stories, in fact, to more than fill the entire hour. I will hold each of these treasured memories in my heart for the rest of my life.

I join with my colleagues to honor his legacy and together hope we will continue his work bending that arc toward justice.

Rest in peace, John, knowing your memory will be a blessing to your Nation and to all whose lives you touched. And I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. BRADY).

Mr. BRADY. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY), the former chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, the committee on which John Lewis did so much of his important work for the great State of Georgia.

Mr. BRADY. Madam Speaker, John Lewis was many things. He was a father. He was a Congressman. As you know, he was a civil rights pioneer who marched with Martin Luther King, Jr. He was a husband. He was a son of the South, one who walked in the wind to bring equality to America and is now walking in the heavens with his Creator.

John was all these extraordinary things, and he was also my friend. We are a better Nation and a better people because of him. This institution, all of our country, will miss him dearly.

I always struggle to explain back home just what an extraordinary person he was. To know John was a blessing. To get to work with him on so many important issues on the Ways and Means Committee, including the IRS reform in over two decades, making important improvements to Medicare for our seniors and those who need our help the most, that was an honor of a lifetime.

I served with him on the Ways and Means Committee for many years. He was a warm, needed, inspirational presence in that storied committee room. When I look down the dais, I will be sad to miss my friend. But I will always be proud to have had the privilege of working with a remarkable spirit.

Each day he walked in these halls, we all witnessed firsthand his remarkable integrity, his intelligence toward the complex policy issues we debate, and his willingness to work across the aisle if it means Americans will have greater dignity, opportunity, and equal rights.

God loved this remarkable servant, and I know John is walking hand-in-hand with God and his beloved Lillian today.

I miss you, John. Cathy and I will continue to pray for you and all those who call you family. May you rest in peace and rise in glory. God bless you.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Madam Speaker, I rise today in honor of our friend and colleague, Congressman John Lewis.

With every march, every sit-in, every time we reject unjust rules and institutions designed to oppress any group, we honor the legacy of John Robert Lewis. A record number of Americans have stood up, spoken up, and laced up their marching shoes in recent weeks. Millions of them are too young to know about the man in whose footsteps they are following as they make what he so rightly called good trouble.

May we all model his grace, courage, kindness, and commitment to nonviolence as a way of life and continue the good trouble he started even when—especially when—it is unpopular.

I feel so much gratitude to have learned from this giant of history, this singular American genius, and to have served, however briefly, alongside him. His loss is devastating. His memory everlasting.

Rest in power, my beloved brother.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, at this time, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COOPER).

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

No one loved Nashville, Tennessee, more than our friend and colleague John Robert Lewis.

As a young man, he arrived in Nashville on a bus with a ticket purchased by the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Dr. King wanted young John to attend American Baptist College.

For anyone wondering how to honor John Lewis and his legacy, think of his alma mater, American Baptist, and remember also the historically Black college and university that he later attended, Fisk University. If you want more John Lewises in the world, think of his beloved training grounds, American Baptist and Fisk.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI).

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Today I rise today with a heavy heart to honor the life of Representative John Lewis, whose passing is a tremendous loss for Congress and for the entire country.

I will always remember walking across the Edmund Pettus Bridge with him on the 50th anniversary of Bloody Sunday. I took my son with me on that trip, and when John passed last weekend, my son said this: "He is the most memorable person I have ever met. I will never forget what it felt like to be in the same room as him."

We will never forget what it felt like to serve in the same Chamber as him.

And as the Nation reckons with centuries of systemic racism, we owe a great debt to John Lewis and his legacy, think of his ability to remain calm in any kind of storm. I can hear his voice urging us: Never give up, never give in, and always keep the faith.
Rest in peace, rest in power, John Lewis.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BARRAGAN).

Ms. BARRAGAN. Madam Speaker, like so many here tonight, I was inspired by John Lewis and his lifelong fight for our country to live up to its ideals to be more tolerant, more just, and more equal.

He was fearless. He sacrificed his body and soul to carry on the fight of his forebears. He carried on like a warrior, like a warrior of the civil rights movement.

I yield to the gentleman from Washington State (Mr. HECK).

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

He was my hero. I called him “Mr. Lewis” when I first arrived to Congress, and I will never forget, he would say, “Call me John.” He was so humble and supportive.

Hearing John Lewis tell firsthand stories of the fight for civil rights was a privilege. Walking the Edmund Pettus Bridge with him was something I will never forget.

We will honor his life by continuing to, and as he said, cause “good trouble, necessary trouble, and help redeem the soul of America.”

As he wrote: “Freedom is the continuous action we all must take, and each generation must do its part to create an even more fair, more just society.”

We will try.

Thank you, John.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Washington State (Mr. HECK).

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

Early in my service, I got out of the car in the parking garage to walk into Cannon, and Mr. Lewis walked up behind me. I turned and he said: “Good morning, sir.” I opened the door to try to point for him to enter first, and he said: “You first, my brother.”

I often heard him refer to my colleagues as “my brother” or “my sister,” and for a while I actually was fooled into thinking that was because he hadn’t yet learned our named. But that wasn’t it. He knew. It was more a sign of respect and affection and mutuality.

No one has ever walked in this Chamber on this floor, before, now, or in the future, who will ever command the love and reverence of him, because he was a great man.

Godspeed to you in your journey, John Robert Lewis, my brother.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Oklahoma (Ms. KENDRA S. HORN).

Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

It is my honor to rise today to recognize, honor, and celebrate the life, legacy, and impact of Congressman John Lewis.

Of those who have left their mark on history, the unique and indelible imprint of John Lewis stands in a category all its own. His strength, courage, commitment, compassion, kindness, and fierce determination to challenge injustice made the world a better place for all of us and truly bent the arc of history ever closer to justice.

John showed us that being bold and standing up for those whose voices aren’t heard are intricately linked with the need for compassion and hope. Though I don’t think any of us were ready to let him go—I know I certainly wasn’t—I simply cannot imagine the world without him. In fact, it is one of the greatest honors of my life to be able to have served with him and to call him a colleague and to join him on the civil rights pilgrimage last year, as I know many voices have said before.

And it was on this journey that I had the opportunity to share with him a blessing that had been bestowed upon me that I believe embodies the life and the lessons and the legacy of John Lewis that I will share today in his Honor.

“May God bless you with a restless discomfort about easy answers, half-truths, and superficial relationships, so that you may seek truth boldly and love deep within your heart.

“May God bless you with holy anger at injustice, oppression, and exploitation of people so that you may tirelessly work for justice, freedom, and peace among all people.

“May God bless you with enough foolishness to believe that you can make a difference in this world so that you are able, with God’s grace, to do what others claim cannot be done.”

Thank you, Mr. Lewis, for living those lessons and those words. Godspeed.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAUR), a cardinal on the Appropriations Committee.

Ms. DELAUR. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

In October 1995, the Black clergy in my community asked if I could get Congressman John Lewis of Georgia to come to New Haven for our local elections. I was honored to welcome John to my hometown, what I said about him that evening.

“John Lewis is a true hero of the cause of progress. It is often said that John Lewis is ‘one of the most courageous persons the civil rights movement ever produced.’ The most astonishing thing about that sweeping statement is that it probably doesn’t go far enough to describe the heroics of the man you see before you. John Lewis has dedicated his life to protecting human rights, securing personal dignity for all, and likes to call it ‘The Beloved Community.’ His display of ethics and morality has won him rare admiration from both his House colleagues and from leaders around the world over.’

He thanked me for the introduction, and he said to the congregation, ‘I love my sister ROSA DELAUR.’

And I loved that our offices, when I first came to the Congress, were next to each other.

I served with Congressman John Lewis for 30 years, and I consider myself blessed. My grandchildren, Teo, Sadi, and Jasper, met John Lewis. He signed for them his book, ‘March.’

John Lewis’ ‘March’ tells the story of a poor sharecropper’s son who transformed America and so much more. There are few in the world who change it. John Lewis changed it.

The Black clergy in my community, my grandchildren, my family, you can be sure we will carry on your work, John Lewis. Count on it.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOUTON).

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

This morning, when I was young enough to have a lot of American heroes around, from the Greatest Generation that won World War II to the civil rights leaders of the 1950s, to the men who walked on the Moon. To call one of them a colleague was one of the greatest honors of my life, and it hit me every day I saw John Lewis on the House floor.

“Good morning, sir,” was my usual greeting. Not because of my Marine background or his age—most people in Congress are older than me—but simply because there is nobody in Congress who had more respect. Nobody.

But he was much more than just a towering figure. He was a loving, caring, indefatigably optimistic friend and mentor, especially to young people like me.

John and I took bets on the 2017 Super Bowl, with the winner committing to visiting the loser’s district. And the Patriots had the greatest comeback in Super Bowl history, we started talking dates for his trip to Massachusetts. But with a few conflicts and his getting older, I proposed an alternative: a visit to some of the civil rights sites in his hometown.

Through all the turmoil of the last few years, there are only two times I have cried in Congress: visiting the prison in Hanoi with John McCain and visiting Atlanta with John Lewis.

You ever wonder who a hero John and his fellow American patriots were, spend some time in Atlanta or Birmingham or Selma, where he came within an inch of his life fighting to uphold a nation’s ideals even when the nation said they don’t apply to you or your family.

I found myself wondering if I would have had the courage to join in those protests to be a freedom fighter, to change a nation. That is what John Lewis did, for America, and in so doing, he changed the world.

And he never lost faith in either as he did it.
During the impeachment trial, I asked him if he had ever seen it this bad. And while he told me never, not even during the civil rights movement, because he said there was more hope, more movement, he nonetheless maintained his characteristic optimism and looked confidently like a preacher to his Sunday school student and said: But, don’t worry. We will get through it. Keep the faith, brother. Keep the faith.

We miss you, John.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I would inquire how much time remains. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia has 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. DEAN).

Ms. DEAN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, like many others in this Chamber, the last time I heard Mr. Lewis’ voice was on a Caucus call recently. Mr. Lewis implied us: Be bold. Be brave. Keep the faith. Keep your eyes on the prize. Keep working. There is much work to be done. Don’t get weary. Continue the work.

John Lewis was a hero to all of us for causing “good trouble” and for standing on the right side of history, for standing for our common humanity.

His humility, strength, and belief in the greatness of this country never faltered. What a blessing it has been to me to serve with him.

I had the privilege of being with him on a visit in Florida to the detention camp where immigrant children were kept separated from their parents, and through an interpreter, he spoke to the children.

He had two messages. So whether he was speaking to us in Congress or to a President or to children, his message was always the same: Be bold. Be brave. Keep the faith. Keep your eyes on the prize. Keep working. There is much work to be done. Don’t get weary. Continue the work.
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sorrow he felt for the soul of America, that in the wake of the brutal murder of George Floyd we were not in a better place, and that those poisonous, toxic roots of slavery still entangled our institutions and our Nation.

But he taught us that he had never been more optimistic, watching the peaceful protesters across this country assemble.

He told us, as he always did, to be bold, to not be weary. He told us that the wheels of progress are blowing.

So we must honor him by continuing our work, by unfurling those sails to catch that wind, and to live for justice; to see, as he saw, the divinity in not only John Lewis, but in all of us; and to know that, collectively, we can continue the march that he started for us, and we can bring this country to live up to the ideals of justice and equality for all.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. RUIZ), a distinguished Member.

Mr. RUIZ. Madam Speaker, when I stood in John Lewis’s presence, I stood in awe, in reverence, and with great respect.

John Lewis was an extraordinary man of faith, perseverance, virtue, and kindness. He endured ridicule and beatings during his nonviolent fight alongside Dr. King.

He spent a lifetime fighting against injustices, poverty, white supremacy, and racism, and for equality and human dignity. He was a social justice and civil rights warrior who inspired me, all of us in this Chamber and this Nation.

He was a man of God on a relentless mission of peace to create the kingdom and bring to Earth life as it is in Heaven.

As great a man as he was, he was always humble and gentle. He was always faithful in his fight for freedom from oppression.

John was also a friend. He always asked how my daughters, Sky and Sage, were doing. He would bring me a chariot of liberty in the Civil Rights Act of that era.

He spent his life so much so that he was arrested 40 times and beaten 350 times.

It was in this darkest hour that the legendary John Lewis thundered; channeling Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., he said, “We may have all come on different ships, but we are all in the same boat now. We have to stick together. We have to stand up. We have to do what is right. Millions of Americans are counting on us.”

And as he thundered those words, chills ran down my spine, and a moral righteousness took over me as he brought our entire caucus to its feet. And we fought the good fight, though we lost the vote in the House. But we still inspired the American people.

The effort to repeal Obamacare ultimately failed in the Senate, and Mr. John Lewis lit the spark with his words, his ghostly image, and his soul’s courage. Rest in power, Mr. Lewis.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Madam Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO), my good friend.

Mr. TONKO. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

It is with the heaviest of hearts that I stand in tribute to Congressman John Robert Lewis this evening.

Brother John, his son, Michael Collins, his remarkable and devoted chief of staff, to his entire staff, we grieve with you.

When I think about John Lewis, and to describe him: A commitment to God? Immutable. A commitment to believe that we are all equal before God? Immutable. Belief that the law must support the biblical belief in the equality of all mankind? Unyielding.

Because his great-grandfather was the victim of grave injustice, he didn’t have to watch a movie to hear the call of a slave master’s voice in the wind. He rebelled against that voice to deliver justice during his life.

In the 1960s, he was deemed a radical, a radical with a passionate belief in peaceful civil disobedience, so much so that he was arrested 40 times and beaten multiple times.

John knew that the televised images of police beatings and cracked skulls animated the just souls of 1965 to build a chariot of liberty in the Civil Rights Act of that era.

John wept at the sight of George Floyd being murdered, but also saw that another moment to create a more just and perfect Union was upon us.

In the coming days, when the streets are filled with those who mourn John, we will see people in fine suits and people in rags. We will see laborers and professionals. We will see faces pained by disease or poverty. But all of them will rejoice that John Lewis lived.

There will never be another John Lewis. In fact, I believe no Member of Congress is greater than the John Lewis that has walked across the threshold of this Chamber.

God rest, good man. You changed our country. You were a purveyor of good trouble. You taught us what was non-
I will end with his quote, and he said: “I say to people today, you must be prepared if you believe in something. If you believe in something, you have to go for it. As individuals, we may not live to see the end. Well, my dear friend, you may not see the end, but before this year is over, the John Lewis Voting Rights Act of 2020 will be delivered; and I hope someday a statue of you will be in Statuary Hall so we can all pass by it and touch your shoes and have your spirit fill our hearts.

God rest your soul. Rest in power.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, I want to praise John Lewis, not the Congressman, but John Lewis the gentleman from Georgia, a great man, a treasure, and our brother.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, I rise today in remembrance of our friend and colleague John Lewis, the gentleman from Georgia, a great man, a treasure, and our brother.

Congressman Lewis spent his life fighting for justice. When Mr. Lewis spoke, he did so with a force and moral clarity.

He was an original freedom fighter who embodied what it means to be a humble public servant.

John never let anything stand in the way of doing what was right. His legacy will continue by the generations of brothers and sisters who inspired to get in good trouble.

It was a blessing to have known Congressman Lewis, and I know his light will continue shining bright in the courage and conviction of the American people. As we lay our friend to rest, the torch of justice shines bright.

Let us honor Congressman Lewis by continuing his fight.

Rest in power, my friend.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentle

man from New Jersey (Mr. RASKIN).

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, I thank Ms. CLARK for organizing this beautiful observance and testimony to our beloved colleague. It is an honor to praise John Lewis, not the Congressman, but John Lewis the gentleman from SNCC, the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, a relative handful of students who began a process that transformed America forever and brought down the walls of American apartheid and Jim Crow through the extraordinary force of their physical courage, their moral courage, and their political courage to confront an entire system of racism bearing down upon them.

The end of their struggle was nonviolence, to create a nonviolent society committed to justice and equality for everyone, and the means of arriving at that nonviolent society was nonviolence itself. So even as the sheriffs and police officers unleashed the German shepherds and the billy clubs on them, the water hoses and the tear gas, they still remained remarkably nonviolent the entire way there.

I asked John Lewis when we got to travel down South on the civil rights tour with the Faith and Politics Institute about where he thought things were. I think he felt that, in terms of civil rights, we have been moving things forward, but in terms of violence, we still had not remotely turned the corner.

I said, what is going to make the difference? He said: When people realize that violence doesn’t work. Leaving aside the morality of it, violence doesn’t work.

We talked about the Vietnam war. We talked about the Iraq war. We talked about gun violence sweeping the
streets. And we talked about domestic violence.

I want to say that the spirit and the memory of John Lewis live in this body and this institution, which loves him. But I see the spirit of John Lewis today in the streets with the hundreds of thousands and millions of young Americans who are demanding non-violent, just, and peaceful transformation of our society. John Lewis lives in the young people today, and he would be so proud of the young people of America.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Madam Speaker, it is difficult to close such a remembrance and a celebration, and we will never close the chapter on our friendship, admiration, and reverence for John Lewis. But John Lewis, for me, has always been the embodiment of the words of Micah 6. John has shown us what is good: to love justice, love mercy, and walk humbly with your God.

Rest in peace, power, and glory, Brother John.

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

---

**LEAVE OF ABSENCE**

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. GRIFFITH (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today on account of health concerns.

---

**PUBLICATION OF BUDGETARY MATERIAL**

**REVISION TO THE AGGREGATES, ALLOCATIONS, AND OTHER BUDGETARY LEVELS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2021**

**COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, Washington, DC, July 22, 2020.**

**MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (CBA), the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (BBEDCA), and the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2019 (BBA), I hereby submit for printing in the Congressional Record a revision to the aggregates and allocations set forth in the statement of aggregates, allocations, and other budgetary levels for fiscal year 2021 published in the Congressional Record on May 1, 2020.

This revision is for allowable adjustments for amounts for wildfire suppression, program integrity, Overseas Contingency Operations, and disaster relief, pursuant to section 251(b) of BBEDCA, as provided in bills reported by the Committee on Appropriations. The amounts for wildfire suppression are contained in the text of H.R. 7612, the Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2021. The amounts for program integrity are contained in the text of H.R. 7614, the Department of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2021. The amounts for Overseas Contingency Operations are contained in the text of H.R. 7617, the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2021. Finally, the amounts for disaster relief are contained in the texts of H.R. 7668, the Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Act, 2021 and H.R. 7669, the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2021.

Accordingly, I am revising aggregate spending levels for fiscal year 2021 and the allocation for the House Committee on Appropriations for fiscal year 2021. For purposes of enforcing titles III and IV of the CBA and other budgetary enforcement provisions, the revised aggregates and allocations are to be considered as aggregates and allocations included in the budget resolution, pursuant to the statement published in the Congressional Record on May 1, 2020.

Questions may be directed to Jennifer Wheelock or Raquel Spencer of the Budget Committee staff.

JOHN YARMUTH

---

**TABLE 1.**—REVISION TO ON-BUDGET AGGREGATES—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(on-budget amounts, in millions of dollars)</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2021–2030</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current Discretionary Allocation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BB</td>
<td>1,375,000</td>
<td>1,451,628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OT</td>
<td>2,950</td>
<td>1,722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revision for Program Integrity (H.R. 7614):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BB</td>
<td>1,881</td>
<td>1,512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OT</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revision for Disaster Relief (H.R. 7668):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BB</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OT</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised Discretionary Allocation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BB</td>
<td>5,060</td>
<td>1,365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OT</td>
<td>1,384,434</td>
<td>1,457,837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Law Mandatory:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BB</td>
<td>1,172,696</td>
<td>1,332,443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OT</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED**

The Speaker announced her signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 4148. An act to extend the Chemical Facility Anti-Terrorism Standards Program of the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes.

S. 4209. An act to amend title IX of the Social Security Act to improve emergency unemployment relief for governmental entities and nonprofit organizations.

**ADJOURNMENT**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 4(b) of House Resolution 967, the House stands adjourned until 9 a.m. tomorrow for morning-hour debate and 10 a.m. for legislative business.

Thereupon (at 9 o’clock and 50 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, July 23, 2020, at 9 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

**BUDGETARY EFFECTS OF PAYGO LEGISLATION**

Pursuant to the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (PAYGO), Mr. YARMUTH hereby submits, prior to the vote on passage, the attached estimates of the costs of H.R. 7573, a bill to direct the Architect of the Capitol to replace the bust of Roger Brooke Taney in the Old Supreme Court Chamber of the United States Capitol with a bust of Thurgood Marshall to be obtained by the Joint Committee on the Library and to remove certain statues from areas of the United States Capitol which are accessible to the public, to remove all statues of individuals who voluntarily served the Confederate States of America from display in the United States Capitol, and for other purposes, as amended, for printing in the Congressional Record.
MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

183. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 11, to memorialize the United States Congress and the Louisiana congressional delegation to remove the revenue sharing cap on the funds of the Mexico Energy Security Act of 2006 for Gulf producing states and to take such actions as are necessary to rectify the federal revenue sharing inequities between energy producing states; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

186. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 6, to memorialize the United States Congress and the Louisiana congressional delegation to take such actions as are necessary to rectify the federal revenue sharing inequities between energy producing states; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY

STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements, are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Ms. BASS:

H.R. 7718. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 7719. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8, the VIIIth Amendment of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. CISNEROS:

H.R. 7720. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8, of the United States Constitution

By Mr. CRABOT:

H. Res. 1061. A resolution condemning war crimes committed in Idlib, Syria, by the regime of Bashar Al-Assad and its backers and calling for a political solution to the Syrian civil war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. ENGEL:

H.R. 7721. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. RAUBER:

H.R. 7722. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. CISNEROS:

H.R. 7723. A bill to prohibit the use of Federal funds to implement, administer, or enforce the Presidential Memorandum on Excluding Illegal Aliens From the Apportionment of Federal Benefits, following the 2020 Census, issued on July 21, 2020; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. MOORE (for herself and Mr. ESTES):

H.R. 7725. A bill to amend part D of title IV of the Social Security Act to allow States to use incentive payments provided under the child support enrollment program to improve parent-child relationships, increase child support collections, and improve outcomes for children by supporting parenting time agreements for noncustodial parents in uncontested agreements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. MURCIEL-POWELL:

H.R. 7726. A bill to permit child care providers that receive payment for services provided under the of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 to use a portion of such payment to purchase personal protective equipment, be necessary to improve the health of participating children and child care workers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PAPPAS (for himself, Mr. PALAZZO, and Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire):

H.R. 7727. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to ensure that grants provided by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs for State veterans’ cemeteries do not restrict the use of remainments of certain deceased members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces in such cemeteries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee (for himself, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mrs. RADWENGEN, Mr. BOST, and Mr. McHUGH):

H.R. 7728. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish presumptions of service-connection for members of the Armed Forces on active duty under certain circumstances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Ms. Matsu, Mr. TONKO, Mr. CARDENAS, and Mr. TRONE):

H.R. 7729. A bill to establish the position of Interagency Coordinator for Behavioral Health to coordinate the programs and activities of the Federal Government relating to mental health, and for other purposes; to the Committees on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. MENG (for herself, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. COOPER, Mr. Vela, Mrs. SHALALA, Mr. PAYNE, Mrs. Napolitano, Mr. Espaillat, Mr. Gallego, Ms. LOPRESTI, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. RUSH, Ms. NORTON, Mr. NAJIBI, Ms. HAALAND, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. Watson Coleman, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. Ocasio-Cortez, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Miss Rice of New York, Ms. SCHOLZ of Illinois, Mr. WELCH, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. POCAN, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. Lee of California, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. GOMRI, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. CUPP, Ms. SCOTT, Mr. WATSON, Mr. DAVIS of California, Mr. Deutch, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. MENG, Mr. PAPPAS, Mrs. BRATTT, Ms. KELLY of Mississippi, Ms. SHALALA, Ms. SCANLON, Ms. BROWNLY of California, and Mr. MUFUME):

H.R. 7730. A bill to extend the special air traffic rule for civil helicopters operating VFR along the North Shore, Long Island, New York, to require the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration to promulgate a new special air traffic rule, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. VAN DREW:

H.R. 7731. A bill to promote workforce recovery through the provision of additional training services, investment in treatment activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ (for herself, Mr. HASTERT, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. MENG, Mr. PAPPAS, Mrs. BRATTT, Ms. KELLY of Mississippi, Ms. SHALALA, Ms. SCANLON, Ms. BROWNLY of California, and Mr. MUFUME):

H.R. 7732. A bill to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services, acting through the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, to carry out a national campaign to increase awareness and knowledge of the virus that causes COVID-19; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution.

By Ms. MOORE:
H.R. 7725.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL:
H.R. 7726.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. FAPPAS:
H.R. 7727.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee:
H.R. 7728.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution, which states “[t]he Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States”.

By Mr. RUIZ:
H.R. 7729.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution, Congress has the power “to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.”

By Mr. SUOZZI:
H.R. 7730.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution, Congress has the power “to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.”

By Mr. VAN DREW:
H.R. 7731.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution.

By Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ:
H.R. 7732.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution.

By Ms. MOORE:
H.R. 7733.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution.

By Ms. MOORE:
H.R. 7734.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 596: Mr. PENCE, Ms. HOUHANAN, Mr. FULCHER, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. CORREA, Mr. REED, Mr. TAYLOR, and Mr. Hurd of Texas;

H.R. 1074: Mr. GARCIA of Illinois;

H.R. 1164: Mr. FOSTER;

H.R. 1255: Mr. PINKER;

H.R. 1434: Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina;

H.R. 1636: Mr. REED and Ms. DEGETTE;

H.R. 1799: Mr. UPTON;

H.R. 2150: Mr. RASKIN;

H.R. 2350: Mr. BITER;

H.R. 2442: Mr. SERRANO, Mr. BONAMICI, Mr. HECK, Mr. UPTON, and Ms. STAUBER;

H.R. 2633: Mr. SAN NICOLAS;

H.R. 2858: Mr. STRUBE;

H.R. 2908: Mr. KIHANNA;

H.R. 3711: Mr. TRONE;

H.R. 4052: Ms. LOUPHEN, Ms. SCANLON, and Ms. DEGETTE;

H.R. 4104: Ms. SHERILL, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. BECKER, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mrs. TRAHAAN, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. ESCOBAR, Mr. ROSE of New York, Mr. CONNOLLY, and Mr. FITZPATRICK;

H.R. 4236: Mr. PRESSLEY;

H.R. 4248: Mr. FINKENAUER;

H.R. 4549: Mr. MILLER;

H.R. 4764: Mr. HECK and Mr. TRONE;

H.R. 4903: Mr. WALTZ;

H.R. 5002: Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. KIND, and Mr. PRICE of Georgia;

H.R. 5306: Mr. GROTHMAN and Mr. SOTO;

H.R. 5416: Mr. CARTWRIGHT;

H.R. 5602: Mr. KIND;

H.R. 6129: Mr. TRONE;

H.R. 6144: Mr. TRONE;

H.R. 6297: Mr. KATKO;

H.R. 6364: Mr. HERRERA BEUTLER;

H.R. 6384: Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. COHEN, Mrs. LURIA, and Mr. SAN NICOLAS;

H.R. 6561: Mr. DEUTCH;

H.R. 6666: Mr. SAN NICOLAS;

H.R. 6697: Mr. KELLY of Mississippi;

H.R. 6692: Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana and Mr. ZELDIN;

H.R. 6699: Mr. SERRANO;

H.R. 6693: Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania;

H.R. 6690: Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania;

H.R. 6692: Mr. SAN NICOLAS;

H.R. 6975: Mr. GARCIA of Illinois;

H.R. 7019: Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana;

H.R. 7023: Mr. ROSEN;

H.R. 7058: Mr. COSTA and Mr. LAHOOD;

H.R. 7061: Mrs. HARTZLER;

H.R. 7079: Mr. REED;

H.R. 7092: Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. YOUNG, Ms. DE LAURO, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, and Mr. ENOCH;

H.R. 7153: Ms. HOULAHAN, Mr. PETERS, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. SOTO, Mr. NEUSE, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Ms. GARCIA of Texas;

H.R. 7197: Mr. KURLIN, Ms. DEAN, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. CLAY, Ms. MATSU, and Mr. LOWENTHAL;

H.R. 7200: Mr. KELLER;

H.R. 7211: Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina;

H.R. 7224: Mr. ROCICLEMAN;

H.R. 7229: Mr. TRONE and Mr. SOTO;

H.R. 7321: Mr. VAN DREW;

H.R. 7530: Mr. NAPOLITANO, Ms. HAALAND, and Mr. MOULTON;

H.R. 7328: Mr. COSTA;

H.R. 7334: Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee;

H.R. 7349: Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee;

H.R. 7355: Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee;

H.R. 7414: Mr. CARTWRIGHT and Mr. DEUTCH;

H.R. 7433: Ms. NORTON, Ms. KAPUTR, and Mr. CARDENAS;

H.R. 7436: Mr. SOTO;

H.R. 7512: Mr. LATTA;

H.R. 7536: Ms. BROWNLEY of California;

H.R. 7580: Mr. CASE and Mr. THOMPSON of California;

H.R. 7521: Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. POSEY, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. COHEN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. EVANS, Ms. TLAIB, and Ms. KAPUTR;

H.R. 7531: Ms. NORTON;

H.R. 7556: Mrs. HAYES;

H.R. 7677: Mr. SOTO;

H.R. 7562: Mr. KIND;

H.R. 7586: Mr. GOLDEN;

H.R. 7658: Ms. NORTON;

H.R. 7677: Mr. WELCH, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CARSON of California, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Ms. KELLY of Illinois;

H.R. 7679: Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. BALDERSON, and Mr. CONWAY;

H.R. 7859: Ms. BARRAGÁN;

H.R. 7706: Mr. WELCH, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CARSON of California, Mr. BALDERSON, Mr. FLORES, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. BROWNLEY of California, and Mr. RYAN;

H.R. 7716: Mr. THOMAS of Pennsylvania, Mr. MEUSER, Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee, and Mr. WALKER;

H.R. 7714: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania;

H.R. 7798: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina;

H.R. 1042: Mr. PAYNE, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. BRATTT, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Ms. KELLY of Illinois;

H.R. 1043: Mr. SAN NICOLAS;

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII, petitions and papers were laid on the clerk’s desk and referred as follows:

121. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the House of Representatives, with the signatures of 366 Members, relative to the resolution addressing the dire need for direct funding from the federal government to state, town, village, and city governments to assist in alleviating some of the financial distress caused by the COVID-19 global pandemic, to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

122. Also, a petition of Mr. Gregory D. Watson, a citizen of Austin, TX, relative to respectfully requesting enactment of Federal legislation that would completely halt the issuance of H-1B visas and Optional Practical Training visas — or renewals of such visas — to immigrants and aliens during periods of decline in the Gross Domestic Product of the United States, during periods in which the nationwide unemployment rate in the United States exceeds 5%, or during periods of a Presidentially-declared public health emergency in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. GRASSLEY).

PRAYER
The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal spirit, grant to this Nation and to all people a social conscience built on the vision of the ancient prophets who saw sufficiency for every person and a time when anxiety would overcome chaos and hopelessness. Hasten the day when the small and weak can make their contributions alongside the great and powerful. Lead us to the day when we will see peace among the Nations of the Earth, when swords shall be beaten into plowshares. Use the Members of this body to bring us to the time when Your will is done on Earth, even as it is done in Heaven.

Lord, we trust You with our future. Let Your glory cover the Earth as the waters cover the sea.

We pray in Your mighty Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. Loeffler). The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I ask permission to speak for 1 minute in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SREBRENICA
Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, there is an area in Bosnia that goes by the name of Srebrenica. This month is the 25th anniversary of a massacre that took place there. It happens to be the worst genocide on European soil since the Holocaust.

Twenty-five years ago, 8,000 Bosnians were murdered out of ethnic and religious hatred. Many Bosnians, who witnessed this horrific atrocity, became refugees and found a home in my State of Iowa. We must remember for those Bosnians, Iowans, and for all Bosnians who suffer as they continue to deal with unimaginable memories. It is also important for the rest of us to make a point of remembering what has happened so we can prevent it from happening again.

I yield the floor. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT
Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, this week, the Senate will pass the 60th annual National Defense Authorization Act. Every year, this legislation lets the Senate make our top priorities for protecting our homeland, our allies, and our global interests into law, and, certainly, the recent behavior of our adversaries world over shows why this task is as urgent as ever.

Even as our Nation is focused on fighting the pandemic at home, our servicemembers have contended with dangerous behavior from would-be competitors all around the world. The Russian military has kept probing the bounds of U.S. airspace, and Putin’s regime has kept its sights on cyber war and destabilization by proxy.

China continues to treat international commercial law as its own private pond, choke freedom and autonomy out of Hong Kong, and try to ethnically cleanse Xinjiang.

Both countries continue to modernize their military capabilities from sea to space. And Iranian meddling, North Korean saber-rattling, and the persistent violence of terrorist groups like ISIS and al-Qaida demand our attention as well.

Amid these threats and many others, the American people and the entire free world look to the men and women of the U.S. military to preserve order and peace. The open and bipartisan process led by Chairman INHOFE and Ranking Member REED has produced strong legislation that will advance their missions.

It is the product of intense committee work; it contains more than 200 bipartisan amendments; and it builds on the historic progress which this administration and this Republican Senate have secured over the past 3 years.

After years of cuts to our military that weakened readiness, imperiled modernization, and called into question our commitment to preserving our global interests, we have reversed the tide. We have invested in strength. We built a new national defense strategy and are investing in rebuilding and modernizing our military to help achieve it.

This legislation will carry the progress even further—more support for defense research and innovation, resources for military housing and healthcare, tools to deepen our commitments with regional partners in Europe and the Pacific.

For most Americans, investing in the greatest fighting force in the world is not controversial. It is a no-brainer. But lest we forget, the radical energy
on the far left is sparking some truly extraordinary behavior among our Democratic colleagues.

Case in point, later today, we will vote on an amendment that was advertised in an opinion essay by the junior Senator from Vermont titled “Defund the Pentagon: The Liberal Case.” This is the junior Senator from Vermont—an essay titled “Defund the Pentagon: The Liberal Case.”

You heard correctly. We have moved on from defunding local police to defunding the U.S. Armed Forces. Maybe we will be sending social workers on overseas deployments, when they aren’t too busy responding to violent crimes. I am not sure. Senator Sanders’ amendment would literally decimate the defense budget. It would rip 10 percent of it right out and pour the money into all the socialist fantasies—free rent, free college, free everything for everyone.

Now, in light of the long-held views of our Senate about the Caspian Sea, the Liberal Case is the junior Senator from Vermont, a proponent of American principles or American history. Progress means fulfilling our values, not attacking them. Yet a group of radicals—sounding the alarm on this culture war—is the Liberal Case in point. The Liberal Case in point, later today, we will vote on an amendment that was advertised in an opinion essay by the junior Senator from Vermont titled “Defund the Pentagon: The Liberal Case.”

FREE SPEECH

Mr. McConnell. Madam President, on a final matter, since the spring, our Nation has engaged in important conversations about racial justice in policing.

Most people understand that continuing our Nation’s tremendous progress toward justice does not mean battling against American principles or American history. Progress means fulfilling our values, not attacking them. Yet a group of radicals—sounding the alarm on this culture war—is the Liberal Case in point. The Liberal Case is the junior Senator from Vermont, a proponent of American principles or American history. Progress means fulfilling our values, not attacking them. Yet a group of radicals—sounding the alarm on this culture war—is the Liberal Case in point. The Liberal Case in point, later today, we will vote on an amendment that was advertised in an opinion essay by the junior Senator from Vermont titled “Defund the Pentagon: The Liberal Case.”

You heard correctly. We have moved on from defunding local police to defunding the U.S. Armed Forces. Maybe we will be sending social workers on overseas deployments, when they aren’t too busy responding to violent crimes. I am not sure. Senator Sanders’ amendment would literally decimate the defense budget. It would rip 10 percent of it right out and pour the money into all the socialist fantasies—free rent, free college, free everything for everyone.

Now, in light of the long-held views of our Senate about the Caspian Sea, the Liberal Case is the junior Senator from Vermont, a proponent of American principles or American history. Progress means fulfilling our values, not attacking them. Yet a group of radicals—sounding the alarm on this culture war—is the Liberal Case in point. The Liberal Case in point, later today, we will vote on an amendment that was advertised in an opinion essay by the junior Senator from Vermont titled “Defund the Pentagon: The Liberal Case.”

You heard correctly. We have moved on from defunding local police to defunding the U.S. Armed Forces. Maybe we will be sending social workers on overseas deployments, when they aren’t too busy responding to violent crimes. I am not sure. Senator Sanders’ amendment would literally decimate the defense budget. It would rip 10 percent of it right out and pour the money into all the socialist fantasies—free rent, free college, free everything for everyone.

Now, in light of the long-held views of our Senate about the Caspian Sea, the Liberal Case is the junior Senator from Vermont, a proponent of American principles or American history. Progress means fulfilling our values, not attacking them. Yet a group of radicals—sounding the alarm on this culture war—is the Liberal Case in point. The Liberal Case in point, later today, we will vote on an amendment that was advertised in an opinion essay by the junior Senator from Vermont titled “Defund the Pentagon: The Liberal Case.”

You heard correctly. We have moved on from defunding local police to defunding the U.S. Armed Forces. Maybe we will be sending social workers on overseas deployments, when they aren’t too busy responding to violent crimes. I am not sure. Senator Sanders’ amendment would literally decimate the defense budget. It would rip 10 percent of it right out and pour the money into all the socialist fantasies—free rent, free college, free everything for everyone.

Now, in light of the long-held views of our Senate about the Caspian Sea, the Liberal Case is the junior Senator from Vermont, a proponent of American principles or American history. Progress means fulfilling our values, not attacking them. Yet a group of radicals—sounding the alarm on this culture war—is the Liberal Case in point. The Liberal Case in point, later today, we will vote on an amendment that was advertised in an opinion essay by the junior Senator from Vermont titled “Defund the Pentagon: The Liberal Case.”

You heard correctly. We have moved on from defunding local police to defunding the U.S. Armed Forces. Maybe we will be sending social workers on overseas deployments, when they aren’t too busy responding to violent crimes. I am not sure. Senator Sanders’ amendment would literally decimate the defense budget. It would rip 10 percent of it right out and pour the money into all the socialist fantasies—free rent, free college, free everything for everyone.

Now, in light of the long-held views of our Senate about the Caspian Sea, the Liberal Case is the junior Senator from Vermont, a proponent of American principles or American history. Progress means fulfilling our values, not attacking them. Yet a group of radicals—sounding the alarm on this culture war—is the Liberal Case in point. The Liberal Case in point, later today, we will vote on an amendment that was advertised in an opinion essay by the junior Senator from Vermont titled “Defund the Pentagon: The Liberal Case.”

You heard correctly. We have moved on from defunding local police to defunding the U.S. Armed Forces. Maybe we will be sending social workers on overseas deployments, when they aren’t too busy responding to violent crimes. I am not sure. Senator Sanders’ amendment would literally decimate the defense budget. It would rip 10 percent of it right out and pour the money into all the socialist fantasies—free rent, free college, free everything for everyone.

Now, in light of the long-held views of our Senate about the Caspian Sea, the Liberal Case is the junior Senator from Vermont, a proponent of American principles or American history. Progress means fulfilling our values, not attacking them. Yet a group of radicals—sounding the alarm on this culture war—is the Liberal Case in point. The Liberal Case in point, later today, we will vote on an amendment that was advertised in an opinion essay by the junior Senator from Vermont titled “Defund the Pentagon: The Liberal Case.”

You heard correctly. We have moved on from defunding local police to defunding the U.S. Armed Forces. Maybe we will be sending social workers on overseas deployments, when they aren’t too busy responding to violent crimes. I am not sure. Senator Sanders’ amendment would literally decimate the defense budget. It would rip 10 percent of it right out and pour the money into all the socialist fantasies—free rent, free college, free everything for everyone.

Now, in light of the long-held views of our Senate about the Caspian Sea, the Liberal Case is the junior Senator from Vermont, a proponent of American principles or American history. Progress means fulfilling our values, not attacking them. Yet a group of radicals—sounding the alarm on this culture war—is the Liberal Case in point. The Liberal Case in point, later today, we will vote on an amendment that was advertised in an opinion essay by the junior Senator from Vermont titled “Defund the Pentagon: The Liberal Case.”

You heard correctly. We have moved on from defunding local police to defunding the U.S. Armed Forces. Maybe we will be sending social workers on overseas deployments, when they aren’t too busy responding to violent crimes. I am not sure. Senator Sanders’ amendment would literally decimate the defense budget. It would rip 10 percent of it right out and pour the money into all the socialist fantasies—free rent, free college, free everything for everyone.

Now, in light of the long-held views of our Senate about the Caspian Sea, the Liberal Case is the junior Senator from Vermont, a proponent of American principles or American history. Progress means fulfilling our values, not attacking them. Yet a group of radicals—sounding the alarm on this culture war—is the Liberal Case in point. The Liberal Case in point, later today, we will vote on an amendment that was advertised in an opinion essay by the junior Senator from Vermont titled “Defund the Pentagon: The Liberal Case.”

You heard correctly. We have moved on from defunding local police to defunding the U.S. Armed Forces. Maybe we will be sending social workers on overseas deployments, when they aren’t too busy responding to violent crimes. I am not sure. Senator Sanders’ amendment would literally decimate the defense budget. It would rip 10 percent of it right out and pour the money into all the socialist fantasies—free rent, free college, free everything for everyone.

Now, in light of the long-held views of our Senate about the Caspian Sea, the Liberal Case is the junior Senator from Vermont, a proponent of American principles or American history. Progress means fulfilling our values, not attacking them. Yet a group of radicals—sounding the alarm on this culture war—is the Liberal Case in point. The Liberal Case in point, later today, we will vote on an amendment that was advertised in an opinion essay by the junior Senator from Vermont titled “Defund the Pentagon: The Liberal Case.”

You heard correctly. We have moved on from defunding local police to defunding the U.S. Armed Forces. Maybe we will be sending social workers on overseas deployments, when they aren’t too busy responding to violent crimes. I am not sure. Senator Sanders’ amendment would literally decimate the defense budget. It would rip 10 percent of it right out and pour the money into all the socialist fantasies—free rent, free college, free everything for everyone.

Now, in light of the long-held views of our Senate about the Caspian Sea, the Liberal Case is the junior Senator from Vermont, a proponent of American principles or American history. Progress means fulfilling our values, not attacking them. Yet a group of radicals—sounding the alarm on this culture war—is the Liberal Case in point. The Liberal Case in point, later today, we will vote on an amendment that was advertised in an opinion essay by the junior Senator from Vermont titled “Defund the Pentagon: The Liberal Case.”

You heard correctly. We have moved on from defunding local police to defunding the U.S. Armed Forces. Maybe we will be sending social workers on overseas deployments, when they aren’t too busy responding to violent crimes. I am not sure. Senator Sanders’ amendment would literally decimate the defense budget. It would rip 10 percent of it right out and pour the money into all the socialist fantasies—free rent, free college, free everything for everyone.

Now, in light of the long-held views of our Senate about the Caspian Sea, the Liberal Case is the junior Senator from Vermont, a proponent of American principles or American history. Progress means fulfilling our values, not attacking them. Yet a group of radicals—sounding the alarm on this culture war—is the Liberal Case in point. The Liberal Case in point, later today, we will vote on an amendment that was advertised in an opinion essay by the junior Senator from Vermont titled “Defund the Pentagon: The Liberal Case.”

You heard correctly. We have moved on from defunding local police to defunding the U.S. Armed Forces. Maybe we will be sending social workers on overseas deployments, when they aren’t too busy responding to violent crimes. I am not sure. Senator Sanders’ amendment would literally decimate the defense budget. It would rip 10 percent of it right out and pour the money into all the socialist fantasies—free rent, free college, free everything for everyone.
Well, you can guess what happened next. The grievance industrial complex came after the letter itself. The authors were accused of advancing bigotry and the cycle of nonsense started all over again. The United States of America needs free speech. We need free expression. And all of us, from all perspectives, need the courage to speak up and defend it.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2021—Resumed

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 4049, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 4049) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Inhofe amendment No. 2301, in the nature of a substitute.

McConnell (for Portman) amendment No. 2800 (to amendment No. 2301), to require an element in annual reports on cyber science and technology activities on work with academic consortia on high priority cybersecurity research activities in Department of Defense capabilities.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

CORONAVIRUS

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, Democrat Senators returned to Washington on Monday prepared to work in a bipartisan way on the next phase of coronavirus relief.

After standing for months while COVID-19 surged in more than 40 States, Senate Republicans finally said that the end of July, more than 3 months after the CARES Act passed—would be the time for another emergency bill. But here we are. It is in the middle of the week, and the Republican Party is so disorganized, chaotic, and unprepared that they can barely cobble together a partisan bill in their own conference.

Indicative was Leader McConnell’s speech. He rants and raves about the New York Times and cancel culture, but there is not a word about COVID. People are ready to lose their unemployment benefits, to lose their apartments and be evicted. Local governments are laying off people because they don’t have the dollars. We are in a national crisis.

We don’t hear a word out of Leader McConnell as we are on the edge of so many cliffs. Instead, there is a lot of talk about the New York Times and cancel culture. That may be fodder for the far right. That is not what America needs.

When Leader McConnell, at this crucial moment, can’t even mention COVID-19, it shows what a knot the Republicans are tied in. The bottom line is this: The White House Chief of Staff said Republicans “were on their own 20 yard line” when it comes to their legislative proposal—their own 20-yard line. A few days after we passed the COVID-19 bill, after millions more Americans applied for unemployment, after many small businesses went under, and many more died and were hospitalized as COVID-19 rages in the Southern States. We are still on the 20-yard line? Where have the Republicans been?

I have never seen a political party in the middle of a crisis so tied in a knot that the majority leader can’t even mention it in his speech and spends time ranting against favorite targets of the far right and can’t come up with a proposal.

This is not a game. This isn’t typical Republican incompetence and reckless delay. Even after all of these months, the White House, and Senate Republicans are starkly divided about what to do. The White House is insisting on policies, like a payroll tax cut, that would do nothing to help millions of unemployed Americans and that many Senate Republicans don’t even support. The Republicans can’t even seem to agree on whether to provide any new aid for State and local governments or if the States should be able to more flexibly use the support we have already given. A few days after the other side of the aisle hardly want to spend any more money to help our country in this once-in-a-generation crisis because it might add to the national debt, giant corporate tax cuts—$1.5 trillion to $2 trillion in addition to $2 trillion for fights over the largest public health crisis in a century and forestalling a depression is a bridge too far?

Where are the priorities on the other side of the aisle? I guess they are for helping big corporate fat cats—wealthy people—but not average people who are hurting. That is the trouble with the Republican Party.

Seriously, there are only 3 weeks left until the August work period, and the Republicans are still in the opening phases of preparing their bill. We don’t have time for this mess that the Republicans are in. The moratorium on COVID–19 aid that we passed in the CARES Act expires in 2 days. The Wall Street Journal reports that nearly 12 million adults live in households that missed their last rent payments and that 23 million have little or no confidence in their ability to make the next ones.

Next week, the enhanced unemployment benefits we passed in the CARES Act will expire while 20 to 30 million Americans will still be without work. A recent study showed that those enhanced benefits prevented nearly 12 million Americans from slipping into poverty—12 million. Yet, because the Republicans can’t get their act together, those benefits might expire soon.

Congress needs to act quickly. The Senate Republicans and the White House need to get on the same page, produce a proposal—not just drop it on the floor but start negotiations. Better yet, we could start negotiations on the Heroes Act, which already passed the House, and, unlike the developing Republican proposal, it would actually match the scale of this crisis.

Speaker Pelosi and I met yesterday with Chief of Staff Meadows and Secretary Mnuchin. Even with all of this chaos, we have had some indications about what the Republicans are trying to do in their bill. Over the weekend, we heard that the administration was trying to block additional funding for coronavirus testing and contact tracing. President Trump has also ended the CDC’s data collection efforts, potentially risking access to data that public health experts so vitally need.

So, when we met with Chief of Staff Meadows and Secretary Mnuchin, Speaker Pelosi and I told them to back off these counterproductive and dangerous ideas. In addition, we will be sending a letter to the administration to demand answers on how data is being reported to the White House, as well as pushing for legislation in the upcoming bill to ensure that COVID-19 data is fully transparent and accessible without there being any interference from the administration.

We know Donald Trump likes to hide the truth. He thinks, when the truth doesn’t come forward and when he muzzles government officials, that it changes things. It doesn’t. The virus still rages and will rage unless we do something about it, not simply hide the statistics that show his depth in morally reprehensible policies.

We know that the President has made those statistics public so all of America, including the President, will know how bad the situation is, because that is what we need—the truth to set us free and then to act on it. Let me repeat: If the administration refuses to reverse course, the Democrats will insist on data transparency in the next COVID relief bill.
All of our efforts to bolster the economy, help the unemployed, save small businesses, and ensure our children are safe at school will be meaningless if we don’t stop the spread of the virus. Hiding COVID data from the CDC, as well as foot-dragging on more testing and tracing, is incomprehensible and imperils everything else we are working on. So we need to make a law, and we need to make it soon. Right now, the infighting and partisanship on the Republican side and cockamamie ideas for hiding data from the CDC, are only adding to the delay.

We also saw the return of President Trump’s coronavirus press briefings yesterday. It is remarkable that President Trump has lowered the bar so much that his performance yesterday was seen as a change in tone. It is a very sad state of affairs in our country when one day of the President’s reading statistics is hailed as leadership when that is what he should have been doing all along. The mere acknowledgment by the President that COVID-19 is raging through our country is some kind of breakthrough. Is that what people believe? Is that what Trump wants the people to believe? It is crazy.

The mere time the President takes the podium, he is a risk to public health. We are 6 months into the coronavirus, and the President has only just come around to the idea that wearing masks would be a good idea. He did not do it for crisis, or for crisis, for public admission, not praise. We are 6 months into the crisis, and the President said yesterday that his administration is in the process of developing a strategy that is going to be very, very powerful—6 months in. Countries in Europe and East Asia developed national testing regimens ages ago. That is why they are way ahead of us in fighting this crisis.

Americans must be hanging their heads in shame and disbelief that this administration is still trying to sort out the basics. Then, when he says he is going to try and sort out the basics months and months too late, as the crisis has raged, people think he should get praise? No, he should be criticized because he hasn’t done what he was supposed to have been doing for months.

President Trump started his press conference by labeling COVID-19 the “China virus,” which shows the President is still trying to deflect blame and play political games with this deadly, serious virus—games that are divisive. The truth is, more than anything or anybody else, the responsibility for America’s failure to deal competently with COVID-19 falls squarely on President Trump’s shoulders. It is long past time for the President to start acting like it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic Leader, Mr. DURBIN, Madam President, I read this morning that more Americans have died in the last 3 months than in any 3-month period in the history of the United States. That is a stunning statistic. We are searching the records to make sure that it is an accurate statement, and I am afraid it is.

So far, we believe 140,000 Americans have died of this COVID-19 crisis that we are facing. This is not a moment of American greatness. They have just done a review of the nations across the world and the safety of living in those nations that face this pandemic. Where does the United States rank among the nations of the world in terms of safety in dealing with the coronavirus? It ranks 58th—two ranks ahead of Russia. How could we have reached this moment in time when this pandemic has been so devastating in the United States, more so than in many other countries around the world—countries that are supposedly not even close to us in terms of economic development and strength? They have handled this far better than the United States. Yet what are we doing about it now? It is a valid question.

I know that the President has decided he doesn’t want the likes of Dr. Tony Fauci by his side any longer. The President尽情了他不喜欢的任何科学家—no scientist, but Dr. Fauci and Dr. Collins, of the National Institutes of Health, were interviewed over the weekend and were asked directly about the issue of testing.

Why do we take so long in the United States to get results, and what kind of problems does that create?

Well, we know. If people suspect they are positive for this virus and go in for a test, they are worried that they may be endangering their own lives, not to mention the lives of others. Then, they have to wait 1 day, 2 days, 3 days, 6 days—more—for the test results. That is unacceptable. We need to invest more money in testing and more money is needed tests to provide quicker results.

You would think that it would be obvious to everyone, but it is not obvious in this negotiation that is taking place now in the U.S. Senate. There are Republican Senators who are resisting the idea of putting more money into testing in the United States. What country do they live in? Can they imagine the lives of others? Then, they have to wait 1 day, 2 days, 3 days, 6 days—for the test results. That is unacceptable. We need to invest more money in testing and more money is needed tests to provide quicker results.

We are serious about opening this economy, if we are serious about stopping the spread of this pandemic, and if we are serious about opening our schools and making certain that teachers and pupils are safe, we need more testing. Yet here we are, tied in knots, as Senator SCHUMER said earlier.

The Republicans can agree among themselves about the issue of putting money into testing in the midst of this pandemic. It is hard to believe. It was more than 2 months ago that the House of Representatives passed the Heroes Act. Senator MCCONNELL has come to the floor regularly to ridicule that effort because he doesn’t like the provisions in the act. It is his right to have a difference of opinion, but the obvious question to Senator MCCONNELL is this: Where is your alternative? What have you been doing for the last 2 months? You should have been writing a bill that we should be voting on as soon as we finish the one that is pending on the floor.

The White House and the Senate Republicans can’t come to any agreement about how to move forward. There are some who are basically saying: Enough. We are not going to waste any more money on any type of COVID-19. I have seen their testimony. I have seen their statements before the microphones. That is hard to imagine.

I wonder if some of the Senators from states like Kentucky who have stood by and let millions of their people die, would have stood up and said, “We have spent enough money on this,” have been home recently. Have they been there to meet people who are unemployed, out of work, or who have been laid off? Do they even know what is left to take care of your family?

As for the last Federal unemployment payment under the CARES Act, Senator SCHUMER is right. It ends on July 31, a week from Saturday. We have been told that the last checks will be mailed this Saturday, which is just a few days from now. Three days from now, the last check goes out. While that check is making its way through the mail, is it even possible that the Republican leadership, with the White House, will come up with a proposal to deal with this? It has been 2 months. Senator MCCONNELL said, during those 2 months, that he didn't feel any sense of urgency—no sense of urgency. Can you imagine the sense of urgency if you can’t make your mortgage payment? Can you imagine the sense of urgency if that utility bill is so large you can’t pay it? That is the reality facing a lot of families who have been laid off and are unemployed. I believe—and many agree—that one of our highest priorities is to make sure that the resources are there for the families.

I also want to say that we are in the midst of this conversation about public health while the President and his party are trying to kill the Affordable Care Act in the Supreme Court. More
Madam President, I have been honored to work on the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee since December of 2012, when Senator Joan Inouye was the legendary Senator from Hawaii and recipient of a Congressional Medal of Honor, passed away. Since I have taken that job, I have been impressed many times over by the extraordinary Department of Defense, and the abiding commitment to women and men in uniform, who make so many great sacrifices for our country. But I have also discovered at the same time how poorly we manage the Department of Defense. Our procurement system seems designed to generate red tape, delays, and cost overruns. Our top admirals are spending the world developing one-armed bandit technologies at a fraction of the cost that it takes us to develop them. There is going to be an amendment on the floor today about future spending in the Department of Defense. Senator McConnel had to say about it earlier. He seems to believe that any suggestion that there is misspending in the Department of Defense is not patriotic. Somehow you are a chicken if you raise any questions about waste in the Department of Defense. I couldn’t disagree more. The Sanders amendment proposes a 10-percent budget cut in the Department of Defense. Well, I have taken a long look at the failed audits, the cost overruns, and the sclerotic bureaucracy at the Department of Defense. I believe the American taxpayer deserves more.

One of my early hearings in the Department of Defense was on the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee focused on the defense industrial base and the threat of sequestration. The lives of our servicemembers often depend on the equipment and training provided. When managed well, the defense industrial base generates the best equipment, next-generation technology, good jobs, and powerful weapons. However, I am concerned that holding defense contractors accountable for poor performance has not been the priority it should be today.

Listen to this: From 2016 to 2019, military spending rose by 18 percent. During the same period of time, the Department of Defense accumulated $18 billion in cost overruns for weapons development. Who generated those cost overruns? The top five defense contractors in America saw their profits increase by 44 percent in that same period. This doesn’t add up. Businesses have the right to earn a profit, but taxpayers have the right to demand accountability. With defense spending on such a steep rise, we should be driven by the motto “pay for performance.” I don’t believe that is the culture at the Department of Defense today.

Senator Sanders wants to direct $74 billion to communities across the country—including many needy communities in my State of Illinois—for housing, healthcare, childcare, education, and jobs. Senator McConnell comes to the floor and calls that socialism. Socialism when it comes to education and childcare? I don’t agree with him.

There is considerable merit to what Senator Sanders has to say about the run-up in cost at the Department of Defense, but I do not agree with his basic approach of across-the-board cuts. When you start exempting things like military pay and healthcare, it means the remaining items take a deeper hit. The 14-percent cut that has been proposed for the remaining items at the Department of Defense would be a much harder hit, I think, and I have questions about it. As I have said many times, sequestration didn’t work, and we ought to learn a lesson from it.

The National Guard should not have a 14-percent cut. Special victims count, that would be a significant blow. Violence prevention programs should not be cut by 14 percent. Instead, we ought to look at the Department of Defense budget more carefully, not with an across-the-board cut.

Let’s start with the $16 billion OCO gimmick. OCO is the account created to fight a war. We started this account years and years ago, when we actually were engaged in a war. We have kept it on the books this day because it is a way to escape budget rules. The OCO gimmick funds were requested for routine Army, Navy, and Air Force operations that have nothing to do with fighting a war in Afghanistan. Many other defense functions would take $8 billion or more out for his medieval wall on the southern border of the United States.

The $18 billion in weapons systems overruns that I mentioned earlier—what could we do with $18 billion in cost overruns? Well, you could increase the budget for the National Institutes of Health medical research by almost 50 percent. That is one thing. You could provide student loan forgiveness for healthcare workers who pay more than $18 billion in cost overruns that I mentioned earlier. You could provide student loan forgiveness for these same men and women who risk their lives for us every day.

I have to tell you, there is need for us to look to space in terms of our future defense. I still haven’t been sold on this concept of the so-called Space Force. Putting millions of dollars into additional bureaucratic costs is hard for me to understand or explain.

Ultimately, the Sanders amendment is going to be considered in this authorization bill, but it is not anywhere in concept, it will be in the Appropriations Committee, where I serve. Our work as appropriators is to examine the details of the budget and make the best decisions for the taxpayers and for our national defense. I believe Senator Sanders is on the right track to demand accountability and to ask that we find cost overruns and expenditures that can be changed without jeopardizing our national defense. His exact approach is not one that I would endorse, but I have to say that I stand behind his concept that we need to ask harder questions about this massive spending.
Mr. REED. Madam President, I rise to comment, along with my colleague Senator DURBIN, about the Sanders amendment. I would commend thoughtful and knowledgeable Senator DURBIN is about all these subjects. He has pointed out how there are too many military programs that are not well moderated and that have cost overruns that result in excess costs to the American public. We have to do something about those things, and we also understand that we have huge demand with respect to nondefense spending that we have to meet also.

The Sanders amendment, as Senator DURBIN pointed out, would impose an across-the-board cut to the Department of Defense, except for military personnel accounts and the defense health programs. What he would call a 10-percent across-the-board cut, when you have both civil and personnel and comes really a 14-percent cut to all the accounts at the Department of Defense.

The danger, as so well illustrated by Senator DURBIN, is that this type of indiscriminate getting rid of the good and the bad that has not really work. It doesn’t make sense. It reminds us all of the battles we had over sequestration, where Departments—not only the Department of Defense but the civilian Departments—had to fund programs because they met the cap and then cut other programs that were much more valuable because they exceeded the cap. That is not a way, as they proverbially say, to run a railroad, nor the Department of Defense.

So we do have to look for specific areas to cut, and, as Senator DURBIN said, a great deal of that is done and will be done in the Appropriations Committee where he is the ranking member. I am a colleague on the committee, and each year we have the challenge of taking the authorization that says “you may do this” and actually putting in the money to do it, and that effort is usually valuable, as is the authorization effort, and critically important.

We have to make sure that a result of our deliberations is, first, the resources that are necessary to protect the men and women in the Armed Forces who protect us and also provide for the quality of life of their families and, ultimately, of course, that we are able to deter any threat, and if not, defeat that threat decisively.

This is a very important endeavor, and, again, suggesting that we just cut across the board and then put it somewhere else is not, I think, commensurate with the kind of approach that we must take and we have to take going forward. A further factor, too, is that there are real ramifications for this that are not sometimes obvious. There are literally thousands and thousands—not just military personnel but civilian workers and construction workers and equipment manufacturing workers—who, in this indiscriminate, across-the-board cut, would lose their jobs at a time when we can’t lose any jobs. This approach would be disruptive. I would not want to make a point to the distinguished Senator from Vermont and thousands of men and women who are working hard to take care of their families all across this country.

Again, we do have to make serious investments in communities across this country that have been neglected, and I have been consistent in support of those efforts. We do have to make investments in our infrastructure for our economic liability and our economic efficiency. We do have to provide support in many, many different ways that transcends and goes beyond just the Department of Defense. In fact, one could say that just as vital a part of our national defense as our military budget is our education budget and our healthcare budget because our strength is not just military forces; our strength is knowledgeable citizens, our strength is healthy citizens, and our strength is an efficient economic system.

But I think this approach, as I suggested today and I think the suggestion from Senator DURBIN also was that just this across-the-board approach is good for a headline, it is good to make a point, but we are here to make a plan, and I hope we do make a plan.

I hope we can continue in this National Defense Authorization Act to try to argue about issues that people feel are not appropriate spending or if, in fact, we need more spending and that in the appropriations process we will do that once again.

Just as a reminder, this bill adheres to the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2019. It is the final year of the Budget Act. So the numbers we are talking about in the National Defense Authorization Act are not willy-nilly; they were not negotiated without the context of nondefense spending. It was a bipartisan agreement to set the levels of spending for both defense and nondefense, and that is what we are doing here today.

We need a serious discussion about national spending priorities, not just defense spending priorities but priorities that look back to poor communities, industrial policy, infrastructure, education, daycare, the impact of artificial intelligence on the workplace. We have a lot to do, and I think we should get on to doing it but not with the shorthand message of “let’s cut everything here, and put it over there.” Let’s look at the serious issues, and let’s confront them, and let’s propose serious solutions.

So because of these indiscriminate cuts, I will be forced to oppose this amendment by Senator SANDERS.

There is another amendment that will come up proposed by Senator TESTER, and that is one I do support. Senator TESTER’s amendment will add additional diseases to those that the Veterans Administration already presumes are the result of exposure to Agent Orange by veterans during their military service in Vietnam.

We know that exposure to the toxic chemical Agent Orange has had severe health consequences for the Vietnam veterans who answered the Nation’s call to military service during the Vietnam conflict. Recognizing this, the Veterans Administration already presumes that certain diseases affecting these veterans are service connected as a result of the exposure to Agent Orange. These diseases include non-Hodgkin’s lymphoma, soft tissue sarcoma, respiratory cancers, myeloma and type 2 diabetes.

We also know that there are other diseases that are not yet covered and that there are veterans who suffer from these diseases, and this conclusion is supported by a scientific review by the National Academy of Medicine. Parkinson’s, bladder cancer, and hypothyroidism should share the same presumption of service connection as the diseases already presumed to be service connected.

Our Vietnam veterans should not have the burden of proving by independent evidence that their diseases were caused by exposure to Agent Orange. The failure to add these conditions to the Veterans Administration’s presumptive list continues to deny sick and aging veterans the healthcare and compensation that they have earned through service to our Nation and that they desperately need.

Senator TESTER’s amendment begins to remedy this inequity, and I urge all Senators to vote for the Tester amendment.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Sasse). The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, in about an hour we are going to take a vote that our servicemembers around the world will likely be watching. It is a critical vote on the amendment of my colleague from Vermont to blindly cut defense spending, taking a hatchet to the already agreed-upon Bipartisan Budget Act.

We have heard from my colleague Jack Reed from Rhode Island, who is part of the strong leadership on the Armed Services Committee and just spoke out against it, and I am going to speak out against it.

I am going to spend some time explaining what this means. This is not just one amendment. This has national implications, and if you are watching in America, I want you to think about what is really going on here.

First of all, my colleague from Vermont says that it is a 10-percent cut, but it is going exempt military personnel and healthcare accounts—which is true as part of the amendment—but it is actually going to come to the other cuts, so it is actually a 14-percent cut to the Department of Defense. That is the amendment we are going to vote on.
To paraphrase one of our great Presidents, Ronald Reagan: There they go again. There they go again.

I chair the Subcommittee on Readiness of the Armed Services Committee. One of the reasons I ran for the Senate in 2004 was because I wanted to be part of that team of military readiness. As a colonel in the U.S. Marine Corps Reserve, I had a little bit of an up close and personal view on it.

The readiness of our Armed Forces in the summer of 1950 was plummeting. In the second term of the Obama administration, defense spending was cut by 25 percent, and, with that, the readiness of the men and women in the military plummeted. By the way, at the same time, defense spending was cut by 25 percent, Russia was increasing defense spending by 34 percent, and China was increasing by 83 percent.

So let me just give an example. These numbers were classified, and they have been declassified. In 2015, when I arrived in the Senate, these were some of the numbers relating to readiness. Remember, we are supposed to be in charge of readiness here. Three of the combat teams in the U.S. Army—the brigade combat team is the 5,000 men and women deployed block in our military, and 3 of the 58 were at the tier 1 level of readiness that you want for a deployed unit. You can understand why that was classified in 2015 because we certainly didn’t want our adversaries to know that. So 5 percent of the U.S. Army was fully ready to fight. Less than half of Marine Corps Navy aviation could fly—another classified number, now unclassified. Training and flight time for all military pilots plummeted.

When I arrived in 2015, the Obama administration proposed a cut of another 40,000 Active-Duty troops for the U.S. Army. One of the units they were looking to cut was the 4th Brigade of the 25th Infantry Division—the 4-25 at JBER in Alaska, the only airborne combat team in the Asia Pacific. I put every ounce of my energy into fighting that misguided decision. The 4-25 was not cut, thankfully. All the rest of the 40,000 were cut. We are still digging out of that hole.

So I want to throw something out there because people don’t think about it. Imagine if there had been a major contingency or, yes, a war in 2015 with these readiness numbers. Sometimes wars hit us when we are least expecting them. I am going to talk about that.

I want to talk about that. It would have been very ugly—not only for our national security but more importantly for our troops—for the men and women we are supposed to make sure are trained. No man or woman ever have to go into a fair fight, so we know they are always going to win.

We just celebrated the 70th anniversary of the outbreak of the Korean war on June 25, 1950. I am a bit of a Korean war history buff. I will tell you this: What we didn’t celebrate was actually what happened in the summer of 1950 at the outbreak of the Korean war.

Here is what happened. The greatest military power in the world in 1945 was the U.S. military. We had just won World War II. By 1950, due to dramatic defense cuts, lack of training, lack of readiness, our military had a very difficult time halting the invasion of a third-world army, the North Korean army.

For the history buffs who understand Korean war history—the military certainly knew it. Task Force Smith was. It was the first American unit that went in to stop the North Korean army. Task Force Smith was obliterated. Hundreds were killed in the summer of 1950. As a matter of fact, thousands. A third of young Americans died horrible deaths during the summer of 1950 because the leadership in Congress, the leadership in the executive branch, and the leadership in the Pentagon let the readiness of our Armed Forces plummet. That; that hasn’t happened in 70 years ago right now—if you look back 70 years ago in the summer of 1950 on the Korean Peninsula—thousands of young Americans were being killed because they weren’t trained and they weren’t ready.

This was probably one of the biggest derelictions of duty in U.S. history. Because it is a forgotten war, not many people know about it. But it was a dramatic failure of leadership in the Congress, the executive branch, and the military. The military even has a saying for this: “No more Task Force Smith.” We will never ever—ever—let our young men and women go fight a war where they are unprepared, and because of that, they die.

I agree we need to do all we can to address many of the social issues that my colleague from Vermont highlights, particularly during this pandemic. But we need to understand why that was classified in 2015 because we certainly didn’t want our adversaries to know that. So 5 percent of the U.S. Army was fully ready to fight. Less than half of Marine Corps Navy aviation could fly—another classified number, now unclassified. Training and flight time for all military pilots plummeted.

Now we have a Sanders amendment for across-the-board DOD cuts of 14 percent just as we are on the verge of getting back to readiness—ten times. No other bill in the last 5½ years, since I have been here, has been filibustered more than the Defense Appropriations bill.

Our friends in the media never report on this, but that is one of the issues that really burns me up here because it happens all the time. Trust me, our troops know it. They watch it, and they know it.

So let me just give an example. These numbers were classified, and they have been declassified. In 2015, when I arrived in the Senate, these were some of the numbers relating to readiness. Remember, we are supposed to be in charge of readiness here. Three of the combat teams in the U.S. Army—the brigade combat team is the 5,000 men and women deployed block in our military, and 3 of the 58 were at the tier 1 level of readiness that you want for a deployed unit. You can understand why that was classified in 2015 because we certainly didn’t want our adversaries to know that. So 5 percent of the U.S. Army was fully ready to fight. Less than half of Marine Corps Navy aviation could fly—another classified number, now unclassified. Training and flight time for all military pilots plummeted.

When I arrived in 2015, the Obama administration proposed a cut of another 40,000 Active-Duty troops for the U.S. Army. One of the units they were looking to cut was the 4th Brigade of the 25th Infantry Division—the 4-25 at JBER in Alaska, the only airborne combat team in the Asia Pacific. I put every ounce of my energy into fighting that misguided decision. The 4-25 was not cut, thankfully. All the rest of the 40,000 were cut. We are still digging out of that hole.

Here is the good news. With the Reynolds amendment, the Pentagon has finally happened. It took decades, but an audit of the Pentagon has finally happened. The Senate minority leader has recently come out in favor of the Sanders amendment. I wonder where Joe Biden is on the Sanders amendment.

Of course, as my colleague from Illinois just mentioned, the Pentagon must do a better job of managing waste and cost overruns. I fully agree with that. But in fact, the Trump administration was the first administration to finally undertake an audit of the Pentagon. Again, Democrats and Republicans on the Armed Services Committee pressed for it, and we finally got it. It took decades, but an audit of the Pentagon has finally happened.

Make no mistake, the Sanders amendment is the first salvo in the national Democratic leadership’s goal of defending the military across the board. If you don’t like the Sanders amendment, here is the POLITICO op-ed from Senator SANDERS about his amendment titled: “Defund the Pentagon: The Liberal Case.”
"Defund the Pentagon"—there they go again. This is a really important issue. I hope my colleagues on both sides of the aisle defeat this amendment overwhelmingly—overwhelmingly. The men and women of the military know when the next conflict is coming. We didn’t know that in the summer of 1950, the military was going to be rushed to the Korean Peninsula and would barely be able to hold its own. Thousands died because they weren’t ready because of defense cuts by the Congress and the executive branch and the Pentagon.

So this is an important vote. The lives of the men and women in our military and Hunter Learning could all depend on this vote, and I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to strongly reject it. I yield the floor.

"The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

REMEMBERING JIM POSEWITZ

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, before I call up my amendment and get to the issue of our veterans in this country, I want to say a few words about a good friend and a legendary Montana conservationist named Jim Posewitz, who passed away a few weeks ago.

He was a towering figure in Montana and in the history of conservation in our great state. He was a man who knew right from wrong, and Montanans know that he was almost always right and seldom wrong.

Poz’s accomplishments are too long to list, but any Montanan who fished in the Madison River, hiked in the Bob Marshall Wilderness, or birded in the Republic of Montana’s Rocky Mountain Front, owes a deep debt of gratitude to Poz’s more than 30 years of work for the Montana Fish, Wildlife, and Parks and to his post-retirement work as a conservation advocate, ethicist, and leader.

The Wilderness Act of 1964 says that America’s wildest places are those where man himself is a visitor. He was a man who knew right from wrong, and Montanans know that he was almost always right and seldom wrong.

The Wilderness Act of 1964 says that America’s wildest places are those where man himself is a visitor. He was a man who knew right from wrong, and Montanans know that he was almost always right and seldom wrong.

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, before I call up my amendment and get to the issue of our veterans in this country, I want to say a few words about a good friend and a legendary Montana conservationist named Jim Posewitz, who passed away a few weeks ago.

He was a towering figure in Montana and in the history of conservation in our great state. He was a man who knew right from wrong, and Montanans know that he was almost always right and seldom wrong.

Poz’s accomplishments are too long to list, but any Montanan who fished in the Madison River, hiked in the Bob Marshall Wilderness, or birded in the Republic of Montana’s Rocky Mountain Front, owes a deep debt of gratitude to Poz’s more than 30 years of work for the Montana Fish, Wildlife, and Parks and to his post-retirement work as a conservation advocate, ethicist, and leader.

The Wilderness Act of 1964 says that America’s wildest places are those where man himself is a visitor. He was a man who knew right from wrong, and Montanans know that he was almost always right and seldom wrong.
this is not authorized—but if they feel that strongly, they should tell their Republican leadership to allow the appropriations bill to come up so they can actually vote on the Defense bill. Right now, this is just idle chatter when they object to Senator Sanders’ amendment and yet they’re unwilling themselves to actually vote up or down on the appropriations bill for not only the Department of Defense bill but the other Departments. The Sanders amendment, after all, maintains full support for the personnel needs of the Department of Defense, as well as the critical medical research supported throughout the Department. It would also take some of the Department’s sweeping budget and reserve it for underfunded domestic needs. This is long overdue.

I again call on my Republican colleagues to stop talking about the money you want or don’t want to spend. Tell the Republican leader to allow your provisions bills to come to the floor and vote up or down.

REMEMBERING JOHN LEWIS

Mr. President, on another issue, I have had such an incredibly heavy heart since I heard Friday night my dear friend and hero, John Lewis passed away. I stand here on the Senate floor today to talk about him.

When I got a call at our home in Vermont late that night, my wife, my son, and I just sat there and talked about John for hours and cried. We knew America lost a genuine hero—an unwavering lodestar who, over decades of selfless activism and public service, drew us closer to our ideals.

I remember when he invited me in to watch actually a sit-in by Democratic Members in the House of Representatives when the Republican Speaker had closed down the House for them to have votes. He saw me outside, and I asked him what is going on, and he said: You are my brother.

He took me by the arm, brought me in, and sat me down in the well of the House to watch what was going on. I was always humbled and honored to be called his brother, as he often did when we were together, including an unforgettable visit he had with us in Vermont just last year.

I have been thinking so much of what we can say, and there aren’t enough words—there certainly aren’t—in paying tribute to a man whose life was defined by the relentless and fearless pursuit of equality. John bled, literally, and his bones were broken, literally, for the cause of civil rights. He came to Congress bearing those scars—a living, breathing reminder that our society’s progress on racial equality came through the sacrifices of heroes like him.

In Congress, John Lewis stood with equal moral clarity, serving as its conscience and reminding us that our work to build a genuinely equal and just society remains unfinished. His thundering words just months ago echo even more loudly today. He said:

When you see something that is not right . . . you have a moral obligation to say something. To do something. Our children and their children will ask us, “What did you do on that day?”

That is a question all of us must ask ourselves.

VOTING RIGHTS ADVANCEMENT ACT

Mr. President, there is one thing I am doing today that I want to share with my fellow Senators and Americans today. I am reintroducing the Voting Rights Advancement Act, and we are renaming it the John Lewis Voting Rights Advancement Act.

This is bipartisan legislation. It has 47 Senate cosponsors. It would safeguard what John fought for over a lifetime to achieve: equality at the voting booth. The bill would restore the Voting Rights Act to end the scourge of minority voter suppression.

Now, the House already passed a companion to the John Lewis Voting Rights Advancement Act in December. Now let’s do our part. We can’t claim to honor the life of John Lewis if we refuse to carry out his life’s work. Of course, if we stand in the way of that work, that would be the wrong thing to do.

So I would urge my fellow Senators, join me in calling on Senator McConnell to allow a vote up or down on the John Lewis Voting Rights Advancement Act in December.

Let’s do that for John, but let’s not do it simply because it is named after him but because it is precisely what John would do. And if we have a moral compass, we should do it and take action to forge a more perfect Union, protect our democracy, and above all, do what is right.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 1788, and I ask that it be reported by number.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment by number.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. Sanders] for himself and Mr. Murray, proposers, proposes an amendment numbered 1788 to amendment No. 2901.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To reduce the bloated Pentagon budget by 10 percent and invest that money in jobs, education, health care, and housing in communities in the United States in which the poverty rate is not less than 25 percent)

At the end of subsection A of title X, add the following:

SEC. 47. REDUCTION IN AMOUNT AUTHORIZED TO BE APPROPRIATED FOR FISCAL YEAR 2021 BY THIS ACT; ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAM TO REDUCE POVERTY AND INVEST IN DISTRESSED COMMUNITIES.

(a) In General.—The amount authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2021 by this Act—

(i) the aggregate amount authorized to be appropriated for military personnel and the Defense Health Program; minus

(b) ALLOCATION.—The reduction made by subsection (a) shall—

(1) apply on a pro rata basis among the accounts and funds for which amounts are authorized to be appropriated by this Act (other than military personnel and the Defense Health Program);

(2) be applied on a pro rata basis across each program, project, and activity funded by the account or fund concerned; and

(3) be used by the Secretary of the Treasury to carry out the grant program described in subsection (c).

(c) GRANT PROGRAM.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the Department of the Treasury a grant program through which the Secretary of the Treasury shall, in coordination with the Secretary of Education, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, provide grants to eligible entities in accordance with the requirements of this subsection.

(2) APPLICATION.—An eligible entity that desires a grant under this subsection shall submit to the Secretary of the Treasury an application in such form and containing such information as the Secretary may require.

(3) PURPOSES.—

(A) PERMISSIBLE PURPOSES.—An eligible entity that receives a grant under this subsection may use the grant funds for any of the following:

(i) To construct, renovate, retrofit, or perform maintenance with respect to an affordable housing unit, a school, a childcare facility, a community health center, a public hospital, a library, or a clean drinking water facility if any such building or facility is located within the jurisdiction of the eligible entity.

(ii) To remove contaminants, including lead, from infrastructure with respect to the provision of drinking water if that infrastructure is located within the jurisdiction of the eligible entity.

(iii) To replace, renovate, or remove rented, subsidized, or blighted property that is located within the jurisdiction of the eligible entity.

(iv) To hire public school teachers to reduce class size at public schools within the jurisdiction of the eligible entity.

(v) To increase the pay of teachers at public schools within the jurisdiction of the eligible entity.

(vi) To provide nutritious meals to children and parents who live within the jurisdiction of the eligible entity.

(vii) To provide free tuition to residents within the jurisdiction of the eligible entity to attend public institutions of higher education, including vocational and trade schools.

(viii) To provide rental assistance to residents within the jurisdiction of the eligible entity.

(ix) To reduce or eliminate homelessness within the jurisdiction of the eligible entity.

(B) IMPERMISSIBLE PURPOSES.—An eligible entity that receives a grant under this subsection may not use the grant funds—

(i) to construct, maintain, or operate any site, facility, or complex other than a permanent housing facility, including a prison or a jail; or

(ii) to purchase a vehicle for a law enforcement agency.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection—

(A) the term “eligible entity” means—

(i) a county government with respect to a high-poverty county; or

(ii) a city or municipal government within the jurisdiction of which there are not fewer than 5 high-poverty neighborhoods; and

(ii) a city or municipal government within the jurisdiction of which there are not fewer than 5 high-poverty neighborhoods; and
Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I thank Senator LEAHY for his support of our amendment, for his beautiful words on John Lewis, and for his insistence that we be sure that every American has the right to vote. That is where the American people are today: loss of jobs, loss of income, 50 million have filed for unemployment, and 87 million people are uninsured or underinsured, that is not a good economy. When half of our workers live paycheck to paycheck, not surprisingly, when you live paycheck to paycheck, and the paycheck stops coming in, you are in financial distress. That means that your economic situation goes from poverty, from their apartments or will lose their homes to foreclosure. That means that you go hungry. It means that you may become homeless. It means that when you get sick, you no longer have health insurance or the income to see a doctor. That is not what I would call a good economy. When over half a million Americans are homeless and 18 million families spend at least half of their incomes on housing, that is not a good economy. When 40 percent of our people do not have the savings to pay for a $500 emergency, that is not what I call a good economy. When over half a million Americans are homeless and 18 million families spend at least half of their incomes on housing, that is not a good economy. When 40 percent of our people do not have the savings to pay for a $500 emergency, that is not what I call a good economy.

What the pandemic has taught us is that a relatively low unemployment rate, which is what we had before the pandemic, does not adequately guarantee for the security and well-being of working families. When tens of millions of our people earn starvation wages, that is not a good economy. When 40 percent of our people do not have the savings to pay for a $500 emergency, that is not what I would call a good economy. When over half a million Americans are homeless and 18 million families spend at least half of their incomes on housing, that is not a good economy. When 40 percent of our people do not have the savings to pay for a $500 emergency, that is not what I would call a good economy. When over half a million Americans are homeless and 18 million families spend at least half of their incomes on housing, that is not a good economy. When 40 percent of our people do not have the savings to pay for a $500 emergency, that is not what I would call a good economy.

Further, over the last few months, hundreds of thousands of Americans have taken to the streets to demand justice for the murders of George Floyd, Breonna Taylor, Rayshard Brooks, and Ahmad Arbery, among many others, and to end the rampant police brutality that we see in America today. These tragic killings of unarmed African Americans have highlighted the urgent need to rethink the nature of policing and to fix a broken and racist criminal justice system. On top of all of that—on top of a pandemic, on top of an economic collapse, on top of systemic racism—we have to address the existential threat facing this planet of climate change.

A few weeks ago, temperatures in Siberia—the coldest region on Earth—topped 100 degrees, shattering records. If we do not get our act together and transform our energy system away from fossil fuel and into renewable energy, we will be leaving this planet in increasingly unhealthy and uninhabitable for our kids and future generations.

That is where we are today: hunger, homelessness, racism, a warming and dangerously warming climate. These are the issues that we have to focus on. Our attention must be on improving the lives of ordinary Americans—working people, lower income people—and not the lives of the top 1 percent of the wealthiest people in the world. If we are going to protect the working families of this country who are now under so much stress, it is absolutely imperative that we change our national priorities.

The status quo and conventional wisdom that we see on TV every day and that we hear on the floor of the Senate is no longer good enough. History has overtaken us. Unprecedented crises have overtaken us. The status quo is not good enough. We must respond.

We must finally have the courage to stand up to powerful special interests and all of their campaign money and understand that we cannot allow these people to continue to have so much power over the economic and political life of this country, that we can start developing policies that work for working families, not just the rich, but just the powerful, and not just those who contribute to super PACs.

Fifty-three years ago, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., challenged our country to fight against three major evils: “The evil of racism, the evil of poverty, and the evil of war.” That was what Dr. King said 53 years ago. And if there were ever a moment in American history when we need to respond to Dr. King’s clarion call for justice and demand, as he stated, “a radical revolution of values,” now is that time. This is the moment for us to bring about what Dr. King called “a radical revolution of values,” what he was fighting against systemic racism and police brutality, whether it is transforming our energy system away from fossil fuel, whether it is ending a cruel and dysfunctional healthcare system, or addressing the grotesque level of income and wealth inequality in our country, now is the time for change, real change.

In my view, given all of the unprecedented crises our country faces, now is not the time to increase the Pentagon’s bloated $740 billion budget, which is 53 percent of all discretionary spending in America. Let me repeat that. The military budget alone is 53 percent of all discretionary spending in this country. That is not the time to be spending more on national defense than we did at the height—the height—of the Cold War or the wars in

The current crisis, or series of crises, have revealed the extraordinary inequities in our economy. If people didn’t know it before, they surely know it now.

In the United States today, over half of our $300 billion pay gap, that is not what I would call a good economy. Not surprisingly, when you live paycheck to paycheck, and the paycheck stops coming in, you are in financial distress. That means that your economic situation goes from poverty, from their apartments or will lose their homes to foreclosure. That means that you go hungry. It means that you may become homeless. It means that when you get sick, you no longer have health insurance or the income to see a doctor. That is not what I would call a good economy. When over half a million Americans are homeless and 18 million families spend at least half of their incomes on housing, that is not a good economy. When 40 percent of our people do not have the savings to pay for a $500 emergency, that is not what I would call a good economy.

What the pandemic has taught us is that a relatively low unemployment rate, which is what we had before the pandemic, does not adequately guarantee for the security and well-being of working families. When tens of millions of our people earn starvation wages, that is not a good economy. When 40 percent of our people do not have the savings to pay for a $500 emergency, that is not what I would call a good economy. When over half a million Americans are homeless and 18 million families spend at least half of their incomes on housing, that is not a good economy. When 40 percent of our people do not have the savings to pay for a $500 emergency, that is not what I would call a good economy.

Further, over the last few months, hundreds of thousands of Americans have taken to the streets to demand justice for the murders of George Floyd, Breonna Taylor, Rayshard Brooks, and Ahmad Arbery, among many others, and to end the rampant police brutality that we see in America today. These tragic killings of unarmed African Americans have highlighted the urgent need to rethink the nature of policing and to fix a broken and racist criminal justice system. On top of all of that—on top of a pandemic, on top of an economic collapse, on top of systemic racism—we have to address the existential threat facing this planet of climate change.

A few weeks ago, temperatures in Siberia—the coldest region on Earth—topped 100 degrees, shattering records. If we do not get our act together and transform our energy system away from fossil fuel and into renewable energy, we will be leaving this planet in increasingly unhealthy and uninhabitable for our kids and future generations.

That is where we are today: hunger, homelessness, racism, a warming and dangerously warming climate. These are the issues that we have to focus on. Our attention must be on improving the lives of ordinary Americans—working people, lower income people—and not the lives of the top 1 percent of the wealthiest people in the world. If we are going to protect the working families of this country who are now under so much stress, it is absolutely imperative that we change our national priorities.

The status quo and conventional wisdom that we see on TV every day and that we hear on the floor of the Senate is no longer good enough. History has overtaken us. Unprecedented crises have overtaken us. The status quo is not good enough. We must respond.

We must finally have the courage to stand up to powerful special interests and all of their campaign money and understand that we cannot allow these people to continue to have so much power over the economic and political life of this country, that we can start developing policies that work for working families, not just the rich, but just the powerful, and not just those who contribute to super PACs.

Fifty-three years ago, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., challenged our country to fight against three major evils: “The evil of racism, the evil of poverty, and the evil of war.” That was what Dr. King said 53 years ago. And if there were ever a moment in American history when we need to respond to Dr. King’s clarion call for justice and demand, as he stated, “a radical revolution of values,” now is that time. This is the moment for us to bring about what Dr. King called “a radical revolution of values,” what he was fighting against systemic racism and police brutality, whether it is transforming our energy system away from fossil fuel, whether it is ending a cruel and dysfunctional healthcare system, or addressing the grotesque level of income and wealth inequality in our country, now is the time for change, real change.

In my view, given all of the unprecedented crises our country faces, now is not the time to increase the Pentagon’s bloated $740 billion budget, which is 53 percent of all discretionary spending in America. Let me repeat that. The military budget alone is 53 percent of all discretionary spending in this country. That is not the time to be spending more on national defense than we did at the height—the height—of the Cold War or the wars in
We don’t need more cruise missiles. We don’t need more nuclear weapons. We don’t need more fighter jets. What we do need in this country, desperately, is more healthcare, more housing, more childcare, and better schools.

Now is the time to fundamentally change our national priorities, and that’s not just about money. This amendment in itself is not going to do anywhere near what we need to do as a country, but it is an important step forward in changing the way we think about our needs.

Let me be clear. If we were to institute a 10-percent cut in military spending, that $74 billion could provide high-quality childcare to every family in America. Imagine that. We could solve the childcare crisis in America just by cutting the military budget by 10 percent.

We could, by cutting the military budget by 10 percent, provide section 8 housing vouchers to all of the 7.7 million families in America who are paying more than half of their limited incomes on rent.

A 10-percent cut to the Pentagon could provide a free college education for 2 million low-income students.

A 10-percent cut to the Pentagon is enough to hire 1 million teachers in the poorest schools in America.

So I am a little bit tired about hearing that we don’t have enough money for nuclear weapons, that we need more money for missiles, or tanks, and guns, and more and more for all of that. Yet we are turning our backs on Americans who are hurting the most.

I believe this is a moment in history when it would be a very good idea for all of my colleagues, Democratic and Republican, to remember what former President Dwight D. Eisenhower said in 1953. I think we all recall that Eisenhower knew something about military budgets and the way our military people end up being cloaked. This world in arms is not spending more than half of their limited incomes on rent.

Moreover, as the GAO has told us, there are massive cost overruns in the Defense Department’s acquisition budget that we continue to ignore year after year. According to the GAO, the Pentagon’s $1.8 trillion acquisition portfolio currently suffers from more than $628 billion in cost overruns, with much of the cost growth taking place after production.

A major reason why there is so much waste, fraud, and abuse at the Pentagon is the fact that the Defense Department remains the only Federal agency in America that has not been able to pass an independent audit. Many of us will recall what then-Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld—George W. Bush’s Secretary of Defense—told the American people on the day before 9/11. It never got a lot of attention—the day before 9/11. Rumsfeld said:
Our financial systems are decades old. According to some estimates, we cannot track $2.3 trillion in transactions.

I don’t know that the situation has changed very much since 2001 and 2003. Yet, more than 20 years after the 9/11 attacks, the Pentagon budget by 0 percent and invest in human needs here at home.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LANGFORD). The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I am proud to speak in support of my amendment with Senator SANDERS to prioritize investments in our communities over the Pentagon. I thank Senator SANDERS for his leadership on this issue, bringing forth this fundamental tension that exists within our society.

The men and women of the Armed Forces deserve our admiration, our respect, and our support. Day in and day out, they defend our country’s interests in all corners of the world, and their families sacrifice alongside them. But what makes America the envy of the world is not simply the strength of our military but the strength of our people.

And 2020 has brought historic challenges: a global pandemic, a growing recession, a reckoning on the systemic racism that pervades our country. We have also lost 5.4 million American workers lose their health insurance between February and May, leaving them even more vulnerable to a virus surging in every corner of this country.

The Sanders-Markey amendment states that we cannot afford, in this, our moment of national crisis, to spend three-quarters of a trillion dollars on bloated defense spending—spending that is supposed to protect or country yet did nothing to inoculate against the most profound public health emergency in a century.

This amendment is also in keeping with President Eisenhower’s warning, as Senator SANDERS said, that “we must guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by the military-industrial complex. The potential for the disastrous rise of misplaced power exists, and will persist.”

Persistence of Ike’s worst fears. In his address to the American people, President Eisenhower also predicted that a permanent arms industry would come to “call the shots.” After Japan surrendered aboard the USS Missouri in 1945, ending the Second World War, that permanent arms industry made its fixture. After we emerged victorious in a historic and ideological struggle against the Soviet Union that brought us to the brink of nuclear holocaust, Eisenhower’s feared permanent arms industry stuck around and retooled to advocate for new weapons to fight the endless war to come.

The catastrophic attacks of September 11 led to more than a doubling of the Pentagon’s budget. Multiple Presidents have stretched a limited authorization of military force to go after those responsible for the 9/11 attacks—to fight new enemies in new geographies, outside of Afghanistan.

All told, so far, we have spent $8.4 trillion in the wars in Afghanistan, Iraq, Syria, and other places since 2001. That is as this war now winds down, the defense industry is pushing for costly new acquisition programs to maintain superiority over China and Russia.

The forecasted “permanent arms industry” began to eat Pentagon accounts for half of the entire fiscal year 2021 U.S. discretionary budget. Our military budget is larger than the next 10 countries combined. Our battle fleet is larger than the next 13 navies combined, with 11 of those 13 navies represented by our allies or our partners.

However, every dollar spent on the Pentagon is one fewer available to fight the scourge of poverty in this country, to strengthen the social safety net and protect American families. Our communities have suffered while we spend ourselves into extreme U.S. military dominance.

The Pentagon budget we debate today shows us what we don’t prioritize giving him or her a quality education; shows mothers and fathers that, in the wealthiest country in the world, they will forever remain one illness away from financial ruin; shows a family that the dream of homeownership, much less affordable rental housing, will remain out of their grasp; shows frontline heroes working in hospitals and nursing homes in these communities. Trillions of dollars in defense spending did nothing to protect us from the coronavirus pandemic. The defense spending can’t protect us from the destruction of the environment and the worsening climate crisis.

Yet we are due to spend nearly 70 times more on defense than we will to protect against the next pandemic and other global health challenges.

We must no longer equate national security with our inventory of planes, missiles, and nuclear weapons system, and if coronavirus is truly a war, as President Trump says it is, he is duty-bound to embrace the fact that national security also means health, housing, and financial security, and national security means doing everything we can to save and improve lives in American communities, particularly communities of color, that have been neglected for too long and that have been the worst of the coronavirus impacts.

Our amendment begins that important work by making smart cuts of 10 percent to the budget of the Pentagon for this fiscal year and redirecting those funds to the Department of the Treasury to administer a grant program to strengthen vulnerable, low-income communities.
For example, in Massachusetts, we would be eligible to receive up to $1 billion in Federal funding to create jobs by building affordable housing, schools, childcare facilities, community health centers, public hospitals, libraries, and clean drinking water facilities, removing lead pipes and replacing blighted properties; to improve education by hiring more public school teachers to reduce class sizes, increasing teacher pay, providing universal nutritious meals, and providing free tuition to students at public colleges and universities, or trade schools; and to make housing more affordable by providing rental assistance and eliminating homelessness.

We should prioritize eradicating poverty, not war. We should prioritize battling global killer diseases, not developing a new weapon designed to eradicate the human race. It is time we funded education, not annihilation—Medicaid, not missiles.

What do we start to make Defense Department cuts? First, we must end the war in Afghanistan, which would save tens of billions of dollars. The time is long overdue to bring our men and women home. And it is time to double down on other tools of statecraft—diplomacy and development—to shape a better future for Afghanistan, particularly Afghan women.

As we work to put a stop to endless war and repeal the 2001 AUMF, the Pentagon must realign its budget to reflect the cold, hard wisdom of Ronald Reagan that “a nuclear war cannot be won and must never be fought.”

Reagan that “a nuclear war cannot be won and must never be fought.”

We, the undersigned Senators, in accord with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on amendment No. 2301 to Calendar No. 483, S. 4049, a bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal
year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

Mitch McConnell, Mike Crapo, Pat Roberts, John Cornyn, John Barrasso, Cory Gardner, Roy Blunt, Thom Tillis, Martha Blackburn, Mike Rounds, Shelley Moore Capito, Kevin Cramer, John Thune, James M. Inhofe, Jerry Moran, Jon Tester, John Hoeven, and John Boozman.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on amendment No. 2901 offered by the Senator from Oklahoma to S. 4049, a bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 87, nays 13, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 137 Leg.]

YEAS—87

Alexander
Baldwin
Barrasso
Bennet
Blackburn
Blumenthal
Brown
Brown
Burr
Cantwell
Capito
Cardin
Collins
Coons
Correa
Cortez Masto
Cotton
Cramer
Crapo
Cruz
Daines
Duckworth
Durbin
Enzi

NAYS—13

Booker
Gillibrand
Harris
Kennedy
Lee

Ms. ERNST. Mr. President, the coronavirus crisis has come with a label saying “Made in China,” but in the midst of Wuhan, China, has flooded the world just like so many products from China that we all now rely upon to protect ourselves against the spread of the con
tagion. The situation underscores the conundrum our Nation faces balancing the need to work with the Chinese Government and the challenges of holding the Communist Party accountable for its devious deeds.

Plain and simple: The Chinese Communist Party attempted to cover up the outbreak of COVID–19 from the very beginning and continues to do so today. Obfuscating the spread of the virus, the regime has fo
cused on containing knowledge of the outbreak, going so far as punishing Chinese scientists who dared to warn about the virus’s imminent danger.

As a result, we now face a worldwide pandemic that has claimed countless victims and could impact every aspect of our lives for months, if not years, to come. China doesn’t play by the rules. They constantly seek to undermine the law. And if you’re an Iowa farmer, they will tell you the same.

For years, China has stolen intellectual property and reneged on their trade agreements. While we have seen China still purchase some of our corn and soybeans, they haven’t completely held up their end of the deal when it comes to China phase one.

Folks, when China cheats on trade deals, the impact is real: American jobs are lost and wealth is transferred from the United States to the Communist Party of China. This is unacceptable, especially after the damage already caused to our economy by China’s mis
diagnosis of the coronavirus outbreak.

For decades, our leaders in Wash
ington played along, remaining quiet as China stole American intellectual property and scientific research, cheated on trade deals, and violated basic human rights. Those days are over.

President Trump is standing up to China by taking decisive actions against the Communist regime for its flagrant violation of trade deals and crackdown on the autonomy and rights of Hong Kong.

I have heard this from farmers in Iowa. They know that this President is standing up for them and pushing back on China. And here in the Senate, my colleagues and I are also holding China accountable.

Right now, I am laser-focused on de
creasing our dependency on China for critical supplies. The COVID–19 pandemic has been what a great awakening when it comes to the vul
nerabilities in our supply chain. The United States has become far too dep
dendent on Communist China for items like personal protective equipment, prescription drugs, and other essential medical supplies to fix that. And that is what I am fighting to do.

During my military service, includ
ing as a logistics battalion commander in the Iowa Army National Guard, I learned firsthand the importance of se
curing the defense supply chain. We cannot continue to rely on our ad
versaries, like China, for critically impor
tant national security materials.

That is why, in this year’s annual De
fense bill, I made it a priority to boost support for university research in places like Iowa to ensure we can make and manufacture metals and materials here at home. This will help make sure China doesn’t corner the world market on these materials.

Retaking our supply chain from Red China also means removing unneces
sary red tape imposed by Washington. I am working to waive the tax penalties for manufacturing and medical supply companies that choose to relocate to America.

I have also demanded the Treasury Department investigate how Chinese companies are avoiding taxes that U.S. businesses have to pay.

Iowans across the State have told me how much they appreciate this Presi
dent standing up for them by pushing back on the years of bad actions by the Communist Party. They also want to end our dependence on that same Communist regime.

Yes, we can and we should continue trading important agricultural prod
ucts. But at the same time, we should bring jobs back and make critical sup
plies ourselves so that when you look at a product’s label, it proudly reads “Made in the U.S.A.”

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sen
ator from Ohio.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President. I want to thank Senator ERNST for putting this colloquy together. What she just said with regard to the importance of having reliable sources here in America is absolutely right.

The supply chain issue is one that I hope we will address in this COVID package—for starters, with regard to our personal protective gear, the PPE, because if we can’t rely on having masks and gowns and other PPE made here in America, it is tough for us, par
ticularly during an international pan
demic like this, to build and rely on countries like China. Also, frankly, some of the product that comes from China has not been reliable itself.

I appreciate what you are doing there and also the work you are doing to en
courage us to be more resourceful here at home, to be sure we are doing the things we have to do to protect ourselves from foreign influence, including China.

Part of our issue with China, I think, is that for the last several years, a lot of us point fingers at China and we are not pointing fingers, frankly, at our in
ternal problems. We need to get our house in order here in America and protect ourselves better. We have legisla
tion to do that, which we just re
ported out of the Governmental Affairs Committee today. It has to do with this issue of China coming to the United States and systemically tar
geting promising research and promis
ing researchers, and saying: We would like to get that research.

The research is often supported by the U.S. taxpayer. It is sort of tough
here for us in America to lose our research and our innovation and our intellectual property to other countries. It is particularly tough when taxpayers pay for it, and $150 billion a year of taxpayer money goes to the National Institutes of Health, the National Science Foundation, and the Department of Energy to do basic research.

That is good. We have helped to develop important therapies and cures for some kinds of cancer. We helped to develop the internet. It has been very helpful to providing jobs and putting things together. A lot of great things have come out of that research.

But one thing that really troubles me is that for 20 years now, with China taking the lead and other countries, as well—Iran, North Korea, and others—they have again targeted these researchers and this research and said: We want to get that. And, frankly, they get it on the cheap because the research is being paid for by our tax dollars.

Let me give you an example of what I am talking about. Recently, in my home State of Ohio, there was a case along these lines. I applaud the FBI and the Department of Justice and our U.S. attorney who finally got on top of this issue. We spent a year studying this issue here in the Congress in what is called the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, which I chair. We found out that this was a huge problem and wrote a report late last year.

In the report, we implored our Federal law enforcement agencies to get on this issue. In fact, we had a hearing where an FBI agent testified and said that it is true. We haven’t been focused on this, and we have to make that up now.

They are making up for it. They are arresting a number of people. They are doing the things that should have been done to try to stop this stealing. In America, of our seed corn, our technology, our innovation, our intellectual property.

Here is the Ohio example. Recently, the FBI announced that it had arrested a researcher connected with the world-renowned Cleveland Clinic and Case Western Reserve University. This individual had received a huge grant from the National Institutes of Health, or NIH. That grant was for about $3.6 million. And then this same individual—of course, not telling NIH or telling Cleveland Clinic or Case Western or anybody else—had accepted money from China.

In the contracts that we were able to research during our investigation, these contracts with China say you are not allowed to reveal that you have this relationship with China, that you are getting the money from China. They not only gave this guy money—$3 million—but they gave him a deanship at Wuhan University. They gave him money to hire people in Wuhan. They gave him the ability to travel around America recruiting others. We think he recruited 30 or 40 people, according to the FBI.

Again, these are all allegations. His arrest has been made. He actually is alleged to have taken biological samples from Cleveland, OH, to China—this taxpayer money. And they are physically taking these to China. They also, by the way, provided lodging for him with a three-bedroom apartment in Wuhan. That is luxury.

This is about money. Unfortunately, this is something we have not patriots but instead are willing to sell us out by selling their research, their expertise that our taxpayers have funded to China and other countries.

NIH, recently, by the way, fired or forced the resignation of 54 researchers—not 1 or 2 or 3, but 54 people. We have been pushing them hard to find out who these people are and what they are doing. They haven’t been willing to do that. They have been working on this for a year or a matter under investigation. They have told us that of those who are under investigation at NIH, 90 percent have ties to China—90 percent.

Wake up, America. Here we are. We are in a situation where other countries, particularly China, have targeted American research. American researchers, and are now taking this back to China to benefit their military, to benefit their economy, and to benefit their healthcare system.

By the way, I do not believe this is for academic purposes. It is wrong what is happening, but it is even more wrong because this is not as if they are taking it back to China. It is taking it back to China to benefit their military, to benefit their economy, to benefit their healthcare system.

Let me tell you what the State Department told us at our hearing on this topic at the end of last year. They said: “The Chinese Communist Party has declared that they are going to develop a national security system to be on the front line of military-civilian fusion efforts for technology acquisition.”

This is our own State Department. This means there is a clear link between the research that is being taken in America and the latest advancement in China’s military and its economy. It has been happening for 20 years. It is time to put an end to it. The legislation that we were able to get through committee today takes a really important step in that direction. There are four or five elements of it.

One of the most important to me is giving the FBI and the Department of Justice the authority to stop any and all of these efforts. They have to go after these individuals by creating a new criminal law that says if you lie on these forms, if you are taking money from China, it is certainly a conflict of commitment and a conflict of interest. You can be taken to court and held accountable. Right now you can’t.

They are arresting these people on things like mail fraud, tax evasion. It is a little like how they used to go after gangsters before we had wire and mail fraud laws. They put it to racketeering and so on. This is something where we need to be sure that we are giving people the tools that they need.

We also help the State Department to keep these people out, and we help with regard to our universities to ensure that we are reporting and being transparent as to the money universities are receiving from China and other countries.

I thank my colleague from Iowa for having this colloquy. I see we have two other colleagues here. I know they are really well-versed and involved in these issues, and I want to hear from them, as well.

I just say that I hope, on a bipartisan basis—by the way, our legislation was bipartisan. Our investigation was bipartisan. I would say this is nonpartisan. This is an American issue. We should all be standing up to protect the American research enterprise and to be sure that our taxpayers, when they pay for this important research, have the benefit of it rather than its being taken, in particular, by China to benefit their military and their economy, but that’s not what is going on.

It is time to wake up. I yield to my colleague from Arizona.

Ms. MCSALY. I thank my colleague from Ohio and others here from Florida and Iowa for coming together to talk about this important American issue and national security issue.

I served 26 years in the military. In my last year in service and since then, I have seen the threat of the rise of China. It is a threat to America’s security, our jobs, and our role as a leader in the world. They are on a deliberate path to try to dominate the world and shape it into their vision. They need to be stopped.

When I was a cadet at the Air Force Academy, we had an honor code that said: “I will not lie, cheat, or steal, or tolerate among us anyone who does.” China has been lying, cheating, and stealing for far too long. Americans are now waking up to this threat and are resolved to change the trajectory and hold China accountable, but this can’t be done by us alone. Our European partners and others in the Pacific and elsewhere need to join with us and also wake up to China’s dangerous path and work with us to stop them.

We have been calling this geopolitical shift a return to “Great Power Competition,” as if to assume that China is the only bad actor under the same rules. We aren’t. China is playing by their own rules and cheating the system for their own gain and power. The Chinese Communist Party is a reckless, predatory adversary that is dedicated to subverting U.S. interests and supplanting our Nation as the world’s dominant leader.

Over the past 10 years, China has increased its military spending by 85 percent. Their investment in defense has been used to build their navy, expand their missile stockpile, and emerge as a leader in technologies like hypersonics, cyber warfare, and artificial intelligence.
This buildup has been far from defensive alone. From their illegal maritime claims among several sovereign states, then building artificial islands where they didn’t exist before to militarize them in the South China Sea with their maneuvers and exercises that are aggressive and bellicose interests.

Congress must do our part to respond to this threat. For these reasons, I introduced several pieces of legislation that immediately stopped China from taking advantage of government funds and taxpayer dollars to purchase products and services from Chinese companies with ties to Chinese military.

To end our reliance on China’s control and manufacturing of PPE, I introduced legislation to authorize the President to incentivize American companies to produce medical devices, equipment, and drugs.

We saw at the onset of the coronavirus that it was clear that outsourcing the production of PPE to an adversary was a risk to our health care system, and we witnessed firsthand the ingenuity of Arizona companies that stepped up to help fill the gap. That is no excuse for ignoring the fact that we have to bring manufacturing home of vital medical equipment so that, once again, it is made in America.

Finally, the coronavirus outbreak has taken a catastrophic toll on our country and the world. Make no mistake. The virus began in China and spread globally because the Chinese Government lied about what they knew about it, and they destroyed evidence and silenced doctors and whistleblowers.

Like the rest of the Nation, Arizona has suffered extremely devastating consequences due to this pandemic. Already, we have lost over 2,900 Arizonans, plus the economic toll.

Communist China unleashed this virus on the world, and it should face severe repercussions for their cover-up and lies about the origins and spread. China’s actions cost lives and devastated the world economy, and it must be held accountable.

I moved to do just that this week by introducing my bipartisan resolution for Victor’s Act. Americans who have been victimized by the lies and deceit of the Communist Party—to include those who lost loved ones, suffered business losses, or personally harmed—deserve the opportunity to hold China accountable and demand just compensation.

I appreciate many of my colleagues joining with me on this legislation. It is due time that we hold China accountable for their malevolent behavior—just over the past several months but over several decades.

The United States must take immediate action and, with strength, demonstrate that the greatest country in the world will not be taken for a fool. Our Republic and our freedoms that it stands for will allow our country to prevail over China’s Communist and rogue agenda. With American will, American innovation, and the American spirit, we will prohibit those who have been victimized by the lies and deceit of the Communist Party—to inhuman rights violator who is denying basic healthcare to the people of Hong Kong, cracking down on dissenters, threatening Taiwan, and militarizing the South China Sea.

Dr. Alaric, prisoners in Communist China are being rounded up, blindfolded, shaved, and loaded onto trains to be taken to concentration camps simply because of their religion. You can’t believe this is happening today in this world.

Communist China’s deceptions surrounding the coronavirus pandemic should be the last straw for every American. It doesn’t matter to Communist China that their lies and misinformation killed hundreds of thousands of people around the world. Communist China is on a mission to be the domino world power. Chairman Xi will stop at nothing to grow Communist China’s reach and its influence around the world. I yield to my colleague from Florida.

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. I want to recognize my colleagues from Arizona, Ohio, Texas, and Iowa for their commitment to holding Communist China accountable and supporting Americans.

I rise today to discuss the threat of Communist China—a threat that poses a huge risk to the national security of the United States, our allies, and the stability of world markets.

Communist China is simply stealing American jobs and technology and spying on our citizens.

General Secretary of the Communist Party of China, Xi, a human rights violator who is denying basic healthcare to the people of Hong Kong, cracking down on dissenters, threatening Taiwan, and militarizing the South China Sea.

Uighur prisoners in Communist China are being rounded up, blindfolded, shaved, and loaded onto trains to be taken to concentration camps simply because of their religion. You can’t believe this is happening today in this world.

Communist China’s deceptions surrounding the coronavirus pandemic should be the last straw for every American. It doesn’t matter to Communist China that their lies and misinformation killed hundreds of thousands of people around the world. Communist China is on a mission to be the dominant world power. Chairman Xi will stop at nothing to grow Communist China’s reach and its influence around the world.

Communist China has unleashed this virus on the world, and it should face severe repercussions for their cover-up and lies. China’s actions cost lives and devastated the world economy, and it must be held accountable.

I moved to do just that this week by introducing my bipartisan resolution for Victim’s Act. Americans who have been victimized by the lies and deceit of the Communist Party—to include those who lost loved ones, suffered business losses, or personally harmed—deserve the opportunity to hold China accountable and demand just compensation.

I appreciate many of my colleagues joining with me on this legislation. It is due time that we hold China accountable for their malevolent behavior—just over the past several months but over several decades.

The United States must take immediate action and, with strength, demonstrate that the greatest country in the world will not be taken for a fool. Our Republic and our freedoms that it stands for will allow our country to prevail over China’s Communist and rogue agenda. With American will, American innovation, and the American spirit, we will prohibit those who have been victimized by the lies and deceit of the Communist Party—to inhuman rights violator who is denying basic healthcare to the people of Hong Kong, cracking down on dissenters, threatening Taiwan, and militarizing the South China Sea.

I yield to my colleague from Florida.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore of the Senate, Mr. SCOTT of Florida. I want to recognize my colleagues from Arizona, Ohio, Texas, and Iowa for their commitment to holding Communist China accountable and supporting Americans.

I rise today to discuss the threat of Communist China—a threat that poses a huge risk to the national security of the United States, our allies, and the stability of world markets.

Communist China is simply stealing American jobs and technology and spying on our citizens.

General Secretary of the Communist Party of China, Xi, a human rights violator who is denying basic healthcare to the people of Hong Kong, cracking down on dissenters, threatening Taiwan, and militarizing the South China Sea.

Uighur prisoners in Communist China are being rounded up, blindfolded, shaved, and loaded onto trains to be taken to concentration camps simply because of their religion. You can’t believe this is happening today in this world.

Communist China’s deceptions surrounding the coronavirus pandemic should be the last straw for every American. It doesn’t matter to Communist China that their lies and misinformation killed hundreds of thousands of people around the world. Communist China is on a mission to be the dominant world power. Chairman Xi will stop at nothing to grow Communist China’s reach and its influence around the world.

Communist China has unleashed this virus on the world, and it should face severe repercussions for their cover-up and lies. China’s actions cost lives and devastated the world economy, and it must be held accountable.

I moved to do just that this week by introducing my bipartisan resolution for Victim’s Act. Americans who have been victimized by the lies and deceit of the Communist Party—to include those who lost loved ones, suffered business losses, or personally harmed—deserve the opportunity to hold China accountable and demand just compensation.

I appreciate many of my colleagues joining with me on this legislation. It is due time that we hold China accountable for their malevolent behavior—just over the past several months but over several decades.

The United States must take immediate action and, with strength, demonstrate that the greatest country in the world will not be taken for a fool. Our Republic and our freedoms that it stands for will allow our country to prevail over China’s Communist and rogue agenda. With American will, American innovation, and the American spirit, we will prohibit those who have been victimized by the lies and deceit of the Communist Party—to inhuman rights violator who is denying basic healthcare to the people of Hong Kong, cracking down on dissenters, threatening Taiwan, and militarizing the South China Sea.

I yield to my colleague from Florida.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore of the Senate, Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, I rise to join my colleagues in discussing the single greatest geopolitical threat facing the United States for the next century, and that is the rise of Communist China.

We are, right now, months into a deadly global pandemic that has sickened over 14 million people worldwide and has taken the lives of over 600,000 people. Why are we in the midst of this global pandemic? It is because the Communist Chinese government deliberately lied to the world. It covered up the outbreak and allowed it to spread. The coronavirus pandemic has thrown into high relief the fact that China is our most dangerous threat.

For 8 years in the U.S. Senate, I have worked hard to lead the fight to address the threat of Communist Chinese power and aggression and hostility toward America. I have led the fight to address the threat of Communist Chinese power and aggression and hostility toward America. I have led the fight to address the threat of Communist Chinese power and aggression and hostility toward America. I have led the fight to address the threat of Communist Chinese power and aggression and hostility toward America.

For too long, Washington politicians have ignored the concern with the long-term political stability of Communist China and Chairman Xi, this great power conflict is a zero-sum game. In order for China to be stronger, America and all freedom-loving countries around the world must be weaker. We can’t allow that to happen. It is time we finally stand up and address the new Cold War occurring between the United States and the Chinese Communist Party.
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For long, Washington politicians have ignored the concern with the long-term political stability of Communist China and Chairman Xi, this great power conflict is a zero-sum game. In order for China to be stronger, America and all freedom-loving countries around the world must be weaker. We can’t allow that to happen. It is time we finally stand up and address the new Cold War occurring between the United States and the Chinese Communist Party.
For a long time in Washington, there were politicians in both parties—Democrats and Republicans—who were apologists for China, who denied the threat was there, who insisted that the path forward was getting more and more in bed with the Chinese Communists. Most of that long-term foreign policy consequence of this global pandemic is that people’s eyes are opening up on both sides of the aisle here in Washington and across the world. One need look no further than China’s Kingdome’s reversal of its decision to allow Huawei to build its telecom infrastructure in order to understand how China’s mendacity has been revealed to the world.

So how do we hold China accountable? How do we deal with the Chinese Communist Party?

First of all, we should sanction Chinese officials involved in the ongoing suppression of medical experts, of journalists, and of political dissidents, all of whom are “disappeared” by the Chinese tyrants. I have introduced legislation to do just that. Over the past several years, I have introduced, roughly, a dozen separate pieces of legislation that have all focused on different aspects of addressing the China threat.

Another aspect is Chinese propaganda—Chinese propaganda that is reflected here in the United States. Big Business, giant corporations, the media, Hollywood—all are terrified to talk to Communist China. All see the billions they can earn from access to the Chinese markets as being more important than free speech.

We look at Hollywood, sadly, too many movie producers here in the United States have been perfectly content to allow the Chinese Communists to censor American movies. For example, later this year, the sequel to “‘Top Gun’ is scheduled to come out—‘Top Gun: Maverick,’ one of the greatest military recruiting films ever made. In the sequel, on the back of Maverick’s bomber jacket, the flag of Taiwan has been removed and the flag of Japan, both of which the Chinese overlords deemed to be offensive, and our heroic First Amendment champions in Hollywood dutifully complied with censorship.

By the way, it needn’t just concern geopolitical affairs in Asia. With another Hollywood movie, ‘Bohemian Rhapsody’ and ‘Bohemian Rhapsody’ is fabulous, the biopic of Freddie Mercury, the lead singer for Queen—the Chinese censors decided it offended their sensibilities to have scenes from “Bohemian Rhapsody.” I have introduced legislation in this body called the SCRIPT Act that will impose consequences when American companies allow the Chinese Government to censor our films. The consequences are simple. We don’t have the film, and we don’t impose direct negative consequences, but what we do have the power to do is to use the incentives we have; namely, lots of movies borrow Federal dollars. When you go watch a movie and see a plane or a ship or a tank, whether you go watch a movie on the border and you see DHS assets, all sorts of Federal agencies allow movies to use equipment that is the property of the Federal Government. The SCRIPT Act is very simple. It says, if you are going to allow the Chinese Communists to censor your movie, the Federal Government is not going to loan you our equipment and materiel. We are not going to facilitate making a movie if you are going to give the Chinese Communist Party the editing and censoring pen.

Not only do the Chinese Communists engage in propaganda in Hollywood, but they also engage in espionage and propaganda on our university campuses—a very deliberate, systematic effort to subvert. In the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019, I was proud to secure a funding prohibition for the Department of Defense from funding universities where the money could go to a Confucius Institute, the result of this bipartisan legislation, which earned support from Republicans and Democrats. If China has a state-controlled newspaper explicitly participating in this exercise—to remind ourselves why this year is different.

The answer, of course, as to why is this year different is the Chinese Communist Party. It is the one that is to be held responsible, to be blamed for the suffering, the chaos, for this crisis that we have had, which is a health, food, and financial crisis all rolled into one. It has happened because of decisions that China made, decisions that were made by the Chinese Communist Party’s leadership.

There are some things that are the known knowns, if you will. They are the things that we know happened as you look back over what has happened with COVID-19.

What we know is this: On December 31, 2019, government officials in Wuhan, China, confirmed they were monitoring the spread of a disease that looked a lot like pneumonia. They didn’t know exactly what it was. It didn’t have all the markers, but a lot. But on New Year’s Day, they let us know: Hey, we have a problem out here. Just days later, they confirmed it was caused by a novel virus that had infected dozens of people. We now know it was hundreds of people.

On January 23, however, that authorities shut off Wuhan from the rest of the country. By this time, the virus was spreading like wildfire. Let’s pay close attention to what I just said. They shut off Hubel Province, they shut off Wuhan not from the rest of China, but from the rest of China. Don’t you dare go anywhere else in our country. This is contagious.
Now, as if that 23-day gap wasn’t bad enough, credible watchdog reports revealed that the CCP—Chinese Communist Party—lied—they lied to global health officials about the danger posed by the virus for not just a day or two while they figured it out but for 51 days before the world understood and said: Listen up. Pandemic. Pandemic. Fifty-one days. This deception allowed a regional outbreak to spread into a global pandemic that has so far killed more than 140,000 Americans.

It is hard to chalk all of this up to incompetence and overwhelmed bureaucrats, but every Member of this body knows that is not what happened. That is why, over the past few weeks, more and more of my colleagues here in the Senate have agreed to support legislation that will allow Americans to hold China accountable for the destruction caused by the pandemic.

On Monday, Senator McConnell introduced the Civil Justice for Victims of COVID–19 Act. I am very pleased to support and to be a cosponsor. This bill contains elements of my Stop COVID Act, which I introduced earlier this year. It would strip Chinese officials of their sovereign immunity for actions that caused the pandemic and would give our Federal courts the authority to hear claims that China has caused or contributed to the COVID–19 pandemic. This is not an unusual step. We did this after 9/11 for the families of those who died. What we did is give them the opportunity to go to court and make their case—hold China accountable.

It is time for this body to reject the artificial backstops that some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle use to protect China from criticism, and I encourage those colleagues to ask themselves: What are you afraid will happen if we hold China accountable for what they have done? What do you fear?

We have known for years that Beijing uses every tool in its toolbox to spy on us. Look at what we have learned about Huawei. They embed the chips in the hardware. You do not know they are there until they activate. We know they steal our intellectual property. Look at what they have done to the music industry, to the entertainment industry, to publishers, and to automotive engineers. China—they can’t innovate their way to success, so what do they do? They steal their way to success, and they steal their way to success, and then they lie about it.

China continues to cause chaos on the international stage. Look at their work pushing into the South China Sea. Look at what they have done to the freedom fighters in Hong Kong. Look at how they act and how they pressure and try to stifle Taiwan. This is standard operating procedure for the Chinese Communist Party.

Now, because they chose to lie and not come forward, we have more than 140,000 Americans who are dead. Millions more have lost their jobs, and they have lost their sense of community. How much further are we willing to let this go? I will tell you this: As I, every single day, talk to Tennesseans about China and what has happened with China and how China has not been an honest broker, not only in this but for decades, Tennesseans have had enough. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, the world is watching China deal with COVID—the economic effects and health effects. It has affected every single one of our families in some way. While the world is watching and we are dealing with all those issues here in the United States, we can’t lose track of what is happening on the world stage because China is using this moment when the world is distracted to push its way into Hong Kong and to break its word.

When we deal with China, we know what they have done, the predatory tactics they have taken either on their own people or on countries around the world.

The United States of America—when we do foreign aid, we go help other countries. More freedom, more security, more stability, and more economic growth. We don’t ask anything in return. We engage with them to help them.

China is working with developing countries around the world by moving into different countries and taking collateral of their ports, of their airports, and establishing military bases around the world when poorer countries default on the loans they give them. They are not helping other countries; they are taking over other countries.

They are stepping into country after country and offering them great new technology from Huawei to help their cell phone systems. They are establishing Huawei systems all over their banks. But what they are really doing is monitoring their people and gathering data on people all around the world. The security systems aren’t there to set up and prop up dictatorships in poor countries; they are there for the dictatorship of China to track what is going on there and any international development.

We should be aware of what China is doing, and we should not ignore this momentum for the free people of Hong Kong.

Today, many Americans are aware of how China has handled the issue of protective equipment. The medical equipment that we desperately needed in March, April, May—much of it manufactured in China—we could not get because the Communist Government of China kept the materials from American companies that were manufacturing in China. The Communist Government did not allow the export of that equipment, and they just took that equipment over, putting all of the schedules behind. Suddenly, Americans woke up and understood that our supply chains are at risk. Our pharmaceutical supply chains are at risk, and our PPE supply chains are at risk.

What many people don’t know is that our rare earth minerals and critical minerals supply chain is at risk. Lots of folks really like the solar panels and electric car batteries; except we are completely dependent on China for the rare earth minerals that are in those.

If we don’t develop our own sourcing for these rare earth minerals and we do have those same rare earth minerals here—if we don’t develop our own supply chain, if we don’t develop our own manufacturing for pharmaceuticals and for the precursors of pharmaceuticals, we will continue to be vulnerable to the Chinese Government, and at the moment the Communist government determines, they will take over that supply, and we will be at risk.

In the two decades, the Confucius Institutes have thrived on college campuses, spreading a Communist philosophy all through our college campuses. It is now at a moment that college campuses and leadership in colleges are starting to wake up to say: Why are we allowing Communist indoctrination on our campuses?

It is a bill that I have pushed, that I will continue to push to be able to wake up our universities, to say: Why are we allowing this on our campus?

It is an issue that I have pushed for years, dealing with Chinese Communists spying on American technology, stealing technology, and also stealing our science and inventions.

They come over with a grant from the United States and say they are going to send over researchers, when really what they are doing is harvesting the research and taking it back to China.

They take materials, whether it be new movies or clothes or the tools of production, and all that manufacturing that comes to China, they then take that same technology, move it to a different factory, and literally compete against the first company, because to do business in China, you have to turn over all your intellectual property to the Communist government, which then takes it and uses it on their own.

The Chinese Communist Government is not the ally of freedom for the world, and we should be aware of that. Certainly the people of Hong Kong are aware of that.

In 1997, after 150 years as a British territory, Hong Kong became a part of China under the Joint Declaration. It was one country, two systems—that Hong Kong for 50 years would remain autonomous and free.

Well, just over two decades later, the Chinese Government has broken its promise, and Hong Kong is no longer free. While the world was dealing with COVID–19, the Communist government has moved into Hong Kong and has taken it over. They passed a law in Beijing that they...
sent over and declared in Hong Kong that they can't have any of what they call subversion, organization or perpetration of what they call terroristic activities, collusion with a foreign country or an external element, which I will explain a little more.

This new security law literally was delivered to the people of Hong Kong at midnight, and it went into place immediately. Then the next step was that the Chinese Communist police—military law enforcement—moved into Hong Kong to begin implementing this.

Free speech immediately stopped. Those protesters who were out on the street just wishing to be able to vote and to speak their mind were immediately rounded up.

Teachers and academics have been arrested or fired or threatened. Communist Chinese leaders have contacted them to reprimand them about teaching about human rights in their classrooms, remembering that in Hong Kong—when it was a British colony—it was a required class in Hong Kong just weeks ago—to learn about human rights and freedom, and now the Chinese Government is removing those teachers and threatening any other teacher who teaches about human rights that they will be removed.

Faith leaders have been squashed. You see, under this security law that has passed, you can't have any external elements or external influence, anything that they define as “external element” as any kind of worship of God as well that does not align with the Communist Government. So any faith-based group who is there in Hong Kong is immediately being squashed.

The Muslim Uighurs are gathered up in Communist China and put in concentration camps to reeducate them on how to be more Chinese. Now the people of Hong Kong are experiencing that same type of oppression as the first step has stepped in to take away their right to free speech, their right to gather and protest, and now also their right to have freedom of faith. Leaders of the democracy movement have already been rounded up and arrested. This is something that we should not ignore. We have said as a world “Never again,” and we should engage.

I know many people in my State say we should focus on COVID-19, and we should. There is much that needs to be done. We cannot take our eyes off freedom around the world, as well, and the people of Hong Kong. As they lose their freedom, the world loses freedom, and China sees it can move into one more place one more time. Taiwan is next, and they will continue to move in this same way. We should stay engaged.

There are multiple bills this body has already done on sanctions, and we should continue. We should continue to press in and speak out for those who cannot speak for themselves in Hong Kong. They are being isolated. Senator Tim Kaine and I just dropped a bill yesterday dealing with internet freedom for the people of Hong Kong, saying that the American Government should be engaged in trying to break through what is called the great firewall in China. We know they will extend this firewall into Hong Kong, as well, and will prevent the people from Hong Kong from being able to connect online to the outside world, just as they have with the people of China. But the people of Hong Kong have grown up and lived in freedom, and they should have access to that. We should continue to work with the Chinese Government to make sure that they will continue to have the free speech that we have.

This is something that we should not ignore. We have said as a world “Never again,” and we should. But we should not lose track of freedom. Freedom is our responsibility to help and to help other free people to guard. Let's stand with the people of Hong Kong.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I am glad to have the opportunity to talk for a bit on the floor of the U.S. Senate on U.S. policy toward China because I am so passionate about this. We should be actively working on those things as well, and we should. But we should not lose track of freedom. Freedom is our responsibility to help and to help other free people to guard. Let's stand with the people of Hong Kong.

The second thing that this President has done that makes China very, very pleased is to essentially make the argument for the Chinese that the autocratic model that they are perfecting is the best method by which to organize society around the world, because they say: Listen, we got this virus under control in a matter of months, and the world’s greatest democracy is still dealing with an epidemic that looks to be continuing on for many more months. So as we engage in this broad fight between models of governance, our inability—this administration’s inability—to get this virus under control is maybe the greatest gift that this President has given to China.

Here is what makes it so unconscionable: We know that democracy is inefficient. We know that capital markets sometimes can be inefficient when pressed up against the wall by emergency. So we built into the statutes of the United States emergency powers to give to this President—to any President—so that when they are faced with an emergency, they can cure some of the inefficiencies of democracy.

We are on the floor today—Senators Baldwin, Stabenow, Brown, and I—to talk about one particular power this President has. It is an act called the Defense Production Act, and it allows the President during times of emergency to commandeer parts of the manufacturing supply chain in this country to make sure we are making everything we need in order to repel a foreign invader. Sometimes that may be an army, but in this case it is a pathogen.

What we have known from the very beginning is that there was no way for this country to have enough personal protective equipment—masks, face shields, gowns, and gloves—and there was no way for this country to be able to have enough tests to know who has it so that we can track it and get rid of it without the Federal Government stepping up and utilizing the Defense Production Act.

Twenty percent of nursing homes today have less than a week’s supply of PPE.

Doctors at one hospital in Houston, where the outbreak is raging out of control, are being told to wear their N95 masks for 15 days in a row when it is recommended for a single use.
The national strategic stockpile once had 82 million gloves. Today they have less than 1 million. Guess what. It is going to get worse. More people need to be tested. Schools are about to reopen. The superintendent of the Jefferson County school district in Louisville, KY, says that he needs $10 million to order face masks alone. It is going to cost schools across this country $25 billion to purchase medical supplies, and these medical supplies are going to be priced to make sure that my kids’ teachers or my local doctor has a mask this fall, not useable. We have a solution: the Defense Production Act.

We also don’t have enough tests. It now takes 7 to 10 to 14 days to get a test back. In Connecticut, it used to take just 1 day. You can’t beat this virus if you don’t get results for 7 to 10 days. That person who gets tested goes out and spreads it during that time.

James Davis from Quest Diagnostics said:

We would double our capacity tomorrow ... but it’s not the labs that are the bottleneck. [It] is our ability to get physical machines and ... our ability to feed those machines with chemical reagents.

That is equipment that could be produced in the United States if the President took control of the manufacturing supply chain—not forever, but to the extent of this crisis.

So the Medical Supply Transparency and Delivery Act, which Senator BALDWIN and I introduced will, as Senator BALDWIN and I talked about, essentially picks up the ball the President has dropped and commands the President to operationalize the Defense Production Act and put somebody in charge of its effectuation to make sure we are producing in this country all of the medical equipment—the masks, the gloves, the testing reagents, the cartridges—that it is possible to produce in this Nation.

The level of gleeful, willing, knowing, and no one should normalize an administration that has the power to save lives and refuses to operationalize it.

Why won’t this administration take control of the supply chain? Why are they willing to let people die? States can’t run the supply chain by themselves. It is a national and international supply chain. Hospitals can’t create their own supply chain. They need help. So the competence from this administration is absolutely stunning, and no one should normalize an administration that has the power to save lives and refuses to operationalize it.

So I rise today to urge the Senate to take up and immediately pass the Medical Supply Transparency and Delivery Act. I want to thank Senators BALDWIN, MURPHY, and BROWN for introducing this important legislation. I am very proud to be an original cosponsor of this bill.

As you all know, throughout history—and I love history—perhaps no State was as crucial to our Nation’s victory in World War II as was Michigan. My colleagues may debate that, but I have the mic, so I will talk about Michigan.

The truth is that more than half of Michigan men and women proudly served in uniform, including my own dad. Back home, the people of our State were hard at work producing the bombers, the tanks, the trucks, the helmets, and the guns needed to win the war. In fact, Michigan was called at that time “the arsenal of democracy.”

When we were fighting World War II, we were making the things that were needed to win the war—the arsenal of democracy. Both at home and abroad, victory in many ways depended on the people of my State.

For the past 6 months, our Nation has been fighting a different kind of war, a raging health pandemic, taking over 141,000 American lives so far. Unfortunately, this time our national generals appear to be missing in action. This is such an important discussion we are having today and such an important bill that needs to be passed.

Let me start again by underscoring something that Senator MURPHY said, because despite what happened in the beginning as it relates to China and certainly over the years, I have not been shy to address concerns related to stealing our intellectual property rights or other issues related to China. The reality is, despite whatever the smokescreens are about China, you can’t say that they are the reason that with 4 percent of the population, we have 25 percent of the cases of COVID-19 and 25 percent of the deaths in the world. There is much more to it, and, unfortunately, it lands right in this country’s complete lack of Federal leadership that has been completely AWOL when it comes to the kind of national strategy we need to get our people the equipment, the support they need, the testing they need, and to have a strategy to safely reopen the economy and keep our kids in school.

We also don’t have enough tests. It now takes 7 to 10 to 14 days to get a test back. In Connecticut, it used to take just 1 day. You can’t beat this virus if you don’t get results for 7 to 10 days. That person who gets tested goes out and spreads it during that time. That person who gets tested goes out and spreads it during that time. That person who gets tested goes out and spreads it during that time. That person who gets tested goes out and spreads it during that time. That person who gets tested goes out and spreads it during that time.

We have a solution: the Defense Production Act.
Meanwhile, Governors, hospitals, and nursing homes have spent time, energy, and money bidding against one another and being pitted against one another for lifesaving PPE and testing supplies. This is no way to fight a pandemic. This is no way to fight a war; and, certainly, this is no way to win a war.

In Michigan, after the CARES Act passed, going back to the State, working with our State Governor and her team and our delegation, I, literally, was in a situation of reaching out—because the work in healthcare, no people in the medical supply business, and we got some of the first masks because I knew a guy who knew a guy who knew a guy in China. That was how we got the masks—no national supply chain.

Masks were coming in. Fifty-cent masks were being bumped up to $5, $6, $7 apiece—no accountability, nobody worrying about the United States and whether we could get the best deal and whether hospitals were able to get what they needed. Frankly, it was chaos—complete chaos. Again, that is no way to fight a pandemic, and it is certainly no way to fight a war.

During World War II, Michigan didn’t decide the arsenal of democracy on its own. The Federal Government saw a need and called on Michigan companies and workers to fill it, and we did. It is the same thing this administration should be doing right now. The White House outlined Executive actions the President could take immediately to produce the PPE and testing supplies we need to end this pandemic. Instead, doctors and nurses are wearing the same masks for a week or more. People are waiting more than 10 days for test results, and more than 141,000 Americans, so far, have died, including more than 6,100 in Michigan.

It is time to pass this important bill. It is past time. It is time to put our great American companies to work producing the supplies we need. It is time to win this war. We have done big things before, and we can do it again. I join with my colleagues in urging that this bill be taken up immediately. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I thank Senators MURPHY and STABENOW and Senator BALDWIN’s terrific leadership on this. I echo Senator MURPHY’s earlier call, the call for the Federal Government to respond. I see on the other side of the aisle Senators and President Trump. It is campaign season. So it is time to bash China, even though they have been in the pockets of China.

I was the other body when corporate interests came and lobbied the House of Representatives and lobbied the Senate asking for China to get all of these trade breaks and tax breaks so that American companies could shut down production in Milwaukee and in Cleveland and move overseas to China and get all kinds of tax breaks. And then my Republican colleagues were also pro-China because they wanted these American corporations and their contributors, starting with Senator MCCONNELL down the hall, to get all of these advantages for China.

Now, if you are thinking about running for President of the United States in 2024, you bash China. If you are in a tough reelection right now for the Senate, you bash China. If you are a House Member and afraid of being defeated, you bash China. If you want to help the cause for Donald Trump, it doesn’t matter that President Trump has been the best friend of China. It doesn’t matter the Republican leadership has been in the pocket of Chinese Communist interests because of their support for American corporations. It is just good politics to bash China. So we know that, and Senator MURPHY touched on that.

Mr. President, I want to say a few words first about Agent Orange and then move to what Senator TESTER has done today on behalf of the tens of thousands of Vietnam vets who suffered because of exposure to Agent Orange.

We all know what the issue is. The National Academy of Sciences has recommended that there are suggestive or where there is sufficient evidence associated with Agent Orange. For years, we have known that. The VA has added illnesses in categories to the list of presumptive medical conditions associated with Agent Orange. They have resisted this.

Time is running out for these veterans. We did this to them. The American Government decided to spray Agent Orange. We knew it was harmful. We definitely know it is harmful now. If you were exposed to poison while serving our country, you deserve the benefits you earned, period.

For 3 years, in the Veterans’ Affairs Committee—I sit in the Veterans’ Affairs Committee—many of the Veterans’ Administration to recognize that these three illnesses are caused by Agent Orange and they should get Veterans’ Administration benefits. I begged the Veterans’ Administration, and no answers. I begged the President of the United States, and President Trump said he is a friend of veterans, but he couldn’t be bothered to add these three illnesses on the list. So these veterans, individually, have to go to Congress and individually fight for their care. It’s not right, and I’m sure it’s not what Senator TESTER’s amendment does today. It makes it automatic.

Instead, the White House said no and the Veterans’ Administration said no, but because of the work of Senator TESTER today, my colleagues are finally—it doesn’t happen often around here. My Republican colleagues actually stood up to the President of the United States and said: No, Mr. President, you are wrong on the VA about covering these illnesses for Vietnam vets. And, finally, this Congress did the right thing. I thank Senator Tester for that work.

Mr. President, we know a lot of things. We know 144,000 Americans are dead. We have grown numb to these numbers. We can’t forget who they are. We are their families, our neighbors, our brothers, our parents, and our neighbors.

As has been said, we are 4 to 5 percent of the world’s population. We have accounted for almost 30 percent of the deaths in the entire world. That is not because we don’t have skilled doctors. It is not because we don’t have smart scientists. It is not because we don’t work hard. It is because of leadership.

We know this President and the majority leader down the hall, who does the bidding every single day of this President, had chance after chance to get ahead of this virus. President Trump failed and Senator MCCONNELL failed. Now they have stopped even pretending to try.

The President demands that schools reopen—no plan to protect teachers and students. He demands businesses open up—no plan to protect workers and consumers. The American people have done their part and made incredible sacrifices. Essentially, they bought President Trump time in March, April, May, and June, and he wasted it.

This spring, people stayed home. They worked hard to flatten the curve. The Federal Government has failed. This spring and said we need to be producing a million tests a week by the end of the summer, or imagine if we said our goal...
is to be ready to open schools in the fall and I am calling on American businesses and American workers to manufacture the tests we need to do it? Look around the world. Other countries figured this out. We are being left behind. It is time for us to step up. If the President will not lead, I pledge that the President will not use DPA on its own, Congress must use its authority to force him to.

That is why it is so disappointing to see my Republican colleagues objecting to Senator Baldwin’s bill. But, of course, they are objecting because they are doing the bidding of President Trump, and they want to blame China for everything, instead of taking any responsibility themselves. But objecting to Senator Baldwin’s bill, which would force the President to actually do his job and coordinate a national response to a national crisis—that is the answer.

The American people should not have to fend for themselves again and again and again in the middle of a pandemic. It yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. President, President Trump’s response to this pandemic epitomizes the failure of leadership. So we are here today to provide leadership in the Senate to do what the Trump administration has failed to do.

In April, with my good friend Senator MURPHY, from Connecticut, the two of us introduced legislation called the Medical Supply Transparency and Delivery Act. That act would force President Trump to take action and scale up American production of things like test kits, swabs, reagents, personal protective equipment, and the medical equipment needed at the local level to address the ongoing COVID–19 pandemic in our country.

Three months later, States still do not have the supplies they need. Now more than a million Americans have been infected with the coronavirus, and, tragically, over 141,000 people have died in our country. For 3 months, our legislation has been in the majority leader’s legislative graveyard.

Since this public health crisis started, the Trump administration has had no national testing plan, and they have never had a plan to provide States with the testing supplies they need to combat this pandemic. As a matter of fact, last week, Senator Baldwin said that the Trump administration failed to slow down testing, and, this weekend, as President Trump once again said the coronavirus would disappear, there were reports that the White House is trying to block Federal funding for States to conduct testing and contact tracing.

President Trump has not only abandoned each and every one of our States, he has also turned his back on front-line healthcare workers, who continue to face shortages of personal protective equipment, including gloves, gowns, face shields, and masks.

The Trump administration has created absolute chaos in the medical supply chain, leaving healthcare workers at hospitals and long-term care facilities at the forefront of this crisis to fend for themselves, rationing the scarce personal protective equipment that has been provided to them. In fact, just last week, Vice President MIKE PENCE, who was put in charge of our pandemic response, said the administration would be issuing guidance encouraging healthcare workers to reuse personal protective equipment. This is the same Vice President who said that the United States would “have this coronavirus pandemic behind us” by Memorial Day weekend. He was tragically wrong, and this White House continues to play catchup on a pandemic and a virus that is spreading faster than ever.

The person whom President Trump put in charge of our medical supply chain was his son-in-law, Jared Kushner. Jared Kushner predicted in April that by June we would be back to normal and we would be able to “rocking again.” It is July. It is July, and this is where we are.

Last Thursday, America had its highest test of new coronavirus cases in 1 day. And in my home State of Wisconsin, our highest case count ever yesterday—yesterday—and we have many hospitals across my State with less than a week’s supply of face shields, goggles, gowns, paper medical masks, and N95 masks.

This public health crisis has not disappeared. We are not back to normal, and we are not “rocking again.”

The fact is, President Trump has failed to lead, and this White House has taken us in a wrong direction in our fight against this pandemic. New coronavirus cases are rising in the States that we work for, which means we need more testing supplies, more testing, and more personal protective equipment for our workers.

One question my colleagues have asked is whether we are going to let this President continue to take our country in the wrong direction, or are we going to lead and do what we all know needs to be done?

Not one of my Senate colleagues can make an honest case that their State has everything it needs to fight this pandemic.

In Wisconsin, we have been shortchanged by this administration. They have failed to ensure that Wisconsin labs that are currently performing tests do not have access to a consistent supply of reagent.

We are not alone. States across the country have been abandoned by the Trump administration. They have been forced to go this alone while President Trump has tried to pass off responsibility for his own failures.

Every single one of us knows that our States need more resources and supplies, so we can ramp up testing. Identify those who are infected, isolate positive cases, and safely trace all contacts so that the spread of this virus can finally be contained. We all know that President Trump’s broken supply chain has been a failure, and my legislation with Senator MURPHY, supported by 46 Democrats, will help fix it.

In order to put people back to work and safely reopen businesses and schools, we need both a national testing plan and the supplies to implement it. This is true in Wisconsin and every other State in our Nation.

Our legislation will help respond to this public health crisis and prepare for the future by mobilizing a Federal response to increase the production of the testing and medical supplies we need at the State and local level. Specifically, the bill will provide critical oversight of the distribution of medical supplies and put an expert in charge to oversee COVID-19 equipment production and delivery so we know we are putting science and facts over politics and private distributor profits when it comes to responding to this pandemic.

Finally, our legislation unlocks the full authority and power of the Defense Production Act so that we can produce and deliver tests, testing supplies, personal protective equipment, and medical equipment needed at the local level to address the ongoing COVID–19 pandemic in our country.

If my colleagues on the other side of the aisle believe that this is a choice to continue to ignore President Trump’s failure to respond to this public health crisis, knowing full well that until we confront it in the bold and effective way that we should, we will not solve our economic crisis, or they can choose to liberate themselves from this failure and support a solution that will serve the people who sent us here to work for them.

If my colleagues on the other side of the aisle believe, as this Vice President does, that this pandemic is behind us, then object. If my colleagues on the other side of the aisle believe, as Jared Kushner does, that we are rocking again in July, then object. If my colleagues on the other side of the aisle believe, as President Trump does, that the coronavirus will just magically disappear, well, then, object.

If you oppose the failures of this President and this Administration in responding to the COVID–19 pandemic, then I ask for your vote to pass the Medical Supply Transparency and Delivery Act today.
So I ask unanimous consent that the Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee be discharged and the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 3627, the Medical Supply Transparency and Delivery Act. I further ask that the bill be considered read a third time and passed so that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me say first that I appreciate my colleague from Wisconsin's work on this issue. It is an important issue. It is one that our committee has been working diligently on.

Since the beginning of the COVID crisis, we have held five hearings and a roundtable on exactly this issue—exploring and doing oversight on the national stockpile and its supply chain vulnerability. Just today, we marked up five pieces of legislation very similar to what my colleague from Wisconsin is introducing here and trying to pass by unanimous consent. The five pieces are the Federal Emergency Pandemic Response Act, Securing Healthcare Response and Equipment Act, National Response Framework Improvement Act, National Infrastructure Simulation and Analysis Center Pandemic Modeling Act, and finally—this one closest to my colleague's bill—the PPE Supply Chain Transparency Act, which is actually the piece of legislation we have had the most discussion on—two amendments, including a second-degree amendment to one amendment—before passing it unanimously. So our committee has done a lot of work.

My concern about what my colleague is doing is do not pass this by unanimous consent—is by and large bypassing the committee process. It is true her staff reached out to my staff a couple of weeks ago. We asked, have you vetted it through the Department? Apparently, she has begun that process, but this piece of legislation has not been properly vetted. It has not gone through the proper and full committee process.

Again, without expressing an opinion on a piece of legislation but also acknowledging that our committee has done a lot of work—passed five pieces of legislation on a non-partisan basis today because we are concerned about this as well—I have to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

Ms. BALDWIN. I am, of course, very disappointed that we cannot move this forward.

I want to respond to a couple of the comments made by my colleagues from the State of Wisconsin, the chairman of the Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee.

It is July. It is July, and cases are rising. Action was not taken in February, March, April, May, June, or so far in July. It had more than fair warning that we had shortages of masks and gloves and gowns and face shields and testing swabs and testing media and reagents, and yet it is July.

As I said earlier, yesterday Wisconsin announced the most cases positive for coronavirus in a single day that we have seen since the pandemic began.

As we strive to reopen our economy, the President exerts all schools to hold 5-day-a-week, in-person classes. We know that the demand for testing and the demand for masks will only increase exponentially—the need to keep workers safe as they return to work and the need to keep customers safe as they enter and engage in commerce. To say that this needed to happen back in February is an understatement.

I am pleased that my colleague has held hearings. This bill was filed in April when it became apparent that the President was not going to act. This bill has been available for committee review since April.

The House passed many elements of the Medical Supply Transparency and Delivery Act in their Heroes Act, which they passed 2 months ago. I just ask, where would we be today had this been put into law?

There has been time to review. There has been time to study. But it is past time to pass the Medical Supply Transparency and Delivery Act. I hope we can create another opportunity for the Senate to act on this in the coming days to come because it is so overdue.

I want to again thank my colleagues who joined me on the floor this afternoon—my coauthor, Senator CHRIS MURPHY of Connecticut; my colleague from Michigan, DEBBIE STabenow; and far in this month of July, we have Senator SHEPPARD BROWN; and the 45 other Members of the U.S. Senate who have joined me in sponsoring this bill.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I want to thank my colleagues, Senators BALDWIN and MURPHY, for their urgent words on this most important issue. I am proud to join them as we seek passage to pass legislation to finally require the President to invoke the full authority of the DPA, the Defense Production Act, so that the Federal Government can more speedily get testing supplies and PPE to the parts of our country struggling under the weight of the pandemic.

Make no mistake, medical professionals and frontline workers fighting this virus still—still—do not have the protective equipment and the testing supplies they need, and the Trump administration failed to fully invoke the DPA earlier this year. This is a crisis of President Trump's making.

As we speak, COVID-19 continues to surge across the country. As cases keep growing, our testing supplies and our PPE, already in short supply, are reaching critical levels. From Seattle to Miami, people are waiting in line for hours to get tested, and their results might take days, if not more, to come back. In many places we are missing basic supplies—swabs, gloves. In certain hospitals it has been reported doctors and nurses are being told to reuse their N95 masks as many as 15—15—times.

It has been 6 months since we have been fighting this virus. How is this still happening? The problem should have been solved months ago, but the President has been derelict in his duty. His administration has been a total failure when it comes to testing and PPE.

Instead of fully invoking the DPA and ramping up the production of critical supplies early on, President Trump has let doctors, nurses, and medical staff fighting this disease with one hand behind their back. He has failed to keep us and those working on the frontline safe.

This bill, however, would finally—finally—force the President to do what he should have done ages ago. We have been talking about the DPA since way back in April. I called the President in April, got him on the phone, urged him to invoke it. He told me he would and then contradicted himself a few hours later. How typical, but how devastating for the American people. Then he quickly lost interest—again, typical of this President, whose attention span is much too short for the big fight that we have with COVID.

So what we say is the President's approach to the pandemic was—typically here—no followthrough, no strategy, no comprehension to the threat. The President's mind-boggling refusal to invoke the DPA shouldn't be piled on top of the challenges we our medical workers and citizens already face.

I am sorry we didn't pass this legislation. I hope we can do it soon.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, before I begin, I would like to take a moment to honor Congressman John Lewis, who died on Friday. A leader of the civil rights movement, he was one of the 13 original Freedom Riders and an organizer of the 1963 March on Washington. He was a man of conscience, conviction, and supreme courage.

"When you see something that is not right, not fair, not just, you have to speak up. You have to do something," he would say.

John Lewis did something. Confronted by the great sin of segregation, John Lewis put himself front and center in the fight. He organized sit-ins. He led demonstrations. He marched for...
freedom. And he paid for his convictions with his blood. A man who espoused nonviolence, he suffered incredible brutality at the hands of both police officers and civilian mobs. He was attacked and beaten an untold number of times.

During a march in Selma, AL—on a day that lives in infamy—a police officer fractured John Lewis's skull, leaving him with a scar that he carried to the end of his life. Yet John Lewis was unbowed. No matter how many times he was attacked or what he suffered, he got up again and rejoined the fight.

His death is a great loss, but John Lewis will live on in the annals of American heroes. May we all have his courage in fighting for the right.

**CORONAVIRUS**

Mr. President, so far, Congress has provided $2.4 trillion to fight the coronavirus. Over the past couple of months here in the Senate, we have been working toward the implementation of this money and working with the administration on disbursement.

In June alone, we held 30 hearings in the Senate on COVID-related issues. All of them to help us identify the priorities that need to shape our next bill, which we are hoping to pass in the next couple of weeks. Those priorities are jobs, kids, and healthcare.

First, kids: Getting kids back in school safely needs to be a priority. Being able to attend school in person is important for students’ academic development and for their social and emotional well-being.

The American Academy of Pediatrics has stated: “All policy considerations for the coming school year should start with a goal of having students physically present in school.”

Now, not every school may be able to fully reopen this fall, but we need to make sure that those schools that can reopen have the resources they need to reopen safely. That is why the legislation the Republicans are drafting here in the Senate would provide more than $100 billion. Schools ensure they have what they need to safely welcome students back to class.

While our first priority in getting kids back to school is ensuring their academic and social well-being, getting students back in school is also important for families’ economic health. There are a lot of parents in this country who can’t afford to have one parent stay home to homeschool. We need to ensure that those parents have access to schools and childcare wherever possible so that they can keep or return to their jobs.

Enabling Americans to return to work is key to our economic recovery. Currently, more than 17 million unemployed Americans. While this is a significant improvement from where we were 2 months ago, that number is still much too high, and we have to do everything we can to get these Americans back on the job and receiving a regular paycheck.

That is why the legislation we are drafting will provide incentives for businesses to hire and to retain workers. It will provide a refundable tax credit for Main Street businesses for the protective equipment and cleaning supplies that they need to keep their employees and customers safe and to encourage Americans to return to their work and the economy. We will provide another round of assistance to small businesses, with a focus on those that have been hit the hardest by the pandemic.

We also expect to issue another round of direct payments to hard-working Americans, get them back on their feet and to stimulate the economy.

The third bucket of our coronavirus response is, of course, healthcare. We have to keep ensuring our healthcare professionals have the resources needed to treat patients, develop new treatments, and to find a vaccine to tame this virus once and for all.

The coronavirus legislation that we are drafting will address all three of those priorities.

Our legislation will also include another important priority that will protect jobs, schools, businesses, and healthcare workers, and that is liability protections. No matter how many precautions businesses take, there is no way for them to completely eliminate all risk of employees, students, or customers contracting the virus, but an arm of trial lawyers is waiting to levy lawsuits against even the most careful schools and businesses.

There is absolutely no question that schools and businesses should be liable for gross negligence or for intentional misconduct, but businesses and schools that are taking every reasonable precaution to protect employees and students and customers should not have to worry about facing lawsuits for virus transmission that they could not have prevented.

Healthcare workers giving their all on the frontlines to treat coronavirus patients should not have to worry that their efforts will be rewarded with lawsuits.

I would like to think that we can put a bipartisan bill together and get it to the President’s desk in the next couple of weeks. Republicans are ready and willing to work with Democrats to get this done. We will introduce our draft shortly and be ready to negotiate with Democrats. I am hopeful that, just like the CARES Act, our largest coronavirus relief bill to date.

I would like to think that we can put a bipartisan bill together and get it to the President’s desk in the next couple of weeks. Republicans are ready and willing to work with Democrats to get this done. We will introduce our draft shortly and be ready to negotiate with Democrats. I am hopeful that, just like the CARES Act, our largest coronavirus relief bill to date.

This will work only if Democrats are willing to come to the table and negotiate a reasonable bill. My Democratic colleagues sometimes behave as if government money is drawn from a magical pot of gold that will never run out, but it is not. It is not.

Every dollar of the coronavirus funding we provided so far has been borrowed money, and every dollar we appropriate in the phase 4 bill we are drafting will likely be borrowed money as well.

It can be argued that it is money we need to borrow, but we need to remember that it is borrowed money and that the bill for that money will eventually come due. The more we drive up our debt, the greater the threat to the health of our economy, not to mention the economic future of today’s and tomorrow’s younger workers. We have an obligation to them to limit our borrowing to what is absolutely necessary to fight the virus.

The Democratic leader has come down to the floor the past couple of days and suggested that the Heroes Act—a $3 trillion coronavirus bill the House passed is—"a good product to start with" when it comes to a phase 4 coronavirus relief bill.

That is ludicrous. The bill the Democratic leader is promoting—the bill he thinks is a good starting point for coronavirus legislation—is a bill that mentions cannabis—cannabis more often than it mentions the word "jobs."

Let me just repeat that. The bill the Democratic leader thinks is a good starting point for coronavirus relief legislation mentions the word "cannabis" more often than it mentions the word "jobs."

While the Democratic leader is certainly welcome to disagree with me, I don’t think diversity studies in the cannabis industry have a major role to play in defeating this virus or getting Americans back to work, nor does federalizing election law—another priority the Democrats included in their bill.

Despite its $3 trillion pricetag, the bill the Democratic leader is endorsing fails to meet one of the most basic requirements of any coronavirus relief bill, and that is providing a meaningful plan for getting Americans back to work. It is disappointing to hear the Democratic leader promoting such an unserious piece of legislation at a time that we should be devoting all of our efforts to getting a bipartisan bill to the President.

I hope my other Democratic colleagues in the Senate are ready to look beyond partisan wish lists and focus on negotiating a relief package that addresses the real priorities we are facing: helping kids and parents, getting Americans back to work, and providing the healthcare resources needed to fight the virus.

Republicans are ready to come to the table, and I urge Democrats to join us. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. BLACKBURN). The Senator from Illinois.

MR. DURBIN. Madam President, I am expecting the Senator from Utah to move to a vote that had been previously scheduled.

Since this item, this issue, we are discussing is of such importance to so many individuals in our country
today—and many of them are following this carefully and closely—I wanted to make sure we returned to it today to at least consider one aspect of the debate.

Yesterday, when I made a unanimous consent request to include my amendment to the comprehensive immigration reform bill, Senator Lee objected to it yesterday. He said he had not had time to look at my proposal. That is why I waited until today to come back, so that he would have that opportunity.

Yesterday, I came to the floor to speak about the plight of immigrant workers who are suffering because of a serious problem in our immigration system known as the green card backlog. Many of these immigrants are essential workers who are helping to lead the fight against COVID–19, but the green card backlog puts them and their families at risk of losing their immigration status and being subject to deportation.

Under the current law, there are clearly not enough immigrant visas—also called green cards—to meet the demand each year. The numbers that we have established in 1990 are still applicable today, though our national economy has doubled since then. We are still talking about 140,000 employment visas each year.

These so-called green cards have resulted in many people waiting for long periods of times—literally for years—for the opportunity to become legal permanent residents and securing one of these green cards. While they are waiting, their families are at risk.

These backlogs are particularly difficult on children because as they wait, the children, of course, advance in age, and when they reach age 21, they are subject to deportation. I have met with some of these families, and I have talked with them. It is a heartbreaking situation.

The unanimous consent request, which I will make today, addresses the plight of those children directly. Senator Lee objected to it yesterday. He said he had not had a chance to look at it. I hope he will reconsider when I make the same request today.

These children who face, what we call, aging out at age 21 would be protected by this unanimous consent request, which I am making. In addition to the green card backlog, it is clear there is a solution to this issue, which I am afraid we are not going to be able to achieve. It is to increase the number of green cards available each year in this country.

These immigrant workers who are seeking green cards are already in the United States working legally. This is not a question of increasing the number of green cards, of bringing in new immigrants to compete with American workers. These workers are already here. It is about whether immigrant workers will continue to be able to work on temporary visas, where they have to depend on their employer for their immigration status and their future is uncertain.

I introduced legislation known as the RELIEF Act. My cosponsors are Senator Patrick Leahy of Vermont and Senator Mazie Hirono of Hawaii. The RELIEF Act would increase the number of green cards to clear the backlog for all immigrants waiting in line for green cards within 5 years—eliminate the backlog for green cards within 5 years.

This RELIEF Act would keep immigrant families together by treating children and spouses of green card holders as immediate relatives, just as the children of citizens are. So, they don't count against the green card caps. The RELIEF Act would protect the aging-out children who qualify for a green card based on parents' immigrant petition.

The RELIEF Act that I am describing is not novel or controversial; it is based on a provision of the 2013 comprehensive immigration reform bill, which I helped to write with the so-called Gang of 8. That included Senator McCain, Senator Graham, Senator Schumer, as Senator Russo on the Republican side; myself, Senator Schumer, Senator Menendez, and Senator Bennet on the Democratic side.

We worked hard and passed that measure through the Senate Judiciary Committee and on the floor by a vote of 68 to 32.

What I am proposing is something I have proposed in the past, crafted, passed, and offered to the House of Representatives to help start to solve the immigration crisis, which we currently have in this country. Unfortunately, the Republicans, who controlled the House of Representatives when this measure came before them several years ago, refused to even take up this measure and debate it.

If they had, we wouldn't be here today. The green card backlog would not exist based on the provision which I offered with others in the comprehensive immigration reform bill. Unfortunately, the HouseAllows the Republicans on the other side still unwilling to increase any number of immigrant visas. They want to keep the immigration system on a temporary basis, where they and their families are at risk of losing their immigration status and being deported.

The senior Senator from Utah, Mr. Lee, has introduced S. 386, known as the Fairness for High-Skilled Immigrants Act, to address the green card backlog. I have a basic concern with that bill. It includes no additional green cards. Without any additional green cards, S. 386 would not reduce the green card backlog. Without additional green cards, S. 386 would not reduce the green card backlog.

Don't take it from me. There are those who will disagree and say: Oh, Durbin is wrong. He is just mistaken in saying that.

Please go to the nonpartisan Congressional Research Service. Here is what they said about S. 386. Senator Lee's legislation. "S. 386 would not reduce future backlogs compared to current law."

Despite my concerns about Senator Lee's bill, I agreed to sit down and work in good faith with him to resolve our differences. Last December, we reached an agreement—I believed we did—on an amendment to the bill. The amendment doesn't address the core problem because it doesn't increase the number of green cards. As a result, it would not reduce the green card backlog, but there was an improvement in the amendment which we put together. I talked about it yesterday.

Let me highlight two key provisions of the agreement. First, the amendment protected the families who are stuck in this backlog waiting for a green card. Immigrant workers and immediate family members would be allowed to "early file" for their green cards. That was a proposal that came to me from Senator Lee, and I thought it was reasonable. These individuals would not receive their green cards early, but they would be able, while waiting, to switch jobs and travel without losing immigration status. I thought that was reasonable. Early filing adds a critical protection that wasn't in S. 386.

Listen carefully. Our agreement prevents the children of immigrant workers from aging out of green card eligibility while they wait for green cards. Our agreement also would crack down on the abuse of H–1B temporary work visas. Really, I think this is at the heart of the problems we are running into. There are corporate entities in India, which have extraordinary power over the securing of these H–1B visas.

The amendment we put together would allow legitimate use of H–1B visas, but here is what it would say. It would prohibit a company from hiring additional H–1B workers in the future if the company's workforce is more than 50 employees and more than 50 percent of those are temporary workers.

The 50–50 rule is from a bipartisan H–1B reform bill that I authored with Senator Grassley. This provision was included in the 2013 comprehensive immigration reform bill.

Senator Lee has said publicly: This is a commonsense reform to root out abuse. I think he is right. I know these companies despise this provision, and I think it is one of the reasons we find ourselves with no common ground today. If this is included, they don't want anything to pass, and they are doing their best to stop it.

The reality is that the top recipients of H–1B visas today are outsourcing companies that use loopholes in the law to exploit immigrant workers and offshore American jobs. In the most recent year for which data is available, 8 of the top 10 recipients of H–1B visas were outsourcing companies.

Unfortunately, yesterday, Senator Lee objected to this proposal, which we had put together. Instead, he offered a revised version that included changes that were requested by the Trump administration. Let me explain Senator Lee's changes because I think they are basic, and I believe they are a problem.
First, he wants to remove a provision from our original agreement, known as the hold harmless clause. What it says is very simple. It assures immigrants already waiting in line for green cards that there is nothing we will do that will move them or đerive them from the pursuit of a green card; they can’t fall further behind in line. We hold them harmless from any change we make. Why wouldn’t we? Some of these people have waited for years. The hold harmless clause really says we are going to protect wherever you stand in line.

The second thing that Senator LEE wants to do is to delay for 3 years the effective date of the 50-50 rule to crack down on outsourcing companies. The object of early filing, and the reason why it is so appealing to me, was that it would protect the individuals applying as well as their families from the start, and now the Senator suggested that we delay this. That just means that many children will age out during that 1-to-3-year period of time and be subject to deportation. We shouldn’t do that to these children and these families.

Yesterday, I made a simple proposal to Senator LEE, which he hadn’t seen personally, and that is why we had to come back today. While we continue to debate the best way to fix the green card backlog, let’s make sure no children that are required to leave the country because they don’t qualify as American citizens for any type of Federal financial aid. You are paying for them to go to college, and now he has had a chance to look at the legislation purports to allow aging-out children to move to a student visa status, but it also fails to accomplish even this. Student visas require the applicant to have residency in a foreign country, which, obviously, these children do not have.

Perhaps these are merely drafting errors, but as such, they underscore my concerns about passing slapdash legislation just because it bears a title that compelling us to believe that green cards will have fewer and fewer green cards available to them, meaning they will have to wait longer and longer for relief. In fact, by the time we stretch this out to 2030, the 195-year backlog I mentioned a moment ago would be extended out to a 400- to 500-year backlog. That is not fair. I can’t imagine that is what the Senator from Illinois wants.

If we want to actually protect the children of immigrant workers, we need to end the inequities of the green card system. Real protection for the most vulnerable populations.

Perhaps these are merely drafting errors, but as such, they underscore my concerns about passing slapdash legislation just because it bears a title that compelling us to believe that green cards will have fewer and fewer green cards available to them, meaning they will have to wait longer and longer for relief. In fact, by the time we stretch this out to 2030, the 195-year backlog I mentioned a moment ago would be extended out to a 400- to 500-year backlog. That is not fair. I can’t imagine that is what the Senator from Illinois wants.

If we want to actually protect the children of immigrant workers, we need to end the inequities of the green card system. Real protection for the most vulnerable populations.

Perhaps these are merely drafting errors, but as such, they underscore my concerns about passing slapdash legislation just because it bears a title that compelling us to believe that green cards will have fewer and fewer green cards available to them, meaning they will have to wait longer and longer for relief. In fact, by the time we stretch this out to 2030, the 195-year backlog I mentioned a moment ago would be extended out to a 400- to 500-year backlog. That is not fair. I can’t imagine that is what the Senator from Illinois wants.
agreed on, it is not true. The implementation delay simply allows the USCIS a time to develop the adequate infrastructure to implement what we had proposed, the 50-50 rule change. This is 3 years is there to protect the H-1B vis-a-vis the one we were already doing.

The hold harmless provision is also taken care of with the 3- to 9-year transition that now covers them.

In any event, this legislation—the one Senator DURBIN now tries to pass by unanimous consent, introduced for the second time—should now be reviewed—is sloppy. It doesn’t solve the problem, and it would make a lot of things worse. I therefore object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, we have the opportunity right here to pass this right now. This bill fixes this problem. As to the suggestion that we can’t do anything without increasing the total number of green cards—this is a poison pill. My friend and colleague knows that it is a poison pill. In fact, we had that very discussion. I don’t ordinarily—in fact, I have a uniform policy against publicly talking about private conversations we have as colleagues. We have now brought it to the floor.

We talked about this. This was the basis upon which we reached a deal in his office in December. The point there was to understand that we can’t pass something—certainly by unanimous consent—that increases the total number of employment-based green cards. It is not going to happen. So we are dealing here with that finite universe. That is the basis of the deal we reached in December.

As to this suggestion that we can’t do anything without increasing the total number of green cards, the Senator knows that is not on the table. That is not fair. What we want to do is make this process fair, even if we only have a limited number cards to work with, which is the case. Whether you like that political reality or not, it is the political reality. It is the factual understanding that the Senator and I discussed and understood in December when we made that deal. The Lee alternative is the encapsulation of that.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 1044 and that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; further, that the Lee amendment at the desk be agreed to, the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed, and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DURBIN. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Just do the math; 140,000 EB visas and 226,000 family visas per year and 5 million people waiting. If you think you can solve this without changing the number of green cards, you can’t. You may address it from one angle or another. You may help some who are waiting as opposed to others. You only give assistance to some at the expense of some other group.

I understand the Senator’s position. I don’t quarrel with the fact he made it clear from the start that, from his perspective and perhaps from his side of the aisle, there is just no appetite for increasing the number of green cards, even for these people who have been living and working here in the United States for years and sometimes decades, even for physicians from India and other countries who are literally risking their lives today on COVID-19 patients. The Senator told me there is a storm right now for additional green cards so they can stay here on a permanent basis. I think that is unfair, and that is my position.

The Senator made it clear—and I am not saying otherwise—that he did not agree with me. So do I do is come in and say that at least during the pendency, while they are waiting for green cards—which could be decades unless the law is changed—let’s at least protect their families. That is all I basically said.

He has come back and said: I want to put in a provision that takes out the hold-harmless protection. I want to protect these people who are outsourcing companies in India that have captured the lion’s share of these H-1B visas. I want to make sure that those who are going to be protected have to wait up to 3 years before there is any protection.

Why in the world would we do any of those things? I am willing to sit down and talk to you, but I am not going to accept these at this point unless we can find a starting point, which is protection for the children of these families. If you will agree to that, I will be more than happy to discuss the other provisions again, but because the other provisions are now what you are offering, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Madam President, the protection for the children is now found in the proposal, in the amendment at the desk—the one that was just objected to by my friend and colleague, the Senator from Illinois.

I would ask my colleague rhetorically: You can object directly, as he may choose: If, in fact, he is unwilling and remains unwilling to negotiate on any bill addressing this problem without increasing the total number of employment-based green cards, why in the world did he waste months of my time? Why did he lead me to believe, while in his office, that he was open to such an agreement that was, in fact, the premise upon which we proceeded? We spent months on that, and I worked in good faith.

As I mentioned yesterday, it was against my better judgment that I agreed to announce with the Senator on the Senate floor that we had reached an agreement because I knew that we had to work out a few kinks, that we had to work out a few kinks, but I proceeded solely on the feasibility and our ability to implement that bill. That was the only change that we made.

Now, if the Senator wants to make some adjustments to that, bring it forth. I would love to consider it. Yet what he is now telling me is that the premise upon which we proceeded on those negotiations and then spent
weeks and months working on was false in that the whole premise that we could reach some sort of compromise—
an actual compromise—that wouldn’t increase the number of total green cards available was illusory. I find that disappointing.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, the Senator has addressed a question to me, I believe.

Mr. LEE. Rhetorically or otherwise, the Senator is welcome to answer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I know other Senators are waiting to speak, so I will try to be as concise and brief as possible.

I understand the Senator’s position. He doesn’t want another green card. He believes Members on his side of the aisle don’t want an increase in the number of green cards—period. I knew that going in. He made that abundantly clear. We can’t solve the underlying problem without it, but we can make it better. That is why we continue to talk and negotiate, and I hope we will continue to talk and negotiate. Yet, for goodness’ sake, the starting point ought to be the protection of these children.

Can we not agree that we will protect the children and then proceed to continue the negotiations on the premise that the Senator cannot accept one more green card? I can, and the Senator, in his heart, knows we will try to arrive at a system with that premise accepted. At the starting point, for goodness’ sake, let’s protect the children while we negotiate and debate. Hopefully, we can do it on a timely basis. That is my response.

I am willing to continue to work. I understand the Senator cannot issue another green card. The math never works with 5 million people waiting and 140,000 employment green cards and family visas a year. It is never going to work, but I am willing to try to make the system better, with the understanding that I will increase the number of green cards and that the Senator will not.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Madam President, I am always happy to discuss any counterproposals. If the Senator would make one, I would love to see it. It is not fair to say, without those kids, because I am unwilling to create additional green cards. If the Senator wants to protect these children, pass this bill. Pass it today. Pass it at this very moment.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 4019

Mr. MARKEY. Madam President, I rise to speak in support of S. 4019, the Juneteenth National Independence Day Act—legislation that I have introduced along with Senator CORNYN. We have 54 cosponsors and broad bipartisan support that would make Juneteenth a Federal holiday. In a few minutes, I will ask unanimous consent that the Senate take up and pass this important bill.

Our country is in the midst of a long overdue reckoning on race and justice. That moment is embodied by members of the Minneapolis Police Department who galvanized the Nation as protesters have taken to our streets, demanding justice—justice for George Floyd, justice for Breonna Taylor, and justice for countless other Black and Brown Americans who have been injured or killed at the hands of law enforcement. Yet this reckoning goes well beyond seeking accountability for police officers who betray the trust we bestow upon them.

The disparate treatment and mistreatment of Black and Brown Americans permeates our society. It infects our courts, our schools, and our places of work. It reflects the unfulfilled promise of a nation built upon the nation that all men are created equal, and it has its roots in our Nation’s original sin—slavery—a crime against humanity that we have for far too long failed to acknowledge, address, or come to grips with.

One way to further the process of racial reconciliation and healing is to recognize, honor, and celebrate the formal end of slavery in the United States and to do so at the Federal level. Perhaps the most effective, direct, and far-reaching way to do that is with a Federal holiday commemorating that historic event.

For more than 150 years, the Juneteenth holiday, which marks the emancipation of slaves, has been observed in one way or the other across our Nation, including in Texas, but it is long past time to place Juneteenth on par with other Federal holidays so that all Americans in all 50 States will celebrate Juneteenth alongside Veterans Day, Memorial Day, Martin Luther King, Jr. Day, and other Federal holidays.

The celebration of Juneteenth dates back to June 19, 1865, when Union soldiers, led by MG Gordon Granger, traveled to Galveston, TX, with the announcement that the Civil War had ended and that the enslaved were now free. This was 2½ years after the date of President Lincoln’s Emancipation Proclamation, but neither the news of Lincoln’s order had reached many, including those in Texas, or local officials had the power to enforce it.

On June 19, 1865, Major General Granger read to the people of Texas General Order No. 3, the first lines of which told them clearly and unequivocally, “The people of Texas are informed that, in accordance with a Proclamation from the Executive of the United States, all slaves are free.”

Juneteenth celebrations followed as did the recognition of Juneteenth as the formal end of slavery in the United States. Since 1865, communities all across the Nation have celebrated Juneteenth with parades, cookouts, prayer gatherings, historical and cultural readings, musical performances, and many other celebrations. These events have provided many with the opportunity for reflection, education, and a deeper understanding of our history—as a nation—the whole history—and our past that shaped the lives of Black Americans.

Nearly every State and the District of Columbia have passed legislation recognizing Juneteenth as a holiday or observance, and the Senate has passed legislation designating June 19 as Juneteenth Independence Day, but Juneteenth has never received the higher status it deserves as a Federal holiday. The Juneteenth National Independence Day Act rights this wrong and makes Juneteenth a Federal holiday.

We still must travel a long and difficult road to justice and equality in the United States, but we cannot get there without recognizing the original sin of slavery and more. It is incumbent upon all Americans to truly acknowledge and understand our past and how it affects our present and our future. Making Juneteenth a Federal holiday will not right all of the wrongs of the past, but it does bring us closer to reconciliation in our country.

I agree that slavery was the original sin. Our founding documents said that all men and women were created equal, but that certainly wasn’t the practice when it came to African Americans at the time who were officially designated as something less than fully human. It was an outrageous act at the time, and our country has paid a dear price for that during the years—from the Civil War to the violence that led up to the peaceful civil rights movement in the sixties. It is obvious from the recent events—George Floyd’s death in particular—that we are not where we need to be.

We still have room to grow as part of our developing that more perfect Union.

I know my friend and colleague TIM SCOTT, who has been at the forefront of this discussion with his advocacy for the Juneteenth Act, has a lot of bipartisan ideas for police reform. He points out that, as an African American, his experience has been much different from
those who are non-African Americans. He said, over the last two decades, he has been stopped—as he puts it, “driving while Black”—about 18 different times.

At a roundtable that was sponsored by Mayor Sylvester Turner and that I had requested, I sat next to a pastor of a church in Houston who happened to be the local head of the NAACP.

He said: I honor the police. I respect the police. I support the police. Yet he said: My son is afraid of the police, and we have to do everything we can to cure that trust deficit.

In Texas, we have recognized Juneteenth as a State holiday for 40 years, obviously, because of the fact that this occurred as a result of the Emancipation Proclamation’s being announced in Galveston, TX. Yet I recently cosponsored a bill with Congresswoman SHEILA JACKSON LEE to study and, basically, fund a park in Houston as the possible designation of a national park in further recognition of this event.

I believe strongly that we need to remember our history because if we don’t remember our history, in the words of one sage, “we will be condemned to relive it.” We have come so far, but we know we still have further to go. I do believe that the appropriate word to use is “reconciliation.” This is an opportunity for us to demonstrate our concern and our commitment to equal justice and equal treatment under the law by recognizing Juneteenth as a Federal holiday.

Mr. MARKEY. I thank the Senator from Texas. This is a thoroughly bipartisan effort, and it is long overdue.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of the Senator from Texas’s S. 4019; further, that the bill be considered read a third time and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator object?

The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. JOHNSON. Madam President, in reserving the right to object, let me start out by saying that I agree with virtually everything my colleagues from both Massachusetts and Texas have said about celebrating the emancipation of the slaves. That was an important moment in U.S. history which should be observed, and it should be celebrated. I have no disagreement whatsoever with that at all. The one area of disagreement is how the bill’s sponsors have chosen to celebrate that holiday.

As the Senator from Massachusetts pointed out, since 1865, it has been observed with celebrations and cookouts, which is the appropriate way of doing this. I object to the fact that, by naming it a national holiday—and what they are leaving out of their argument and its main impact—it will give Federal workers a paid day off that the rest of America will have to pay for.

When I asked for a CBO score, the sponsors of the bill had not even obtained a score, and I still don’t think they have obtained a score. The estimate, in terms of what it will cost American taxpayers in the private sector to pay for a paid holiday for Federal workers, is about $6 billion over 10 years. The CBO score would come in at $8 billion over 10 years.

In terms of why I object, let me just put a couple of facts to that $600 million that hard-working taxpayers would have to foot in an era when we are about $26.5 trillion in debt and when 17 million of our fellow Americans are currently unemployed.

The first chart here—let’s just talk about how many days off Federal workers get currently.

I have two columns—minimum and maximum. For paid holidays, they get 10, which is pretty generous. Most people in the private sector get something similar—5, 8, 9, or 10. For paid leave days, they can work up to 26; for paid sick days, 13, minimum and maximum.

What we just added in last year’s NDAA was paid parental leave, which allows an individual—either mother or father, with a natural childbirth or an adoption—60 days of paid leave.

So for a total, at a minimum, there are 96 days, up to 109 days if they take paid parental leave.

Looked at a different way, as a ratio, if they work a maximum number of 109 days, that is, basically, for every 1.4 days you work, you get a day off. On a minimum basis with paid parental leave, for every 1.7 days you work, you get a day off.

Now, again, I realize the paid parental leave is “just a few times in somebody’s career” phenomenon, so let’s take a look at this without paid parental leave, and it will show that the number of days with pay that Federal workers get off is still quite generous.

Again, paid holidays, they get 10; paid leave, 13, up to 26; paid sick leave, 13, for a total of 36 to 49.

So, again, going back to that ratio, the maximum number of days without paid parental leave, a Federal worker can work 4.3 days and then get a day off—basically a 4-day workweek for the entire year. That is quite generous.

So what I am objecting to is creating a national holiday that gives Federal workers a paid holiday, and it will show that the Federal workers get off is still quite generous.

Again, paid holidays, they get 10; paid leave, 13, up to 26; paid sick leave, 13, for a total of 36 to 49.

Last slide. I would like to just, in general, talk about the private sector pay versus Federal worker pay. I know there are some disputes about this in terms of education and that type of thing, but still, this is pretty solid information.

The 2018 average annual wage—just wages, salary, or wages—for Federal workers is about $94,000. For private sector workers, the average is about $63,000 or about 67 percent of what a Federal worker makes.

When you add in benefits, total compensation, the average total compensation for Federal workers in 2018 was $136,000, just shy of $136,000. In the private sector, the total cost of compensation is a little more than $75,000—55 percent of what Federal Government workers make.

So if you strip out and just compare the benefits, again, we are talking about an extra paid day off, an extra paid holiday for only Federal workers to celebrate Juneteenth, paid for by the American taxpayer, $12,000, on average per benefit, compared to $41,000 in benefits for Federal workers.

That is only 29 percent.

So those are the facts. Again, that is what I object to.

Again, I am happy to celebrate Juneteenth. I think we should celebrate the fact that we did remove that original sin by emancipating the slaves. That is a day of celebration. I agree with that. I simply don’t believe we need to make Federal workers in the private sector pony up $600 million a year, $6 billion over 10 years, to give Federal workers, who already are paid quite generously and have quite a few days off one more paid day off.

As the Senator from Massachusetts, I am not objecting. Again, I don’t object to Juneteenth and a celebration, but if we are going to make that a Federal holiday, the main impact of that is giving Federal workers a paid day off. I would just suggest this: Why don’t we take away one of their days of paid leave?

So I have an amendment at the desk, and I would ask that the Senator from Massachusetts modify his request to include my amendment at the desk; that the amendment be considered and agreed to; that the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed; and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator modify his request?

Mr. MARKEY. Madam President, reserving the right to object, the Senator’s proposal—rather than allowing this unanimous consent request to go through, the Senator proposes to hold it hostage to taking away the leave benefits that come with paid holidays for American workers. That is something we have never done before, and with good reason. We shouldn’t be penalizing our workers by taking away benefits, especially not in the current environment and especially not as the price to pay for recognizing a long overdue Federal holiday.

I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection overruled.

Is there objection to the original request?

Mr. JOHNSON. Madam President, reserving the right to object, and to quickly respond to the Senator from Massachusetts, I am not taking anything away from Federal workers. I am just not willing to give them an extra day paid.
So if we create Juneteenth as a Federal paid holiday, they will get an extra day, and I am just saying let’s keep them whole by removing a paid leave day, and then they will have the exact same number of days off as they have currently, and the American taxpayers, they do not want an extra $600 million per year or $6 billion over 10 years. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

PRESCRIPTION DRUG COSTS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, before I speak, several of my colleagues on this side of the aisle, over the next several minutes—well, probably for more than a half hour—will be coming to the floor to discuss what I am discussing, which is a very important problem we have of rapidly increasing drug prices.

After I speak, these other Senators will come to the floor: Senator BRAUN, Senator CASSIDY, Senator COLLINS, Senator HYDE-SMITH, Senator MCSALLY. All of these people have been very favorable in support of the Prescription Drug Reduction Act, and I want to thank them for participating in bringing attention to this very important issue of unjustified increases in drug prices.

After these folks I just mentioned speak, I understand that my colleague from Tennessee has in support of the legislation, is going to come at a later time today.

So thank you to my colleagues.

According to a recent Gallup poll, 9 out of 10 Americans are concerned about prescription drug prices. Specifically, they are concerned that the pharmaceutical industry will take advantage of the current pandemic to increase drug prices. That poll was published a month ago. Unfortunately, those concerns have become a reality now.

Two weeks ago, POLITICO reported that pharmaceutical companies have raised prices on hundreds of prescription drugs just during the pandemic. The report says that there have been more than 800—800—price increases just this year.

I have been working on a bill for over a year and a half to stem these increases and rein in drug prices. It would cost us less than $100 billion. It wasn’t simple, but I am glad to have produced this kind of bill with Ranking Member WYDEN and my colleagues here with me today.

But I am disappointed. My partner and all of my Democratic colleagues who approved this bill in committee by a vote of 19 to 9 declined to cosponsor an improved version of the bill that they helped put together in the first place, and this is the work of about 18 months.

I can’t be sure why, but I have to assume it is because it is an election year, and, somehow, passing a bill that would do so much good in a time with so much hardship might help Republicans who also support the bill, hurting Democrats’ chances of taking the majority.

As we consider a new relief bill, we ought to put aside that kind of politics-before-people method of legislating. We need to approve the Prescription Drug Pricing Reduction Act as part of this package. Our country is facing a public health crisis in a generation—not just a generation, if you think back—in generations.

Millions of Americans are newly unemployed, and many small businesses have slowed or shuttered altogether. People across the country are stretching their paychecks and their savings to get through this virus pandemic.

In the CARES Act, passed in March, and in subsequent legislation, we helped slow the hurt caused by this virus. But there is only so much a stimulus check or tax relief can do when your bills just keep coming and going up—meaning the pharmaceutical bills.

These drug price increases are a weight that Americans shouldn’t have to bear, especially seniors on whom the virus is taking a particular toll.

The increases aren’t a result of a functioning marketplace or an industry with healthy competition. Addressing these price increases is also something we all largely agree on.

In 2016, the President campaigned on making the marketplace for prescription drugs fairer and more affordable for patients. He won. He even talked about that promise in a State of the Union message when he said that he wants Congress to send a bill for him to sign this year.

So the President made that campaign promise in 2016, and the President has done many things since then to carry out that campaign promise. He has even helped me in the development of this legislation.

That was 2016. This is 2020. In 2018, we have had many House Democrats campaign on making the marketplace for prescription drugs fairer and more affordable. Many of them won, and they took over the House of Representatives. It is time to put politics aside and finally act.

Just because Big Pharma was bankrupting patients before the pandemic doesn’t mean they should allow them to keep on doing it now. In fact, there is no better time to put an end to Big Pharma’s price gouging than right now.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. BRAUN. Madam President, Senator GRASSLEY and I share a passion that I think most Americans do in that it is time that we end this stranglehold that the healthcare industry has on all of us because they pose as free enterprises, but there is nothing free about the way they actually operate.

“Free enterprise” means you embrace competition. You are not putting up barriers to entry. You engage the consumer so that they can see what you are charging them. That does not occur. The alternative will be as clear as a bell: they want to make government the business partner of healthcare. If the industry doesn’t get with it and start doing what all the rest of us do when we go to the marketplace—embrace competition, be willing to compete, don’t ask for barriers to entry, don’t tell the customer what we charge them before they buy it. That doesn’t happen in healthcare.

The market is opaque and complex. There is nothing free about it, except that drugmakers are free to charge whatever they want. The market is dependent on government-sanctioned rebates and monopolies by the FDA exclusivities and patent abuse. It is time to fix this. PBM may not mean much to the public, but it stands for pharmacy benefit managers. This is a structure of middleman that is not present in other industries. Normally, with transparency, prices cascade down through the system in a way that everybody can see it, and the successful survivors in that industry have performed because they give good value to their customers; they keep their overhead low; and they earn the business.

PBMs use techniques like spread pricing. Normally, there is a spread—you buy it for this and sell it for that, but not where people can see it. It is time that we get away from this complexity and the opaqueness of it because the day of reckoning will come, and the day of reckoning is not too far away.

I recently came from the business world. No one likes the healthcare industry other than the CEOs and owners of these businesses. All of us who have to deal with them are just asking for that one simple thing: Show us what things cost. Quit hiding it. Insurance companies have these secret deals with hospitals, with pharmacies, with PBMs, with doctors. What they charge is not what people can see. It is time that we get away from this complexity and the opaqueness of it because the day of reckoning will come, and the day of reckoning is not too far away.

Both Chairman GRASSLEY and I have talked with President Trump. President Trump has been the most vocal individual in DC about trying to get the industry to work like the rest of us entrepreneurs do. Every time he has an Executive order, they take him to court. That is ending because just recently the hospitals tried that, and the district court overturned it. They will probably appeal it. Every time the district court overturns it, the appellate court will overturn it.

I have a transparency bill which is as simple as: Show us what you are charging us before we engage your service.
Mr. GRASSLEY has the same thing basically on drug pricing. Let me tell you how that works.

This is a real live experiment that I put into place 12 years ago. I was so sick and tired of the insurance agents coming to me how I was going to sell my company. I thought it was going up 5 to 10 percent this year. I didn’t think I was very lucky. My company wasn’t large enough to spend a lot of time on it. When we got to be 300 employees, that starts to add up. Now we have 1,900 employees. Thank goodness my kids have to deal with that with a good young executive team, but I put something in place 12 years ago that I am proud of.

I said enough was enough. What do we have that is really going to change the dynamic? You have to remember, this is 12 years ago—talk about trying to find transparency then. We were lucky that we were large enough to self-insure. By doing that, we probably saved close to 25 percent, and by engaging or in their case, I have got to end being and incentivizing them to shop around to enable their ability to find better price, it was even there if you looked for it hard back then. Long story short, we have had a premium change that I have not had a premium change in five years. I am proud of that. We covered pre-existing conditions with no caps on coverage because we took a radical change to how healthcare should be bought by the consumer, the employer, and forced the transparency out of a system that wasn’t giving much of it then.

Now there is more transparency, but it is just on the fringes. If you get that to happen, prices will cascade down through the system. President Trump had another Executive order for pharma—all these expensive drugs you see advertised—to put the price along with the advertisement. A lot of times it is deceptive—you can get it for as much as $60,000 or $70,000 drug. Generally, it is the employer, and the employee some of it, but it is, again, due to the fact that we can’t see anything.

Americans are blinded from prices, only to receive medical bills, often, that arrive 2 months later. They have no idea, and they open up the envelope with trepidation. Oh my goodness. It wasn’t what I thought it would be. More often than not, it is: Oh, my gosh. This is terrible. It has got to end.

The second thing we do—you might remember some of this. The President, Mr. GRASSLEY has the same thing basically. Support Chairman GRASSLEY’s legislation to lower the cost of prescription drugs through measures such as the Prescription Drug Pricing Reduction Act or, as I like to call it, the “Making Coronavirus Drugs Affordable Act.”

There is an urgent need to lower the cost of prescription drugs. The high price of drugs is a problem, but it is a problem that is going to be made worse by the coronavirus pandemic. Millions of households have seen their incomes suffer due to economic lockdowns aimed at containing the virus. It is encouraging that job numbers continue to outpace expectations, but still, millions of folks Americans are out of work, which affects their pocketbooks, and potentially their insurance coverage. Americans do not need the added burden of expensive drugs, particularly right now.

Congress is providing relief for American families and businesses through workers’ compensation, but American companies are considering another round of support. I think we should include how we do make drugs more affordable. That way, if folks become ill, they know that they will be able to afford the cure. I believe the best path forward is the “Making Coronavirus Drugs Affordable Act,” as I call it, or, as Chairman GRASSLEY calls it, the Prescription Drug Pricing Reduction Act. I like mine better.

Now, the current issue is, the price of medications is that a balance must be struck between making sure the medication is affordable but also making sure there is still a profit motive that will incentivize the researchers and pharmaceutical companies to find these cures that we know we need. Just think about it. Without innovation, we would not be able to find a vaccine for coronavirus—a vaccine that will save millions of lives worldwide and allow us to go back to a normal life.

Let me just praise the pharmaceutical industry. We have seen them respond to this crisis in many helpful ways. Additionally, they recently committed to a drug to stop them from having anti-microbial resistance, which is to say, to find an antibiotic that will work when other antibiotics no longer do. They have invested in large-scale and rapid treatment options, and, again, it is just so important that we will be able to beat this virus and end the pandemic.

But we must remember this: If a patient cannot afford the innovation, the new medicine, it is as if the innovation never occurred. The “Making Coronavirus Drugs Affordable Act” strikes the balance between lowering costs for families and incentivizing companies to find those cures.

The story I told you about my own company would happen across the country, and we wouldn’t be complaining about these surprise billings. We wouldn’t be holding our breath. We would simply be doing what all educated consumers do when they go to buy from a truly free enterprise.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRAMER). The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, COVID–19 is a continuing threat to Americans’ physical and financial health, and I think it is important that Congress can make a meaningful impact on the family budgets of all Americans by passing sensible legislation to lower the cost of prescription drugs. When other antibiotics no longer do. They have invested in large-scale and rapid treatment options, and, again, it is just so important that we will be able to beat this virus and end the pandemic.
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But we must remember this: If a patient cannot afford the innovation, the new medicine, it is as if the innovation never occurred. The “Making Coronavirus Drugs Affordable Act” strikes the balance between lowering costs for families and incentivizing companies to find those cures.
payments over 12 months. So let's imagine that this was $10,000. Instead of having to pay all of it in January, she could pay $800 every month over the course of the year. That allows her to budget and to factor it in with the other expenses that she has. Not only do we care for the senior citizen's out-of-pocket expense, but we also allow her to pay that expense over a set of months so she can factor it into her budget. That is the second great thing that this bill does.
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this patent thicket—its manufacturer did—in order to block the lower price biosimilar.

The Judiciary Committee has advanced bills that empower the Federal Trade Commission to take more aggressive action on drug pricing. This year, the last year before FTC put Martin Shkreli with a scheme to increase the price of the lifesaving drug Daraprim by more than 4,000 percent overnight, which was the focus of an Aging Committee investigation that I led with former Senator Claire McCaskill in 2016.

Floor consideration should also allow for action on other important prescription drug bills, such as legislation that Senator JEANNE SHAHEEN and I have authored to eliminate incentives that create price hikes, distorting the insulin market. Insulin has been around for 100 years. I realize there is fast-acting and slow-acting insulin, but there is no excuse for the skyrocketing price of insulin.

There is another bill that I cosponsored, introduced by Senators KLOBUCHAR and GRASSLEY, that would end pay-for-delay schemes.

We must come together on prescription drug pricing reform without further delay. Three committees have produced strong bipartisan bills, and we should proceed to act and pass this legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mrs. HYDE-SMITH. Mr. President, I join my colleagues today in calling on this body to include the Prescription Drug Pricing Reduction Act of 2020 in the next coronavirus relief bill so that we can finally address the high cost of prescription drugs.

The troubles caused by skyrocketing drug prices are a never-ending source of worry and hardship for Mississippians and people across this entire country. I want to get this issue out of the way so that constituents more than just about any other issue when I go home. I hear this all the time. I go to church with people who have to decide whether they are going to buy their drugs or buy food. That is a reality we live with.

Let me highlight a few stories shared with me by some of my constituents.

Emily Quinn lives in Fulton, MS. Her husband, Brian, was diagnosed with type 1 diabetes at the age of 2 and continues to rely on insulin daily. Her son Dylan, who is now 16, was diagnosed with type 1 diabetes at the age of 6. The Quinn family pays more than $2,700 each month for just Brian’s and Dylan’s insulin, not including other diabetic equipment and supplies that they have to have.

It is shocking that more than a century—a century, not a decade; a century, 100 years—after insulin was discovered, insulin prices continue to rise by staggering amounts, nearly 300 percent every last year.

Scott Crawford of Jackson, MS, is a volunteer advocate for multiple sclerosis. Scott was diagnosed with primary progressive MS in 2002. Only one drug, named OCREVUS, can help slow the advancement of this disabling disease. That drug costs a staggering $65,000 a year—more than most Mississippians make. Even with good insurance coverage, Scott cannot afford the drug, and the price for OCREVUS, so he just goes without.

MS drugs have seen some of the most shocking price increases of all, with list prices rising nearly 450 percent over the last 10 years.

Two neurologists in Mississippi told me about their Medicare patients who quickly move into the catastrophic phase of Medicare Part D early each year. Even though these patients face only a 5-percent out-of-pocket cost for their drugs in this phase, that small percentage can amount to thousands of dollars for the expensive neurology drugs these patients depend on. Because there is currently no Medicare Part D out-of-pocket cap, they cannot get relief from high drug prices later in the year when they still have to have them.

These are just a few of the many stories that I have received from Mississippians. I have one of my own as well.

My mother, a Medicare beneficiary living in Monticello, MS—Hyde, Loraine—faced $454.50—right there—in out-of-pocket costs for her prescription eye drops earlier this year. A tiny bottle of eye drops, a drug called RESTASIS, has been on the market well over a decade—more than enough time for Allergan, the pharmaceutical company that developed the drug, to recoup its investment. Yet the average wholesale price of this drug has increased almost 250 percent in 10 years. It was almost unbelievable when my mom called me and told me what she paid for eye drops.

This case went all the way to the U.S. Supreme Court because Allergan had undertaken what I consider one of the most blatantly anti-competitive schemes in the history of the pharmaceutical industry. Fearing competition after its RESTASIS patent expired in 2014, Allergan transferred the patents to a Native American Tribe in an attempt to use the Tribe’s sovereign immunity to shield Allergan against competition from lower priced generic alternatives. As I said, this case went all the way to the Supreme Court in 2018. Even though the Supreme Court ultimately ruled this scheme was illegal, the company’s underhanded ploy successfully delayed competition while it continued to reap outrageous benefits from RESTASIS, costing the U.S. healthcare system over $2 billion per year because of their monopoly pricing.

We want pharmaceutical companies to succeed. The great cures and treatments they discover improve the lives of many, many Americans. We recognize that fact. But the cure and therapeutics can only save lives if the patients can afford them. Too many Mississippians and individuals across this country cannot afford their prescription drugs due to the anti-competitive prices of companies—like Allergan—that continue to increase their prices year after year.

Today, the threat of the coronavirus pandemic has only increased concerns about our treatments and treatments for COVID-19 are being tested and developed, the affordability of prescription drugs is more important than ever. Just as much as we need a vaccine or treatment to be discovered, we need it to be affordable for Americans if we are going to get on the other side of this pandemic.

I am proud to be an original cosponsor of the Finance Committee chair’s comprehensive Prescription Drug Pricing Reduction Act to bring affordability and fairness to the prescription drug market. This bill must be an immediate priority for us as leaders if we are serious—if we are serious—about helping patients afford the drugs they need.

This important legislation would create a true out-of-pocket cap for Medicare beneficiaries, reinforce the market forces that have supported the research and development of so many cures, and prevent pharmaceutical companies from price gouging, prevent taxpayers from being on the hook for unlimited price hacks that have no basis in the free market, stop the hurtful tactics of pharmacy benefit managers that hurt patients and community pharmacies while enriching the middlemen.

These reforms could reduce out-of-pocket spending on prescription drugs by $72 billion, reduce premiums by $1 billion, and save taxpayers $95 billion. The Congressional Budget Office anticipates those savings will spill over into even more savings in the commercial health market.

This is a priority that should transcend party politics. Yet Democrats who had previously supported Chair GRASSLEY’s reform legislation have walked away from the drug pricing negotiation table altogether. They would rather deny President Trump a victory on this issue than help the millions of Americans struggling to make ends meet due to high drug costs.

There is no doubt about it: They are putting election-year politics ahead of making prescription drugs affordable for the American people.

This American people can’t wait. Every month they continue to block this vital legislation is another month of thousands of dollars in insulin expenses for the Quinn family in Fulton, MS. Each month delayed is another month that Scott Crawford’s MS advances because he cannot afford his medications. Every month is another month that those neurologists in Jackson will continue to worry about their patients on Medicare who face unlimited out-of-pocket expenses due to no out-of-pocket cap.

These patients, and millions more like them, cannot wait until next year.
or until the coronavirus pandemic passes or until Democrats decide to put the American people over politics.

Mississippians and Americans need a solution now. My friend the Senator from Iowa has done the hard work of writing a bill over the past 18 months that can address the heart of the issue and garner bipartisan consensus. I call on my colleagues to include the Prescription Drug Pricing Reduction Act in the next coronavirus relief package.

I have been very excited to work on this. This is one of the very reasons that I came to Washington, DC—to help Mississippians. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Ms. MCSALLY. Mr. President, I want to thank Chairman GRASSLEY for his tireless leadership on lowering the cost of prescription drugs. I am proud to join with him on the floor today and join him in his legislation that we must pass to help Americans and to help Arizonans.

 Everywhere I go—and when I am hearing from Arizonans—I am constantly hearing about the rising costs of prescription drugs. It is among one of their top and most pressing concerns. From seniors who can’t afford their medications to parents struggling to care for a child who suffers from chronic conditions, out-of-pocket drug costs are too high. Far too many seniors and hard-working individuals in our State either can’t afford both their groceries and their medications or they have been forced to ration their prescriptions because of skyrocketing drug costs.

In 2017, AARP Arizona reported that a whopping 26 percent of our residents stopped taking their medications as prescribed due to cost.

Last fall, I heard from a constituent in her sixties from Green Valley, AZ, who was diagnosed with rheumatoid arthritis and taking several medications for her condition. When she transitioned to Medicare Part D from her employer’s health plan, her out-of-pocket costs for one of the drugs she was taking—Enbrel—went from $19 per month to nearly $6,000 per month. This is a 300-percent increase in her monthly out-of-pocket costs just for this drug alone. I don’t know anybody who can afford $6,000 a month for one drug as a senior—as anyone. This is insane. She had to switch to another medication twice, but because they were infusions, she now has to travel 84 miles round trip to get treated. The significant jump in drug costs have affected both her pocketbook even her quality of life.

This is unacceptable, and I have worked with my Senate colleagues on both sides of the aisle, with Chairman GRASSLEY’s leadership, over the past year and a half since I have been in the Senate to bring down the costs of drugs and help Americans save more of their money.

Senator GRASSLEY’s bill, of which I am proud to be an original cosponsor, does just that by holding Big Pharma companies accountable for exploiting loopholes and keeping pricing high for seniors, families, and taxpayers. Our bill pulls back the curtain on drug pricing and negotiations. It ends the stick-er shock at the pharmacy counter, and it caps out-of-pocket costs for seniors so that Arizonans can afford the medicines they need.

According to the Congressional Budget Office, our Prescription Drug Pricing Reduction Act would save taxpayers close to $2 trillion over the next 10 years. This bill is even more important now that we are navigating a global pandemic and its subsequent economic challenges that are squeezing family and fixed-income senior budgets even more than in normal times. With over 17 million Americans unemployed—including many Arizonans—along with the ever-looming threat of the coronavirus, prescription medicine should be the least of their concerns. Our bill would give Americans and Arizonans one less thing to worry about during these extraordinarily difficult and unprecedented times.

Unfortunately, despite this bill receiving strong bipartisan support until just a few months ago, Democrats recently chose to walk away at the direction of their party’s leadership, and instead embrace the timetable of this legislation that they co-authored. This happens only in DC.

Just to be clear: They were for it before they were against it. This is maddening. This is why people all over my State are so frustrated with the dysfunction in this place, where people are willing to put looking for power and electoral politics ahead of what people need right now. Right now they need relief. They need relief to lower their out-of-pocket costs for all of the issues that they are facing as seniors, as families—all of the diagnoses, any of the conditions. These lifesaving and quality-of-life-improving medicines—we have to lower the costs, and now is the time to do it. Arizona patients and taxpayers and families and seniors need Washington to act now.

I want to urge our Democratic colleagues to put politics aside. I know it is hard to do in an election year, but put it aside. Service before self—that is one of the core values I learned in the Air Force. I bring it here with me today.

Serving others first—that is why you are here. Put those politics aside. Let’s act to lower the out-of-pocket costs of prescription drugs in our upcoming coronavirus relief bill.

This is a pivotal moment for action. We have to come together as a Congress to ensure hard-working Americans, their families, and seniors can access the treatments they need at an affordable cost.

Let’s pass this bill now. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I rise, together with the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, to talk about the chairman’s plan to conclude the deliberations of the legislation before us today.

As you well know from being in the committee, this was a process that was bipartisan, thoughtful, extremely wellorchestrated by the chairman, and we accomplished a great deal. As you know, the members of the committee— we considered literally hundreds of different amendments by the members as we marked up the legislation. Then we passed the bill out of committee, we brought it to the floor, and at that point, a total of 88 amendments were filed on the legislation—446 Republican amendments, 422 Democratic amendments, and 12 joint amendments. So we had a rich field to pick from in terms of trying to improve the legislation.

The first substitute that was introduced on the floor before final delibera-
tion included a total of 79 amendments—34 Republican amendments, 34 Democratic amendments, and 11 joint amendments. Then we proceeded forward. Last week we came up with another unanimous consent to allow the votes that took place this week on several very important amendments, but in addition to that, we incorporated another legislative proposal including 62 amendments.

So from the introduction of the bill to the floor and to this moment, we have adopted 141 amendments. They are bipartisan, both Democrats and Republicans. Now we are at the point—and the chairman, I believe, has a very thoughtful way to conclude the legisla-
tion—to consider another round of amendments and then be able to move to final passage very quickly.

Again, let me conclude by saying that the chairman has done a remark-
able job. I commend him for his bipar-
tisanship, his thoughtfulness, and his cooperation, and I am completely supportive of his proposal to bring this bill to a conclusion.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, first of all, can I say Senator REED has been incredibly great in this whole process. We have been working on this for a whole year now, and we are now to the point where tomorrow we should be able to pass it out of—it will not be before that time. We have a conference we are going to have to be faced with and all that, but today and tomorrow morning are very important to us.

The point that is made by Senator REED—if you add up all the amend-
ments, the real total is 141 days. Only are there 141 amendments since we came out of the committee, but in
the committee, we had over 800 amendments that were part of the bill to start with.

One of the reasons—and I think I speak for Senator Reed and myself at the same time. We have had some experience where we have been. Since the Senate operates with unanimous consent, we were unable to have any amendments at all on the floor. So in order to do that, to make sure—if that should happen again, we wanted to make sure we had all these amendments already in the bill. So that was our starting point.

Now, here is where we are today. We had a great vote on the NDAA, receiving an 87-to-13 vote in favor of ending debate on the substitute. That was great. That was today. That means we are at kind of the end of this process now. We have continued to work on another managers’ package.

Last night we hotlined—a lot of the people watching are familiar with the terminology. We hotlined—we sent out to all the Democrats and all the Republicans for any objections they might have—another group of amendments. It was a large group, an equal number of amendments for Republican and Democratic managers. It came back, and there were a lot of objections to it, so we have now taken that and started on one last managers’ package that we are going to be—a modified version that we are going to hotline tonight.

It is very important that people are listening right now. A lot of times people aren’t listening. Certainly, the staffs should let their Members know that they are going to get a hotline on actually 40 amendments—20 Democratic amendments, 20 Republican amendments—tonight. That is going to be the hotline they are going to look at. Some of your staff and some of the Members may not have read these amendments yet. It is likely that is the case. If you have objections to amendments in this package—that is what we are hotlining—we encourage you to lodge those objections with the Cloakroom. That is when you get these things. That is going to be tonight. We will note those objections and see what remains.

Tomorrow morning—let’s say all the objections have come in. Tomorrow morning, at a time—we were hoping that it was going to be around 10:30 tomorrow, but we know a lot of people want to talk; a lot of people want to be heard. We can’t control that, but we will ask for unanimous consent to pass the package with a balanced number of amendments from both Democrats and Republicans. This is tomorrow, hopefully at 10:30, but maybe that will not work.

We will require Members who want to object to this final package to come down to the floor in person and object. If you already have an objection to a specific amendment in this package registered with the Cloakroom, the amendment should have been pulled from the package. It will not even appear at that time. Otherwise, you need to be here to object in person.

We use the term “balanced.” This is how this works. We have 40 amendments that are going to be hotlined tonight. If the Republicans have eight of them, and then the Democrats have seven they object to, they have to find one more to object to so it ends up being eight and eight or so that the number will be equal. It sounds a little complicated and it might make it might not work, but it will work. We have been doing this now for over a year. Actually, we started this process 2 years ago. So it is going to be the responsibility of the Democrats and the Republicans to make that even so that no one can say that it is biased to one side.

So all of that is what is going to happen, and it is very important that staff and Members be aware of that because what we do happen is have someone come along and say they were not aware of this process that is in place. So that is the process we are going to use, and that is one that is fair.

Again, I don’t think—and this will be the 60th consecutive year. There has never been a year, in my memory, that has had more amendments considered than we have considered this year.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

REINFORCING AMERICAN-MADE PRODUCTS ACT OF 2020

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, when Americans see a “Made in the U.S.A.” label on a product, it is a source of great pride, and justifiably so. It represents the American virtues of entrepreneurialism and industriousness. It has always been to the point that, as Americans, we have a common sense of destiny and a common appreciation for the inherent dignity and eternal worth of the human soul. It is a symbol of support for American manufacturing jobs, for local communities, and for high-quality products. So it often spurs American consumers as well as foreign consumers to buy a particular product—a product lucky enough to have that label.

The Federal Trade Commission currently enforces a difficult standard for all products that want to claim the “Made in the U.S.A.” label. It requires that “all or virtually all” of a product be made in the United States, and it has issued a lengthy legal guidance document—or a series thereof—establishing rules for who may and may not claim that title.

However, one State holds a different standard—one that is nearly impossible for businesses to meet. Under California’s law, if more than 5 percent of the components of a particular product are manufactured outside the United States—even if that means just a few bolts or a few screws—that product cannot lawfully be labeled “Made in the U.S.A.”

Because of the flow of interstate and international commerce, in which most manufacturers sell wholesale to national and international distributors who then dispense products all throughout the country, the other 49 States are forced to comply with this one—the most rigid definition—in order to avoid costly litigation. Under any practical circumstances, this just means they can’t use the label. It makes it impracticable as a business matter and not feasible as a legal matter for them to claim that label. Even though they could legally boast the “Made in the U.S.A.” claim in every other State in the country, California makes it more or less impossible for them to do so. In other words, a single State is effectively dictating a country-of-origin label. Think about that for a minute.

If California or any other State in the Union, for that matter, would like to create a State-of-origin label, I have no issue with such a State doing that and wouldn’t suggest that the Federal Government ought to undo those practices. But as it currently stands, the California law undermines Congress’s rightful authority to regulate interstate commerce and needlessly harms American manufacturers.

This is one of the reasons we are our own worst enemy. This is one of the reasons we fly the Stars and Stripes. It is one of the reasons the Constitution came into existence to begin with—to give Congress the power to regulate commerce between the several States with foreign nations, and with Indian Tribes. Our previous form of government, under the Articles of Confederation, didn’t create a Congress that had that power. As a result, in the early days following the American Revolution, States were engaging in activities amounting to economic Balkanization. We saw economic Balkanization among and between the States. That is why our Founding Fathers gathered in that hot, fateful, and sweltering summer of 1787 in Philadelphia—for this very reason.

The Reinforcing American-Made Products Act would solve this very problem. It would simply ensure that the FTC has the exclusive authority to set the national standard for “Made in the U.S.A.” labeling. The legislation would provide clarity and consistency, helping American companies to avoid unnecessary hardships and frivolous lawsuits that would otherwise deter them from using this coveted and justifiably enviable label of “Made in the U.S.A.”

Now more than ever, in the midst of the economic turmoil associated with the global pandemic, we ought to be doing all we can to support American jobs and to strengthen our local communities. This legislation would help us accomplish just that. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of it.
Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be discharged from further consideration of S. 4065 and that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the bill by title.

The bill clerk reads as follows:

A bill (S. 4065) to make exclusive the authority of the Federal Government to regulate the labeling of products made in the United States and introduced in interstate or foreign commerce, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the committee was discharged, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

Mr. LEE. I know of no further debate on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

Hearing none, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (S. 4065) was passed, as follows:

S. 4065

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE. This Act may be cited as the "Driftnet Modernization and Bycatch Reduction Act".

SEC. 2. DEFINITION. (a) IN GENERAL.—To the extent'; by striking ''To'' and inserting the following:

"(1) in the first sentence, by striking "To the extent" and inserting the following:

"(a) IN GENERAL.—To the extent''; and

(b) EFFECT ON STATE LAW.—Section 206(b) of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1826(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (6), by striking "and" at the end;

(2) in paragraph (7), by striking the period and inserting "; and"; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

"(8) within the exclusive economic zone, large-scale driftnet fishing that deploys nets with large mesh sizes causes significant entanglement and mortality of living marine resources, including myriad protected species, despite the limitations on the lengths of such nets.

"SEC. 3. FINDINGS AND POLICY. (a) FINDINGS.—Section 206(b) of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1826(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (6), by striking "and" at the end;

(2) in paragraph (7), by striking the period and inserting "; and"; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

"(4) prioritize the phase out of large-scale driftnet fishing in the exclusive economic zone and promote the development of alternative fishing methods and gear types that minimize the incidental catch of living marine resources.

"SEC. 4. TRANSITION PROGRAM. Section 206 of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1826) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(1) FISHING GEAR TRANSITION PROGRAM.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—During the 5-year period beginning on the date of enactment of the Driftnet Modernization and Bycatch Reduction Act, the Secretary shall conduct a transition program to facilitate the phase-out of large-scale driftnet fishing and adoption of alternative fishing practices that minimize the incidental catch of living marine resources, and shall award grants to eligible permit holders who participate in the program.

"(2) PERMISSIBLE USES.—Any permit holder receiving a grant under paragraph (1) may use such funds only for the purpose of covering—

"(A) any fee originally associated with a permit authorizing participation in a large-scale driftnet fishery, if such permit is surrendered for permanent revocation, and such permit holder relinquishes any claim associated with the permit;

"(B) any forfeiture of fishing gear associated with a permit described in subparagraph (A); or

"(C) the purchase of alternative gear with more incidental catch mortality of marine resources, if the fishery participant is authorized to continue fishing using such alternative gears.

"(ii) is conducted within 5 years of the date of enactment of the Driftnet Modernization and Bycatch Reduction Act.".

S. 906

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,
SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.
This Act may be cited as the “Driftnet Modernization and Bycatch Reduction Act”.

SEC. 2. DEFINITION.
Section 206(2) of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1802(25)) is amended by inserting “,” with a mesh size of 14 inches or greater; and (4) is compiled within 5 years of the date of enactment of the Driftnet Modernization and Bycatch Reduction Act”.

SEC. 3. FINDINGS AND POLICY.
(a) FINDINGS.—Section 206(b) of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1802(25)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (6), by striking “and” at the end;
(2) in paragraph (7), by striking the period and inserting “; and”; and
(3) by adding at the end following—
“(8) within the exclusive economic zone, large-scale driftnet fishing that deploys nets with large mesh sizes causes significant entanglement and mortality of living marine resources, including myriad protected species, despite limitations on the lengths of such nets.”.

(b) POLICY.—Section 206(c) of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1802(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking “and” at the end;
(2) in paragraph (3), by striking the period and inserting “; and”; and
(3) by adding at the end the following—
“(4) prioritize the phase out of large-scale driftnet fishing in the exclusive economic zone and promote the development and adoption of alternative fishing methods and gear types that minimize the incidental catch of living marine resources.”.

SEC. 4. TRANSITION PROGRAM.
Section 206 of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1826) is amended by adding at the end the following—

“(1) DRIFTNET GEAR TRANSITION PROGRAM.—
“(A) FISHING GEAR TRANSITION PROGRAM.—
“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Drift Net Modernization and Bycatch Reduction Act, the Secretary shall conduct a transition program to facilitate the phase-out of large-scale driftnet fishing and adoption of alternative fishing practices that minimize the impact of living marine resources, and shall award grants to eligible permit holders who participate in the program.
“(2) PERMISSIBLE USES.—Any permit holder receiving a grant under paragraph (1) may use such funds only for the purpose of covering—
“(A) any fee originally associated with a permit authorizing participation in a large-scale driftnet fishery, if such permit is surrendered for permanent revocation, and such permit holder relinquishes any claim associated with the permit;
“(B) a forfeiture of fishing gear associated with a permit described in subparagraph (A); or
“(C) the purchase of alternative gear with minimal incidental catch of living marine resources, if the fishery participant is authorized to continue fishing using such alternative gears.
“(3) CERTIFICATION.—The Secretary shall certify that, with respect to each participant in the program under this subsection, any permit authorizing participation in a large-scale driftnet fishery has been permanently revoked and that no new permits will be issued to authorize such fishing.”.

SEC. 5. EXCEPTION.
Section 307(1)(M) of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1807(1)(M)) is amended by inserting—

“(1) deploys, within the exclusive economic zone, a net with a total length of less than two and one-half kilometers and a mesh size of 14 inches or greater; and
“(2) is compiled within 5 years of the date of enactment of the Driftnet Modernization and Bycatch Reduction Act”.

SEC. 6. FEES.
(a) IN GENERAL.—The North Pacific Fishery Management Council may recommend, and the Secretary of Commerce may approve, regulations necessary for the collection of fees from charter vessel operators who harvest the harvestable Pacific halibut in International Pacific Halibut Commission regulatory areas 2C and 3A as those terms are defined in part 679 of title 50, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulations).

(b) USE OF FEES.—Any fees collected under this section shall be available, without appropriation or fiscal year limitation, for the purposes of—

(1) financing administrative costs of the Recreational Quota Entity program;
(2) the purchase of halibut quota shares in International Pacific Halibut Commission regulatory areas 2C and 3A by the recreational quota entity authorized in part 679 of title 50, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulations);
(3) halibut conservation and research; and
(4) payment of the halibut resource in the recreational quota entity authorized in part 679 of title 50, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulations).

Mr. KAINE. I ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZA-
TION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2021—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

S. 409

MR. KANE. Mr. President, I rise tonight to speak about a provision of the National Defense Authorization Act that would direct the renaming of military bases and facilities that are currently named for those who voluntarily fought for the Confederacy during the Civil War.

I thank Senator Warren for offering the amendment, and I particularly thank her for making adjustments to the amendment to accommodate concerns of colleagues on both sides of the aisle. I was proud to cosponsor the revision in committee and speak for it today.

It is important to state clearly what this amendment will do. If it passes and survives a threatened Presidential veto, it will require the Department of Defense to initiate a 3-year process to change the name of any military base, barracks, or other facility named after a Confederate military leader. Why 3 years? The timing is designed to allow a full public process in each location so that the desires of the community leaders can be taken into account in choosing new names.

I state with clarity the substance of the amendment because one of my colleagues took the floor earlier this month to oppose the amendment, and he obscured its purpose in describing it, only saying that it required that “some of the names of our Nation’s military bases must be removed.” He neglected to mention that the amendment specifically sought change only to military facilities named after Confederates. In fact, he did not mention the Confederacy or the Civil War at all.

If you are unwilling to be plain about what is at stake, it portrays a weakness, not a strength. If you choose to be plain, I speak today because I am a Senator from the State with the most at stake in this discussion. Three of the ten bases whose names must be changed under this amendment are in Virginia. Virginia was the State whose people were most affected by the Civil War, and I served as its 70th Governor. My hometown of Richmond was the capital of the Confederacy, and I served as its 76th mayor. I have dealt with issues of Civil War names, statues, memorials, battlefields, and battle flags throughout my 26 years in public life. Based on decades of grappling with this question, I want to describe a principle, explain an epiphany, and finally pose a question.

First, a principle: If you declare war on the United States, take up arms against it, and kill U.S. troops, you should not have a U.S. military base named after you.

If you declare war on the United States, take up arms against it, and kill U.S. troops, you should not have a U.S. military base named after you.

This principle is nowhere stated in law because it need not be. It is a basic commonsense principle. The principle explains why we have no Fort Cornwallis, Fort Benedict Arnold, Fort Santa Ana, Fort Von Hindenburg, Fort Tojo, Fort Ho Chi Minh.

If you declare war on the United States, take up arms against it, and kill U.S. troops, you should not have a U.S. military base named after you. But we make an exception. Ten bases and many other military facilities are named after Confederate leaders who declared war on the United States, took up arms against it, and killed U.S. troops. Even further, they took these actions to destroy the United States, to tear our country in half so that the seceding Southern States could continue to own those of African descent as slaves—a species of property—rather than treating them as equal human beings. Is this worthy of honor? Does it justify an exception to the sound principle that I describe?

Why were these 10 bases so named when they were constructed in the years before and during the First and Second World Wars? The names were not chosen due to the military skill of the Confederate leaders. Some are revered for their prowess, but some are reviled. The names were not chosen to honor heroes and heroes—some are respected—excepting the bight on character that support for slavery confers—but others were not
distinguished in their behavior or their integrity. The record makes clear that the 10 bases were named for Confederate leaders upon their construction during the First and Second World Wars because of a lingering belief in their views providing the Nation to uphold slavery and White supremacy.

In the days of mandated segregation, a vibrant Ku Klux Klan, popular culture painting a false picture of the war and its aftermath with films like “The Birth of a Nation” and “Gone with the Wind,” there was a powerful desire to hold up the Confederate cause, to sanitize the Confederate cause and deny the reality of African-American suffering. That desire even affected this very body during those years, as the Senate repeatedly used the filibuster to block Federal anti-lynching legislation.

It is clear now, as it has been clear for a very long time, that the cause of the Confederacy was not just but monstrous. Destroying the “Nation with the Wind,” there was a powerful desire to hold up the Confederate cause, to sanitize the Confederate cause and deny the reality of African-American suffering. That desire even affected this very body during those years, as the Senate repeatedly used the filibuster to block Federal anti-lynching legislation.

History can’t be rewritten, and it is important to tell it, but choosing who to honor is another matter entirely. I repeat: I believe that we must have no exception: If you declare war on the United States, take up arms against it, and kill U.S. troops, you should not have a U.S. military base named after you.

This wisdom was understood immediately in the aftermath of the Civil War by Robert E. Lee. He was asked about memorials to the Confederacy and stated: “I think it wiser not to keep open the sores of war but to follow the examples of those nations who endeavored to obliterate the marks of civil strife, to commit to oblivion the feelings engendered.” This amendment is consistent with Lee’s wise observation.

Second, let me explain an epiphany that I have had just in the last few months. When I moved to Virginia to get married in 1984, I saw the Confederate statues in Richmond, and I was puzzled. As a Kansas-raised civil rights lawyer and then later as a local elected official in a city that was majority African American, I was struck by their continued prominence. But together with the leadership of my diverse city, we viewed these statues and other symbols of our past as painful reminders of an incomplete past—painful because of the reality of slavery and discrimination, which have warped our Commonwealth and country since 1619, and incomplete as well. Where were the statues to Richmond heroes from the revolution or the civil rights movement? Why did our city highlight 4
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I thank God I can still learn some new things at age 62. In my view, the statues and base names and the other Confederate honorifics that dot the American landscape have been about the past. But I now see that, for so many, they raise deep and troubling questions about the present and the future. Are we committed to the equality that our federal North Star announced by Jefferson in the Declaration of Independence and reconfirmed by Lincoln at Gettysburg? If we continue to honor men who fought to deport those of African descent of their equality, we signal that we are not committed to our most fundamental American value.

Finally, there are questions for those, including the President, who attempt to honor Confederate names from military bases or take down Confederate statues.

When you saw young Germans in 1989 spray graffiti on the Berlin Wall and knock it down, how did you feel? I knew how I felt. You felt good to see people standing up and saying: You will no longer divide us.

When you saw people throughout the Soviet bloc pulling down statues of Stalin and Lenin after the collapse of the Soviet Union or Iraqis pulling down statues of Saddam Hussein, how did you feel? I know how you felt. You felt good to see people standing and saying with their actions: We will no longer glorify tyrants who oppressed us.

When you see protests by thousands of Hong Kongers in the streets protesting against the Chinese Government, how do you feel? I know how you feel because I heard you, even in this Chamber. You feel good seeing everyday people standing up against a government that would deprive them of their basic freedom.

Well, if you feel that way—and I believe virtually all Americans do—how can we feel otherwise about patriotic Americans who believe in a nation committed to the equality of all when they stand up and say: We will not be divided. We will not glorify those who oppressed us. We will not honor those who stood against our freedom. That is what our people, especially our young people, are saying to us now. Supporting this amendment will show them that we are listening.

In conclusion, we Americans have grown as a nation and as a people since the Civil War. And we have grown as a society and as a country from the first half of the 20th century when, in very different circumstances, it was still seen as a good idea to honor the Confederacy.

One of the key areas of our growth—admittedly a progress of fits and starts—has been a greater acceptance of others, regardless of race or religion or sexual orientation or gender or nationality or physical ability. Thank God for that growth. Of course, the evolution is about overcoming the real-time injustices that are manifest all around us.

I yield the floor.
times, and, right now, folks are working hard just to make ends meet to put food on their table and to care for their families and their loved ones.

As our communities continue to grapple with the devastating impacts of this coronavirus pandemic, the crisis of rising drug costs in the United States has only worsened. Now, more than ever, folks are operating on very thin margins and simply don’t have room in their budgets for expensive prescriptions.

No individual should have to make the decision between filling a lifesaving prescription and feeding their family. The skyrocketing costs of prescription drugs have become a matter of life and death for so many. We have heard the heartbreaking stories of individuals who could not afford their insulin, who were forced to ration and skip doses, and, as a result, they lost their lives.

I remember quite vividly a conversation I had with an Iowa mother explaining how she lost her son who, as a young man, was rationing his insulin because he could not afford to do more. It was a heartbreaking discussion, and having that discussion with that mother, I honestly thought about how many of my own brother and sister who have been reliant on insulin as juvenile diabetics for nearly all of their lives.

When we talk about the cost of prescription drugs, lives are literally on the line. Iowans have been very clear with me where they stand on this issue. They want to see us come together to advance solutions that drive down those drug prices. Seniors, families, and children all need to be assured that when they go to the pharmacy, they will be able to afford their medications and not have to skip a meal—or more—to do so.

This is why I was proud to join my friend and my colleague, Senator Grassley, in introducing a piece of legislation that I know he has worked tirelessly on—the Prescription Drug Pricing Reduction Act of 2020. This vital piece of legislation would root out unfair pricing shenanigans and perverse payment incentives that allow pharmaceutical companies to take advantage of the system at the expense of taxpayers and patients.

According to the Congressional Budget Office, this bill would save taxpayers $56 billion with a “b,” reduce out-of-pocket expenses by $72 billion with a “b,” and reduce premiums by $1 billion with a “b.”

It needs to be said that Chairman Grassley worked for months on end to craft this bill in a bipartisan manner with his Democratic counterparts. In fact, two-thirds of the Senate Finance Committee approved our bipartisan Prescription Drug Pricing Reduction Act a year ago this very month; two-thirds of the Finance Committee. Yet, at a time when Americans are struggling to afford rent and groceries, my colleagues across the aisle suddenly chose to drop their support for this bipartisan drug pricing reform bill that they helped write.

Let me make that clear. The Democrats helped write the bill with Senator Grassley. Those who sat on the Finance Committee approved this bill last year.

This year, they are refusing to assist my senior Senator, Chuck Grassley, in moving forward a bill they helped write. That brings me to the question. What changed over the course of one year? Do you know what, folks? That is exactly what happened. It was the year: 2020 is an election year, and that means Washington is not focused on solutions; it is all about the political scoreboard.

We have seen it already this year with our friends across the aisle blocking us from even debating the JUSTICE Act, the police reform bill that contained about 70 percent of what our Democratic colleagues were asking for in police reform.

Iowans put their partisanship aside and came together and got a police reform package passed; that is, Iowans in our State legislature. I wish we could say the same for Washington, not only on the JUSTICE Act but also this prescription drug pricing bill. Lowering prescription drug costs shouldn’t be about who gets the credit. It should be about working across the aisle to save lives, which is the very reason that Senator Grassley worked hand in hand with Democrats on this bill.

Iowans should expect more from Washington. They want more, and they should get it.

Chairman Grassley, President Trump, and I will not back down from this fight. We will press on and do everything in our power to provide relief to Americans who desperately need it. I will continue to call on my Democratic colleagues to come to the table to work on improving our Nation’s healthcare system and drive down the costs for Americans. Whether it is lowering drug costs, expanding childcare options for working parents, or ensuring protections for individuals with preexisting conditions, like my sister and my brother, or simply making sure that children have access to clean diapers—simple things. These are all issues that Americans want to see Congress take action on.

Just recently, I joined with my colleague Senator Braun of Indiana in introducing a bill that helps address yet another critical issue for Americans—increasing transparency and lowering healthcare costs.

Our Healthcare Price Transparency Act would implement the administration’s rules requiring hospitals and insurers to post discounts and negotiated rates to patients before they receive medical care. Iowans should be able to know the costs associated with their healthcare in advance so they can make the best decisions for themselves and for their families.

Folks, let’s not forget that, outside the Halls of Congress, Americans are facing hard times. They are mourning the loss of loved ones who have been taken by this virus. They are worried about how they will take care of their children at home while they work to provide. They are concerned for their health and the well-being of their loved ones. They are wondering if by ordering skipping a dose of their medication or cutting a pill in half to try to make those prescriptions stretch just a little bit further until their next paychecks.

Let’s put aside political interests. Let’s work together on this. I will be standing at the ready, and it is my sincere hope that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will join me in this effort.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, 6 weeks ago, I stood here as the Senate prepared to begin deliberating historic conservation legislation—the Great American Outdoors Act. I introduced this legislation with Senator Manchin, of West Virginia, along with so many bipartisan champions of the outdoors and our public lands. Senators Daines, Portman, Warner, Alexander, King, Cantwell, Burr, and Heinrich are just a few of the champions who helped to shepherd this historic legislation through this Chamber. I remarked on that day that it was not often the Senate had a chance to make history, but, indeed, history we made.

The Senate came together in an overwhelmingly bipartisan fashion and passed the Great American Outdoors Act 73 to 25, and just moments ago, the U.S. House of Representatives joined us in making history by passing the Great American Outdoors Act with a vote of 310 to 107.

This legislation is headed today to the desk of the President of the United States for his signature. The President has already supported the bill, noting the nature of this historic bill and the huge conservation victory that it is. Weeks since passage, I have traveled all over the great State of Colorado and have visited with land management officials, professionals, stakeholders, and constituents to discuss what the Great American Outdoors Act will really mean on the ground for a personal, local level for Coloradans and the Great American Outdoors Act will really mean on the ground for a personal, local level for Coloradans and the Great American Outdoors Act will really mean on the ground for a personal, local level for Coloradans and the Great American Outdoors Act will really mean on the ground for a personal, local level for Coloradans and the Great American Outdoors Act will really mean on the ground for a personal, local level for Coloradans and the Great American Outdoors Act will really mean on the ground for a personal, local level for Coloradans and the Great American Outdoors Act will really mean on the ground for a personal, local level for Coloradans and the Great American Outdoors Act will really mean on the ground for a personal, local level for Coloradans and the Great American Outdoors Act will really mean on the ground for a personal, local level for Coloradans and the Great American Outdoors Act will really mean on the ground for a personal, local level for Coloradans and the Great American Outdoors Act will really mean on the ground for a personal, local level for Coloradans and the Great American Outdoors Act will really mean on the ground for a personal, local level for Coloradans and the Great American Outdoors Act will really mean on the ground for a personal, local level for Coloradans and the Great American Outdoors Act will really mean on the ground for a personal, local level for Coloradans and the Great American Outdoors Act will really mean on the ground for a personal, local level for Coloradans and the Great American Outdoors Act will really mean on the ground for a personal, local level for Coloradans and the Great American Outdoors Act will really mean on the ground for a personal, local level for Coloradans and the Great American Outdoors Act will really mean on the ground for a personal, local level for Coloradans and the Great American Outdoors Act will really mean on the ground for a personal, local level for Coloradans and the Great American Outdoors Act will really mean on the ground for a personal, local level for Coloradans and the Great American Outdoors Act will really mean on the ground for a personal, local level for Coloradans and the Great American Outdoors Act will really mean on the ground for a personal, local level for Coloradans and the Great American Outdoors Act will really mean on the ground for a personal, local level for Coloradans and the Great American Outdoors Act will really mean on the ground for a personal, local level for Coloradans and the Great American Outdoors Act will really mean on the ground for a personal, local level for Coloradans and the Great American Outdoors Act will really mean on the ground for a personal, local level for Coloradans and the Great American Outdoors Act will really mean on the ground for a personal, local level for Coloradans and the Great American Outdoors Act will really mean on the ground for a personal, local level for Coloradans and the Great American Outdoors Act will really mean on the ground for a personal, local level for Colorado and Colorado’s public lands. I would like to share some of those stories with you today.

Here we have a picture of an amphitheater that is outside of the Black Canyon of the Gunnison National Park. If you would just go a little bit further to the right, you would actually be in the canyon.
This is an amphitheater that was built, basically, in the 1960s. The park itself is now about 20 years old. It had over 40,000 people visit it last year. It has a deferred maintenance backlog of $7.7 million, and this South Rim Amphitheater facility is part of that backlog. It is being used, but it needs significant upgrades. If you actually sat on one of those benches, you probably wouldn’t be able to sit anywhere else for quite a long time because of the splinters and the gouges that were coming off. There is wood that is on those benches, and there are electrical outlets that are popping up from an old projection system.

This is supposed to be used for educational and educational opportunities. With the right improvements, they will be able to restore this and get it back to its original purpose. New park benches and electrical work are among just a bit of this amphitheater’s needed—$200,000 deferred maintenance project alone, this site for education and for experiential learning. Within the rest of the park, there are millions more in maintenance projects like this one that need to be performed and carried out.

Our lands are busy. People are loving them. This is one example, and it is one example of a project that will be completed thanks to the Great American Outdoors Act. Yet it is not just national parks that have maintenance needs.

Secretary of Agriculture Sonny Perdue joined me in Colorado in mid-June, and we toured the Mizpah Campground, which is in the Arapahoe and Roosevelt National Forests, that has been closed for a decade. This is a beautiful river, and the campground is back here. There is only one problem: There is no bridge. This river wiped out the culvert and the bridge a decade ago. This campground without access because, 10 years ago—a decade ago—a flood came through—high water came through—and wiped out the access. You can’t even use this public facility because of a decades-long maintenance backlog at this facility alone.

The Great American Outdoors Act will provide line-of-sight funding for projects like these, which will no longer have to compete for a small pool of funding with every other national forest in the country. When I talk to these professionals—when I talk to the forest rangers and the park superintendents—they talk about how they are able to accomplish building structures in their parks, how they are able to build campgrounds in their parks, and how they are able to keep up with restroom facilities, but they have had no line-of-sight funding for additional help down the road. This means that, as the facilities age, they may just have to be closed or, in this case, wiped out. This is what a loss to the American people that is, but what a benefit to the American people the Great American Outdoors Act will become.

It is not just the national parks or the national forests or the Bureau of Land Management that will benefit from the Great American Outdoors Act. Take the Runyon Sports Complex in Pueblo, CO. This area has a number of ballparks from little leagues to adult leagues. In fact, they just had their first pitch of the season last week—a day that I was actually at the Runyon Sports Complex in Pueblo in tournament to celebrate the beginning of a season that had been much delayed thanks to COVID-19.

This area saw people like Pee Wee Reese play baseball and Babe Ruth visit this same area to play baseball. Now Coloradans of every generation are able to go to the Runyon Sports Complex and enjoy it. It has become a regional draw to help benefit the city economically and to teach kids about sports and teamwork. That is what this means.

The Land and Water Conservation Fund, yes, helps forests and parks, but 40 percent of the Land and Water Conservation Fund’s funding is dedicated to parks and recreation levels. If you grew up on the Front Range of Colorado and played baseball, the odds are good that you will have spent some time on the field at Runyon or at any other number of places that have been funded through the Land and Water Conservation Fund project. Runyon has received over $100,000 in LWCF funding over the years, and the complex continues to be a vital part of the community today.

The LWCF is not just about our public lands; it is about your local ballpark, about your local swimming pool, about playground facilities, and urban parks that otherwise wouldn’t give minority communities access to recreation.

Just up the road from Runyon Field, in El Paso County, CO, and the communities within them, they have benefited greatly from the LWCF. We visited a project in El Paso County that received hundreds of thousands of dollars. It is a county that has received $5 million in funding over the years and has provided benefits for everything from building parks to tennis courts and trails. The State has received over $2 million in funding to improve the Cheyenne Mountain State Park facilities within El Paso County, CO.

Local, regional, and State outdoor recreation projects will only further benefit when the Great American Outdoors Act is signed into law. With the Great American Outdoors Act, Congress is finally fulfilling its commitment to fully and permanently fund the LWCF, which will benefit every State in the Nation.

The passage of this historic legislation could not come at a more critical time. Our economy has suffered during the coronavirus pandemic, and stay-at-home orders have kept Americans cooped up indoors for the last several months. Millions of people and families are facing uncertain futures. Will school return in the fall? Will my business survive this challenging time? Will I receive my next paycheck?

The first waves of the virus hit and shutdown orders went into place, some of Colorado’s mountain towns and rural areas were the hardest and first hit. Community restaurants closed; hotels emptied; and their storefronts were closed to visitors. These are challenging times, no doubt, but one glimmer of hope will always be our public lands and the great outdoors.

This Nation does not have Republican or Democratic public lands. This is not a partisan issue. Preserving and taking care of our public lands provides a benefit to the entire country, and it will provide a benefit for generations to come. Yet not only is this legislation about preserving and protecting our lands, it is also about job creation and economic recovery—more hope for the people of this country. Passing the Great American Outdoors Act will create over 100,000 jobs by addressing the park backlog. In my home State of Colorado, it will create thousands of jobs across the State as the mission of the Great American Outdoors Act is fulfilled. There will be more jobs created as the work begins to address maintenance projects on other Federal lands. The Forest Service, the Bureau of Land Management, our National Wildlife Refuges, and the Bureau of Indian Education’s schools all have needs that will be addressed by this legislation. These will be important opportunities to create jobs when the projects are finally and fully funded.

I mentioned this statistic quite a bit during the consideration of the Great American Outdoors Act in the Senate. For every $1 million we spend on the Land and Water Conservation Fund, it supports between 16 and 30 jobs. That is a figure above and beyond the 100,000 jobs that we created by the parks’ provisions of the legislation alone. This is a bill that will put people to work. It is a bill that will put people to work by building playgrounds, fixing trails, cleaning up ballparks, and protecting our iconic landscapes for generations to come.

This is a bill that reminds us that our communities and our shared, public outdoor spaces are worth investing in. It is a bill that reminds people that we have hope for America. It is a bill that reminds people that your local lands are waiting for you and that Congress was able to come together, during these trying times, in a bipartisan fashion that was so strong and so great that you will be able to enjoy the great American outdoors the way they were meant to be enjoyed.

I am pleased that the House of Representatives affirmed all of this by passing the Great American Outdoors
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Act today with such a strong, bipartisan vote. I thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle and in both Chambers for their hard work and dedication to passing this historic conservation legislation.

I want to mention the President’s signing this bill in the days ahead. I look forward to getting out into the great outdoors, and I look forward to these lands as they continue to inspire the hopes and dreams of kids and adults alike for generations to come.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. President, before the Senator from Colorado leaves the floor, I offer to him my congratulations for his inspired leadership of the Great American Outdoors Act.

This is something that good people on both sides of the aisle have worked on, literally, for as much as a half a century. Now, people are used to politicians who exaggerate, but that is no exaggeration, because I have been around long enough to know and to understand that—first, with the Land and Water Conservation Fund, which was first enacted by Congress in 1964. I was a member of President Reagan’s Commission on American Outdoors and reauthorized support for that in 1986. Senator GARDNER, Senator DAINES, Senator PORTMAN, Senator WARNER, Senator HENNIGEN, Senator MANCHIN, Senator SANTWELL, and a whole parade of Senators on both sides of the aisle have worked very hard to make this happen.

And it would not have happened without President Trump’s leadership, either. We would not have been able to spend the money the way that it is spent—energy exploration money for conservation purposes—unless the President’s Office of Management and Budget had approved that.

So it is usually never true that an important piece of legislation is passed by a single Senator. It is usually a parade of Senators. But Senator GARDNER has been leading the parade, and I congratulate him for that and salute him on behalf of all of us who want to see our national parks—the 419 different places we have, from the Great Smoky Mountains, to Yellowstone, to Pearl Harbor, to the National Mall—protected, as well as our national wildlife refuges, as well as the permanent funding for the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

So I wanted to have an opportunity to say that before he left the floor.

And I see my friend Senator PORTMAN from Ohio here, who really, along with Senator WARNER of Virginia, began the work on the other part of the bill—the bill that would take money from energy exploration and reduce the national park backlog by half over 5 years. The bipartisan legislation contained with the Land and Water Conservation Fund, of more than 800 different outdoor recreation, conservation, and environmental groups, as well as the President.

People will say: Well, that was easy to do with all that support.

It wasn’t easy to do. If it had been easy to do, it would have happened 20 or 30 years ago. But with support from the Senator from North Dakota and leadership from the Senator from Ohio and Senator WARNER from Virginia, especially.

I came to the floor also to talk about something else, but I see the Senator from Ohio so I think I will yield the floor and then speak on the other subject after he has a chance to speak, if he would like to.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Tennessee for focusing on the American Great Outdoors Act. I had come to the floor to talk about the COVID-19 legislation we are considering, but I am very pleased to be here with my colleagues who helped get this legislation across the finish line. It is incredibly important and truly historic for our national parks.

I have spent more than a dozen years on this. It is kind of embarrassing because I was there for the first 11, but from my days as the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, I have been focused on what really is a tragic situation—about a $12 billion now maintenance backlog in our national parks, far more than the $1 billion that is at risk. We have had a huge problem with finding funding for that, and in this legislation, as was noted by my colleague from Tennessee, who has been at this for many years, as well, we are finally doing something to help our parks that is badly needed.

The priority projects—$6.5 billion worth—will now be handled by legislation that passed the House today by a 310-to-107 vote and passed the Senate a few weeks ago. The President has agreed to sign it, and it is debt unpaid to our parks. Without it, future generations wouldn’t have the opportunity to visit and enjoy these incredible treasures.

I spent the last few weeks at a couple of our national parks—one, the Charles Young home in Ohio, which is a beautiful historic home that is actually a station on the Underground Railroad and, therefore, has particular and very important historic significance for our nation. Charles Young was the first Black colonel in the U.S. Army, the first Black superintendent of a national park, and his home needs to be preserved for future generations. And yet the maintenance backlog is huge there, as you can imagine, and without this legislation, they would not be able to make progress.

I got to see specifically what the money is going for, which is making sure that under the Civil Rights Act from 1964, and it has been about 60 years now so that people, particularly young people in our community, can understand the history of our country—the good and the bad, the cooperation and the seeking for freedom that came from the Underground Railroad and the incredible leadership that Charles Young showed as an early African-American pioneer, both in the military and in our national park system.

And then I was at the Cuyahoga Valley National Park, where I had the opportunity to see the 13th most visited park in America and a number of different needs that they have, adding up to about $50 million. Their annual budget, by the way, is about $11 million, and yet they have $50 million worth of things that have to be fixed.

I saw trails literally falling into the river. I saw railroad tracks for the beautiful scenic railroad that runs through there where the tracks have to be replaced. I saw a bridge that is truly becoming dangerous and has to be fixed—an historic bridge. These are things that can’t be done with their normal budget that funds the rangers and some programs. These are capital expenses, things that have to have a separate funding source, the way we budget around here, and we are doing that now.

So after many years of trying different efforts at this and finding some success over the years—the Centennial Act has helped a little bit and some other things to get private-public partnership money—we have now the ability to really say that the parks are going to be in good shape for our kids, our grandkids, and the future generations that can enjoy what LAMAR ALEXANDER has referred to—I think, paraphrasing Ken Burns—as America’s best idea.

With that, I yield back. I would like some time in a moment to talk about the COVID-19 legislation, but I would like to yield now to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Ohio for his courtesy, as well as his leadership. I will not be long.

(End of remarks by Mr. ALEXANDER per the request of the Majority Leader.)

Mr. ALEXANDER. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, the legislation that Senator ALEXANDER is talking about probably is something we ought to look at in connection with the legislation that we are likely to pass here in the Congress in the next week or so regarding the COVID-19 crisis that we face. I am here on the floor...
today to talk about that—to talk about what the next steps ought to be and how we should be responding as Congress to this unprecedented challenge we have of the pandemic.

We are now about 5 months into it, and in April and most of May we were seeing pretty good progress on the coronavirus pandemic. The situation was improving, and many of us thought we were turning the corner. Unfortunately, as we have moved into June and July, we are now trending in the wrong direction in much of the country. Over the past week, the number of hospitalizations, for instance, has risen in many of our States, and there is concern that the situation could worsen when the weather begins to cool.

Today, in Ohio, our Governor announced a statewide mask mandate, as an example. We have not had that yet. He did so because he is concerned about some of the numbers. Ohio is not in as bad a shape as some of the States, but we are not seeing the progress we hoped for.

The past few months have been a somewhat better story for the economy. After the initial shocks of the self-isolation shutdowns last spring, a couple months ago, we have seen a steady rebound taking place in most parts of the country. New unemployment claims, put out just last week, while still far too high compared to what they were before this pandemic, are the lowest we have seen since the crisis began. Recent retail sales numbers are about where they were a year ago when there was no pandemic. So we are seeing better improvement in the economy as compared to the disappointing progress we were making recently on the pandemic.

Thanks to unprecedented Federal action, such as the Paycheck Protection Program which has allowed small businesses to keep their doors open and to retain employees, thanks to some of the targeted tax relief to help our families and also our businesses, we have been able to prevent an even more serious economic collapse that in my view would have had a devastating impact on all of us. However, we are not out of the woods yet. There are still, roughly, 17 million Americans out of work. That is a lot of Americans who have been furloughed through no fault of their own because businesses are not operating at full capacity, and they are facing an 11.5 percent unemployment rate, more than three times higher than it was just 5 months ago.

You will recall that in February we had historically low unemployment. Now we are up to 11.5 percent. Of course, there are parts of the economy that have not seen the progress that other parts have.

So there is a lot for us to consider now that Congress is back in session and now that we are in the middle of negotiating this new what they call the phase 5 coronavirus rescue package. The new legislation will have a significant impact on how we address these dual healthcare and economic crises. That is why it is important, and more important than ever, that we figure out how to work together, Republicans and Democrats alike, and make some smart bipartisan policy decisions.

Unfortunately, not the way the House of Representatives has proceeded to date. The House Democrats chose to construct their own proposal. It is called the Heroes Act. Rather than working across the aisle to try to find some common ground to help Americans deal with this healthcare and economic crisis, Democrats chose and made and released an 1,800-page, $3.5 trillion package that included some provisions that have nothing to do with COVID-19.

How big is $3.5 trillion? Well, that makes it the biggest piece of legislation ever passed by either the House or Senate in the history of our country. Never have we had legislation that exceeds a trillion dollars, which is about a third of the Gross Domestic Product. This corresponds to about an 11 percent of GDP.

17 million Americans out of work. That is in this legislation.

It is clear from the recent resurgence in cases that we are still not where we need to be in testing. I know there has been a lot of discussion recently about testing and whether it is needed or not. I will tell you it is critical because we need to know where the disease is and how it may be spreading. It also gives us much greater context in taking steps toward reopening in a safe way, whether it is our schools or whether it is our businesses, going to bowling alleys, movie theaters. Testing is very important.

Last week, I was in Columbus, OH, at the Columbus Health Department, where officials told me what a huge difference the CARES grant that they received has made in being able to expand testing. They are building a track to monitor and maintain the virus in Franklin County that is needed right now, and they are doing a great job. They need more funding to expand driveby testing. It is easy to access. If you don't have insurance to pay for it, it is covered through CARES funding that passed in the Congress. We are being sure that the funding is providing the best information available as we fight this invisible enemy. We have to continue to do that to prioritize bolstering the ability of our healthcare officials at home and to be able to coordinate the response—State level, local and national levels, and testing, obviously, is key to that.

In addition, as more parts of our country are putting in place plans to reopen our economy, we want to...
make sure that the individuals who went on the COVID-19 unemployment lines in the early days of this pandemic have the opportunity and the incentive to reenter the workforce. We have to be sure our workplaces are safe.

I introduced legislation called the healthy workplace tax credit, a credit on payroll taxes to ensure employers can afford additional safety measures, from the Plexiglas you have probably seen in some places, the shields to protect people, to the PPE that is needed, the gloves in some cases, the masks, the gloves, hand sanitizer, to be able to afford that, and to be sure that there is testing in place so employees and consumers feel safe reentering the economy. This tax credit will support our efforts to make our workplaces healthy and safe and to build consumer confidence that all appropriate measures are being taken.

It doesn’t really matter what we say as elected officials. It doesn’t matter what our Governors are saying or local health officials. If people don’t feel safe or feel comfortable, they are not going to reengage in the economy and step forward. I think this kind of a tax credit should be something that both sides of the aisle can strongly support, and we can ensure that we are doing everything we can to get people back to a more normal life.

As we tackle this healthcare challenge head-on, we also can’t afford to step back on our efforts to combat the drug epidemic. Remember the opioid epidemic. It has devastated communities all around our country, including my home State of Ohio. Unfortunately, we are seeing, during the coronavirus pandemic, the number of addictions, overdoses, and overdose deaths is growing. This is very concerning, particularly because, thanks to a bill including changes in this body, to provide more treatment and recovery and prevention services, we were finally making progress in 2018. In my State of Ohio we had a 22 percent decrease in opioid overdose deaths. Every single year for the previous dozen years we had seen increases, and, finally, we were making progress. Now, unfortunately, we seem to be backtracking because of the COVID-19 crisis.

People are isolated, and people are feeling anxiety. People are not being able to access the treatment they used to be able to access. So in this legislation, we should also be sure that we make permanent the progress we have made recently with coronavirus in providing more telehealth treatment, making that more accessible. I have introduced legislation called the TREAT Act that would do just that so we don’t lose ground on this other deadly disease.

We also need to look forward to the fall and ensure that we have funding to support the schools so they are able to safely reopen their doors to students. Keeping our children out of the classroom for a protracted period of time has already had a negative impact on many of them with regard to educational advancement.

We have heard this from the experts, the teachers, the principal, and the pediatricians back home—the doctors who are looking at this situation are saying it is very helpful in terms of getting kids back to school for education but also for their mental health and for their social skills.

On top of that, many parents, of course, have been forced to make impossible decisions. Do they go to work to earn a paycheck or do they stay home to take care of their child. So reopening the schools will have the effect of having childcare, which is very important. We need to act fast to ensure children don’t lose more progress.

Our phase 5 legislation should provide funding to help our schools safely reopen, whether it is providing additional workers, other protective gear or other resources we have talked about, I think that money is well spent.

Second, we have to get the economy moving again. To do that, I believe we need to extend the unemployment insurance currently in place; whereby, interestingly, we tried to help on unemployment insurance, but we provided a flat $600 payment that has actually disincentivized a lot of people from going back to work. Why? Because most individuals are making more on unemployment insurance than at their previous job. A University of Chicago study says that 60 to 70 percent of those who are on unemployment insurance are making more on UI than they did when working.

As part of this negotiation, I believe Congress should and will extend the additional Federal unemployment insurance benefit in some form, but you should agree that it needs to be on both sides of the aisle. We should fix this disincentive to work by making the benefit a percentage of your previous income. By the way, a July 13 Yahoo Finance-Harris Poll found that 62 percent of Americans believed these enhanced UI benefits served as a disincentive to work. They are right. It doesn’t have to be that way. We can help people to ensure they get the support they need but not have them being paid more than they would if they were going to work.

Depending on how high the Federal payment is, by the way, we ought to also consider a return-to-work bonus for individuals that they receive on top of their paycheck—in other words, take part of the Federal benefit with them back to work. I have been promoting this since May. We haven’t been able to pass it yet around here, but I think we should. It would help people—those workers who want to go back to work to be able to make that tough decision without having a financial disincentive. It would help our small businesses and others who need the workforce badly, and it would help our economy begin to be able to reopen properly.

This idea, by the way, has broad support across the country. That same poll I talked about that 69 percent of respondents support a return-to-work bonus.

There are various ways we can accomplish this goal, but I believe it would be helpful if it is paired with an extension of the unemployment insurance.

So this is something we have to focus on and come up with a bipartisan consensus—a compromise—to ensure that we are not paying people more not to work but ensure we are taking care of people who are furloughed through no fault of their own.

I also think we should be considering provisions to help incentivize the hiring from the employer side, so it is also providing more of an incentive to bring people on board. A way to do this that makes a lot of sense to me because it is building on legislation we have already passed to expand and repurpose the work opportunity tax credit to add a category for COVID-19 furloughed individuals. Also, the employee retention tax credit from the CARES Act we passed just a short while ago can be improved to make it more encompassing and a better hiring credit. Helping to subsidize the marginal cost of a new hire will allow businesses to ramp up operations more quickly as the economy reopens, while also bringing more individuals on unemployment rolls and into the workforce.

I hope these are part of whatever legislative package we end up with. Again, these two should be bipartisan. The work opportunity tax credit has always been bipartisan. The tax credit was bipartisan in the CARES Act. These are things we can do, and they should get done.

We should be sure to stick with what has blossomed to be our coronavirus response. One of the biggest successes, of course, has been the PPP loan program. However, one flaw in the original law creating the PPP program was that it put in place barriers to loans for those owners who had unrelated felony records.

This was brought to my attention by a constituent of mine. His name is Troy Parker. He is a person who has done everything you would expect and more. He would want someone to do who comes off of a felony conviction—a mistake that he made. He was given a second chance, and he took it. He started a small business. It is a cleaning business, and he hires a lot of other second chance citizens. He gives them a chance, an opportunity, and he has been successful. But during the coronavirus pandemic, he lost a lot of his business, as you can imagine, so he applied for a PPP loan. He was told that he got one. Why? Because he has a felony record. He has a conviction for a financial crime, and it was within the last 5
The flexibility, I hope, is something that both sides of the aisle can agree to. Why shouldn’t we have more flexibility with regard to the CARES funding?

By the way, some of it hasn’t been spent. I think Senator Grassley has probably $850 million that is slated to go to the local communities, to our commissioners, and to our mayors for our cities that are under 500,000. Yet we don’t have the flexibility and certainty we need there. That is important to pass as part of this.

These are just a few policy proposals. I believe, that can make an immediate and lasting impact in our response to the challenges we face with this coronavirus pandemic. I am sure that in the coming days, we will be discussing the next steps forward in-depth because I believe we all recognize how important it is to get this right and to move quickly on it.

Unemployment, by the way, expires— that expires on July 31, at the end of next week. That is a deadline we can’t let pass.

We are facing a momentous test of our ability to come together once again to address a disaster that has changed every aspect of our lives, seemingly overnight. It is our responsibility to do that. Now is the time to put aside partisanship, get away from our partisan corners, and work together on some of these constructive solutions.

I look forward to working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle—my colleague from Washington State, my colleagues from North Dakota, and my colleagues who I know share my concern that we can’t allow this opportunity to pass. We have to once again come together.

As we said tonight, there are many of these things that are bipartisan, where there can be a lot of consensus. We have to move forward to support our healthcare system, our schools, our employers, and our families as we work to overcome this crisis.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

THE GREAT AMERICAN OUTDOORS ACT

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I come to the floor to talk about the NDAA, but before I do, I want to join my colleagues and share their great enthusiasm on this issue as the great outdoors and the Energy and Natural Resources Committee and understanding how important it was to get it over the goal line.

So I tell the Senator that I am going to give him a picture of myself hiking in the Dolly Sods in West Virginia as a great thank you for your perseverance of moving this effort to the final goal line. So I just want to thank Senator MANCHIN and, obviously, all my colleagues.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I come to the floor to talk about the NDAA, but before I do, I want to join my colleagues and share their great enthusiasm on this issue as the great outdoors and the Energy and Natural Resources Committee.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.
to raid dollars out of the Department of Energy that are literally there specifically for us to meet our nuclear cleanup obligations and also to fund R&D at our national laboratories, places like the National Renewable Energy Laboratory in Colorado or other facilities in my State, like the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory.

Specifically, the committee-reported bill would have stripped the Energy Secretary’s power over his own budget and would have allowed subcabinet officials on the Nuclear Weapons Council to approve the budget for the National Nuclear Security Administration.

So I know the Presiding Officer knows this well. But it would have allowed the Pentagon to prioritize making nuclear weapons over the critical missions of the U.S. Department of Energy. And I believe it also would have reduced civilian control over spending on our country’s nuclear weapons complex.

I am so glad that Energy Secretary Brouillette wrote to Senator Inhofe and talked about this and said: “These provisions eliminate a President’s Cabinet Secretary from managing some of the most sensitive nuclear security programs in the Department, most notably, assuring the viability of the Nation’s nuclear deterrent.”

I do want to thank Senators Inhofe and Reed for hearing the concerns expressed by many Senators on both sides of the aisle and for hearing the concerns of the Secretary of Energy and accepting the Manchin-Cantwell amendment that stripped these troubling provisions out of the bill because I believe it was a radical change that did not have enough debate.

But I certainly appreciate the Presiding Officer’s interest and determination as well. In particular, I want to thank Senator Alexander and Senators Heinrich, Cassidy, Wyden, Barrasso, Hirono, Risch, and Sanders who jointly sent a letter to the Senate leadership expressing opposition to these provisions.

In a letter that stated, if these provisions would have remained in the bill, they would have “impeded accountability and Congressional oversight, as well as impair future funding for other critical DOE responsibilities such as promoting scientific and technological innovation, managing our National Laboratories, sponsoring basic research in the physical sciences, and ensuring cleanup of the nation’s nuclear weapons complex.”

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that that letter, the Cantwell-Alexander letter, be printed into the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JULY 1, 2020.
DEAR MAJORITY LEADER MCCONNELL, MINORITY LEADER SCHUMER, CHAIRMAN INHOFE, AND RANKING MEMBER LEWIS., As the Energy Committee considers the Fiscal Year 2021 National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA), we write to express our opposition to the inclusion of controversial and far-reaching provisions that would fundamentally alter the Department of Energy’s (DOE) responsibilities for the nuclear weapons complex.

As members of the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, we write in support of our June 29, 2020 letter to Chairman Inhofe and share his concerns that provisions in the Senate NDAA bill undermine DOE’s ability to meet its mission goals and responsibility for maintaining the viability of the nation’s nuclear deterrent.

As currently written, the Senate NDAA bill would strip DOE of its Energy budget, would be unable to ensure DOE’s ability to manage some of the most sensitive national security programs that account for almost half of the Department’s budget. Such changes could imperil accountability and Congressional oversight, as well as imperil future funding for other critical DOE responsibilities such as promoting scientific and technological innovation, managing our National Laboratories, sponsoring basic research in the physical sciences, and ensuring cleanup of the nation’s nuclear weapons complex.

Sweeping changes impacting civilian control of our nation’s nuclear weapons programs should be made in consultation and coordination with the committee of jurisdiction in an open and transparent manner. The changes included in the Senate NDAA bill are contrary to opposition from the Trump Administration, former Secretaries of Energy, recent NNSA Administrators, and the Congressional Advisory Panel on the Governance of the Nuclear Security Enterprise.

We therefore request that the provisions be removed from the pending bill or that the Senate give supporters of the amendment that剥离 DOE’s nuclear weapons budget to OMB.

As energy and environmental advocates, we are concerned that DOE’s Energy budget to OMB in 2021 would continue to fund military nuclear waste sites in central Washington the second largest long-term obligation the Federal Government has, and now, some of our colleagues want more of their budget taken away by the NNSA. How are they going to meet these milestones? This is probably nowhere more important than in the State of Washington. And so the Department of Energy is legally obligated to meet these cleanup obligations at the Hanford site and to meet the obligations of what is called the Tri-Party Agreement, which is a legal contract with the State of Washington. And so is the duty of our Nation to clean up what was a national effort in World War II and the Cold War.

So I hope our colleagues won’t forget history here, won’t forget the obligation to clean up those nuclear waste sites, and certainly won’t forget this effort we had here on the Senate floor. Last year, the Department of Energy completed a Lifecycle Scope, Schedule, and Cost Report for the completion of the Hanford cleanup site. It found remaining cleanup costs to be $232 billion in the best-case, and $677 billion at a worst-case scenario.

So that makes cleaning up legacy military nuclear waste sites in central Washington the second largest long-term obligation the Federal Government has, and now, some of our colleagues want more of the Department of Energy’s Energy budget to OMB in 2021. But taking away DOE’s ability to control its own budget would make it harder to do the cleanups, and we need to retain more of their budget taken away by the NNSA. How are they going to meet these milestones? This is probably nowhere more important than in the State of Washington. And so the Department of Energy is legally obligated to meet these cleanup obligations at the Hanford site and to meet the obligations of what is called the Tri-Party Agreement, which is a legal contract with the State of Washington.

So, in other words, the Secretary of Energy would have lost control over almost half of his budget. This would also mean that the Nuclear Weapons Council, which is comprised of five DOD subcabinet officials and one representative of the Department of Energy, that they would have effectively been dictating to members of the President’s Cabinet what the budget should look like. So imagine that the Secretary of Energy has to come before Congress, and he says, 45 percent of my budget has already been determined by somebody else, and you really can’t go talk to them.

This isn’t just an issue of transparency. This is also an issue about the Department of Energy’s obligations to clean up, specifically in Washington at Hanford. So I want to make sure people understand that nuclear waste cleanup is a Federal obligation. It is an obligation that we have as a nation, not just in Washington, but other States, and unfortunately, we haven’t met all the milestones for nuclear waste cleanup. In fact, Idaho experienced this between 2012 and 2018 when DOE failed to meet cleanup milestones at the Idaho National Laboratory.

Taking away DOE’s ability to control its own budget would make it harder to do the cleanups, and we need to retain more of their budget taken away by the NNSA. How are they going to meet these milestones? This is probably nowhere more important than in the State of Washington. And so the Department of Energy is legally obligated to meet these cleanup obligations at the Hanford site and to meet the obligations of what is called the Tri-Party Agreement, which is a legal contract with the State of Washington.

So I hope our colleagues won’t forget history here, won’t forget the obligation to clean up those nuclear waste sites, and certainly won’t forget this effort we had here on the Senate floor. Last year, the Department of Energy completed a Lifecycle Scope, Schedule, and Cost Report for the completion of the Hanford cleanup site. It found remaining cleanup costs to be $232 billion in the best-case, and $677 billion at a worst-case scenario.

So that makes cleaning up legacy military nuclear waste sites in central Washington the second largest long-term obligation the Federal Government has, and now, some of our colleagues want more of the Department of Energy’s Energy budget to OMB. But taking away DOE’s ability to control its own budget would make it harder to do the cleanups, and we need to retain more of their budget taken away by the NNSA. How are they going to meet these milestones? This is probably nowhere more important than in the State of Washington. And so the Department of Energy is legally obligated to meet these cleanup obligations at the Hanford site and to meet the obligations of what is called the Tri-Party Agreement, which is a legal contract with the State of Washington.

So I hope our colleagues won’t forget history here, won’t forget the obligation to clean up those nuclear waste sites, and certainly won’t forget this effort we had here on the Senate floor. Last year, the Department of Energy completed a Lifecycle Scope, Schedule, and Cost Report for the completion of the Hanford cleanup site. It found remaining cleanup costs to be $232 billion in the best-case, and $677 billion at a worst-case scenario.

So that makes cleaning up legacy military nuclear waste sites in central Washington the second largest long-term obligation the Federal Government has, and now, some of our colleagues want more of the Department of Energy’s Energy budget to OMB. But taking away DOE’s ability to control its own budget would make it harder to do the cleanups, and we need to retain more of their budget taken away by the NNSA. How are they going to meet these milestones? This is probably nowhere more important than in the State of Washington. And so the Department of Energy is legally obligated to meet these cleanup obligations at the Hanford site and to meet the obligations of what is called the Tri-Party Agreement, which is a legal contract with the State of Washington.

So I hope our colleagues won’t forget history here, won’t forget the obligation to clean up those nuclear waste sites, and certainly won’t forget this effort we had here on the Senate floor. Last year, the Department of Energy completed a Lifecycle Scope, Schedule, and Cost Report for the completion of the Hanford cleanup site. It found remaining cleanup costs to be $232 billion in the best-case, and $677 billion at a worst-case scenario.

So that makes cleaning up legacy military nuclear waste sites in central Washington the second largest long-term obligation the Federal Government has, and now, some of our colleagues want more of the Department of Energy’s Energy budget to OMB. But taking away DOE’s ability to control its own budget would make it harder to do the cleanups, and we need to retain more of their budget taken away by the NNSA. How are they going to meet these milestones? This is probably nowhere more important than in the State of Washington. And so the Department of Energy is legally obligated to meet these cleanup obligations at the Hanford site and to meet the obligations of what is called the Tri-Party Agreement, which is a legal contract with the State of Washington.

So I hope our colleagues won’t forget history here, won’t forget the obligation to clean up those nuclear waste sites, and certainly won’t forget this effort we had here on the Senate floor. Last year, the Department of Energy completed a Lifecycle Scope, Schedule, and Cost Report for the completion of the Hanford cleanup site. It found remaining cleanup costs to be $232 billion in the best-case, and $677 billion at a worst-case scenario.

So that makes cleaning up legacy military nuclear waste sites in central Washington the second largest long-term obligation the Federal Government has, and now, some of our colleagues want more of the Department of Energy’s Energy budget to OMB. But taking away DOE’s ability to control its own budget would make it harder to do the cleanups, and we need to retain more of their budget taken away by the NNSA. How are they going to meet these milestones? This is probably nowhere more important than in the State of Washington. And so the Department of Energy is legally obligated to meet these cleanup obligations at the Hanford site and to meet the obligations of what is called the Tri-Party Agreement, which is a legal contract with the State of Washington.

So I hope our colleagues won’t forget history here, won’t forget the obligation to clean up those nuclear waste sites, and certainly won’t forget this effort we had here on the Senate floor. Last year, the Department of Energy completed a Lifecycle Scope, Schedule, and Cost Report for the completion of the Hanford cleanup site. It found remaining cleanup costs to be $232 billion in the best-case, and $677 billion at a worst-case scenario.

So that makes cleaning up legacy military nuclear waste sites in central Washington the second largest long-term obligation the Federal Government has, and now, some of our colleagues want more of the Department of Energy’s Energy budget to OMB. But taking away DOE’s ability to control its own budget would make it harder to do the cleanups, and we need to retain more of their budget taken away by the NNSA. How are they going to meet these milestones? This is probably nowhere more important than in the State of Washington. And so the Department of Energy is legally obligated to meet these cleanup obligations at the Hanford site and to meet the obligations of what is called the Tri-Party Agreement, which is a legal contract with the State of Washington.

So I hope our colleagues won’t forget history here, won’t forget the obligation to clean up those nuclear waste sites, and certainly won’t forget this effort we had here on the Senate floor. Last year, the Department of Energy completed a Lifecycle Scope, Schedule, and Cost Report for the completion of the Hanford cleanup site. It found remaining cleanup costs to be $232 billion in the best-case, and $677 billion at a worst-case scenario.
all for speed, but I am also for meeting the obligations. But there is no magic here. It is a responsibility, and it is science, and it is an investment, and it belongs to the whole Nation. And we certainly don’t deserve to have people coming to the Senate floor with a bill trying to cut 4 percent of the administration’s budget and then say we don’t have to meet that cleanup obligation because we are investing in nuclear weapons instead.

So, believe me, as this bill moves off the Senate floor, I am going to be watching the conference. I am not just going to watch this issue now or in conference. I am going to be keeping watch on this issue in a constant fashion, just like I always have on Hanford cleanup dollars. But I resent that people believe that Congress would fall for such a tactic to believe that the efforts of nuclear weapons development should be controlled by a small subcabinet council and that they shouldn’t report to the entire body. I am going to turn them out of their own budget and demand that it be met at the Presidential level.

Now, I just hope we don’t reach this same dilemma again. I hope we have learned the lesson that people understand that these priorities of cleanup of our nuclear waste sites and what these parts of the country did for us in meeting our obligations in World War II and the Cold War. We need those efforts from a scientific perspective. We laud those efforts from the manpower that it took. We should now laud a budget that keeps the focus on cleanup and gets the job done and not lose track or sight because, from time to time, somebody else wants to make a larger investment in nuclear weapons. I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the question be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerks will now take the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the question be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—AMENDMENT NO. 2407

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I rise tonight to ask: What does democracy look like? I have here a picture of what democracy looks like—people showing up presenting their opinions with their feet and their voices and their signs saying: We want change. And the change they want is to pursue that value that public safety in America be a value that is applied equally to all citizens; that every single person in the community is viewed as a client for the public safety team; that the distribution of protection is equal and the treatment of citizens is equal when public safety officers respond; they respond equally no matter what section of the city the call comes from; that they respond the same no matter the color of a person’s skin; that profiling is a thing of the past; that viewing two young Black men on the street is not viewed differently than viewing two young White men on the street. It is that goal of having everyone treated fairly that has led people to the streets. We need major reform in our country. We need to set behind us the time period when departments of public safety tend to look at the White community and say, “Those are our clients,” and look at the Black community or the dark-skinned community and say, “Those are the threats.” That is what people are trying to change by turning out in America in this fashion.

It is an important moment in which we need substantive change, real change—real change like the bill CORI BOOKER put together and led the battle on, and KAMALA HARRIS put together with him in partnership and led the battle on. That is the type of change that we need in America. That is why people have been turning out in the streets. But there is an unexpected twist on something we didn’t anticipate, in which the President of the United States hasn’t listened to this message about coming together so that every person is treated equally. Instead, he is doubling down on a strategy of racism, a strategy of bigotry, a strategy of creating conflict in America with a determined new effort.

This is a picture of protesting in Oregon. I was at a demonstration much like this, where people chanted: “This is what democracy looks like. This is what democracy looks like.”

This is what democracy looks like, colleagues—people coming together with their signs and their feet and their time, saying: We need change. It is as fundamental as free expression under the First Amendment. It is as fundamental to our Constitution as the right to clean air and to clean water is as fundamental to the vision of “We the People” as anyone can imagine—that vision that Lincoln summarized as “government of the people, by the people, for the people,” not of, by, and for some dictatorial force, not someone who wants to consolidate power in an imperial Presidency.

In fact, our Founders were really worried about authoritarianism. They were really worried about an imperial Presidency.

Once they launched that Constitution, what would happen with that first President? Would that first President say: I am now going to consolidate power in this young Republic, hold on to the Executive, ignore the balance of powers between the branches of government, and consolidate power in the Executive. I am going to take the forces that were the Revolutionary War forces, and I am going to turn them into a force to keep in power regardless of the constitutional requirement for elections.

They were very worried about this. One of the reasons they particularly liked the idea of George Washington being the first President is that George Washington was very worried about that, and the example he set would mean a whole lot.

It is one thing to have a Constitution on paper. It is a whole other thing to have it come to life, to keep it. Coming out of the Constitutional Convention, the story goes that someone asked one of the convention policymakers: What do we have? And he replied: A republic, if we can keep it—if we can keep it.

This is what democracy looks like, this “wall of moms” in Portland, OR, coming out, standing side by side, creating a barrier between the police and the Federal forces that had been allocated to the city by President Trump and the people, creating that barrier, that “wall of moms,” to say: Do not use flashbang on us or all the people behind us; do not use tear gas on us or all the people behind us; do not use munitions, a polite name for, essentially, rubber bullets—they say “non-lethal bullets”—we hope, right, because sometimes they do enormous damage—do not use your batons to baton down our blood; do not pepper spray us in the face. We are the “wall of moms.”

This is what democracy looks like, but this is a message lost on President Trump. We have something entirely different from the President. The President said: I am going to send some forces out to Portland to basically pour gasoline on the fire and turn it into, basically, a much more intense conflict.

So you already have the basics of a challenge in which you have had folks from the White extremists coming in camouflage to Portland to create trouble and looking for a fight, and you have antifa coming to Portland to look for a fight with the White extremists, the White nationalists.

Well, that had calmed down enormously to where there was only a small group left, coming in late at night and causing trouble. But Trump said: If I can recreate conflict in Portland, well, I can run a campaign on fear. Because what we have seen, in Presidential campaign after Presidential campaign, is a Republican candidate saying: If we run on fear, we will win because people think of us as stronger on national security.

Well, we have seen the different strategies. There was the Ebola run-on-fear strategy. There was the “immigrants, rapists, and murderers are going to run across the border and swarm America” run-on-fear strategy. There was the “ISIS is going to run across the Atlantic and invade America” run-on-fear strategy. There was the Willie Horton “you are going to be attacked by a dark-skinned person in an alley” run-on-fear strategy.

And all too often it has worked, this effort to gear up division in America, to play on racism in America.
But to that strategy of division and racism I say: No way. That is too low, too wrong for America. We should be coming together as a country. We should have a message of coming together as a people. We should be taking on the challenges of healthcare and housing and education.

Those are the bills we should have here on the floor of the Senate. We should be taking on the issue of fair labor, good-paying jobs. We should be working on rebuilding America’s infrastructure.

We should be addressing the fact that, even today in States all across this country, you can be discriminated against for being a member of the LGBTQ community. You can get married in the morning, and you can proceed to be thrown out of your apartment. You can be told you cannot eat in this restaurant, you cannot sit in this movie theater, you cannot receive this government benefit.

The Supreme Court just took one step forward on the employment question, strengthening the ability to not be discriminated against in employment.

We passed a bill here in the Senate back in 2013 to do exactly that, to strengthen protections in employment, but the Republican-controlled House wouldn’t even take it up and treat LGBTQ Americans fairly.

If we were doing our job, we would have a debate on the Equality Act that would end discrimination in all of these areas because it is the right thing to do that we expanded the slamed in the face of an American because of who they are or whom they love. Isn’t that something we should be doing here?

Shouldn’t we be taking on this challenge of carbon pollution and climate change? All the fossil fuel companies have worked hard to turn this into a partisan issue. It didn’t used to be a partisan issue. Back when President Bush devastated the environment—President Bush ran against candidate Dukakis, it was the Republican candidate who ran on climate change. It was the Democrat who ran on fossil fuels.

It is not so long ago, before Citizens United, that we had so many climate champions on both sides, but then dark money was introduced, and the fossil fuel community said: This is our chance to control the U.S. Senate. They put hundreds of millions—not thousands of dollars into the Senate campaigns 6 years ago, 2014.

I remember it well because I was one of the few people who were targeting, and I saw their strategy of taking that money and putting it into third-party campaigns and running tremendous numbers of assault ads, negative ads, attack ads—doing it on social media all across the board.

Since then, what happened? Well, all the voices that were on the Republican side of the aisle saying “We need to take on climate” disappeared. That is the corrupting power of Citizens United and dark money.

Then we had a bill here on the floor. We needed 60 votes, under our policy rules, to be able to pass it to close debate. It was disclosure—to say at least we should disclose where money comes from. But what happened? The fossil fuel lobby said no Republican can dare to vote for a policy that would keep us in power, and every single Member across the aisle followed their lead and voted against disclosure.

They voted for darkness. They voted for hiding these massive contributions coming in from nobody knows where because they are hidden.

My point is that this is democracy here, people expressing their views, and here in this Chamber we should have democracy as well. We had it almost over our entire history, of people being able to put virtually any issue on the floor and have it debated on and then to have it voted on and then to have voters know how their Senator voted so there was accountability.

But no more. We are in this incredible period in which there are a record number—low—of amendments, and the amendments we do have are basically not very significant to begin with or they are being blocked by leadership, not by each Senator having power. The idea of 100 Senators having that power—that sounds like something out of just another world, yet that was the Senate throughout its history until recently.

Why do I keep emphasizing this? Because this concentration of power where bills and amendments only go through the majority leader is an absolute fit with government by and for the powerful—the opposite of government by and for the people.

So if someone has a bill that says you can’t gouge Americans on drug prices, they can’t get that bill to the floor because it is blocked by the majority leader, and the drug companies don’t want that bill on the floor, so they give a lot of money to that team.

If someone says we should have reasonable gun safety laws—not violating the Second Amendment—and we will make the world a little safer for our children, well, that bill can’t get on the floor because it is blocked by the majority leader, and it is backed by massive spending of dark money and the NRA.

Or if we have a bill that says we should do a lot more about housing, I can’t put that bill on the floor. How about we have a banking system that serves the cannabis industry so that we don’t have huge bags of money opened up to the possibility of organized crime moving it around the country and doing bad things? We should extend that coverage, but we can’t get that vote on this floor—which brings me to the point. How is there accountability if you don’t know where they are from?

Who can tell me if these folks are from Customs and Border Protection? Are they from the Federal Protective Service? Are they U.S. Marshals? How do we know? We don’t because they are deliberately not made visible on the other shoulder, no identity on the helmet—no identity. Who are these people?

How about these people? Are these the same group here? These are White extremists, nationalists, who come to Portland to get in the streets of Portland. Trump dresses up his Federal forces to look like White extremists on the streets of Portland.

How is there accountability if you don’t know where they are from?

Who can tell me if these folks are from Customs and Border Protection? Are they from the Federal Protective Service? Are they U.S. Marshals? How do we know? We don’t because they are deliberately not made visible on the other shoulder, no identity on the helmet—no identity. Who are these people?

How about these people? Are these the same group here? These are White extremists, nationalists, who come to Portland to get in the streets of Portland. Trump dresses up his Federal forces to look like White extremists on the streets of Portland.

We are told that these are actually Customs and Border Protection. I called up the head of Customs and Border Protection, and I said: What is the story with this tactic of secret police on the streets? He said: Oh, no, no, no; we insist they have “CBP” on them. We insist they have a unique identifier.

In fact, he put this in a tweet. He told all of America: We don’t do that. But America has pictures, and those are definitely not CBP. They are being deployed as secret operators on the streets of Portland.

That is going to be terrifying because you don’t know who they are. Is it just someone who wants to create trouble who puts “police” on their shirt? Is it one of these folks? These folks have badges on them that look a little more official. We see an American flag here. We see an American flag here.

Are these White extremists coming to the streets to beat people up, or are they Federal agents? And if so, who are they, and what is their mission? We found out their mission in short order.
Here we have a picture of a Navy vet. That Navy vet said he came down to say: What does it mean to honor your oath—your oath of office, your oath to the Constitution? He wants to know. He was a veteran who served in our forces in the Constitution.

How did President Trump’s secret police respond? Here is a CBP agent with a baton right here, striking him. Here is another one with a baton coming around to strike him again. Here is another one spraying pepper spray into his face. Just standing here, his hands are basically hooked in his pocket, like this—he is just standing there saying: I came down here to see what people thought about honoring their oath to the Constitution. And he is attacked. He is attacked by multiple members of this secret force Trump puts on the streets of our Nation.

They had not just pepper spray and not just batons; they had other weapons, impact munitions—in this case, U.S. marshals.

Here is a young man who is holding a boom box over his head—that is what it looked like—and he is on one side of the street. On the other side of the street are the marshals. As he stands there, you see him crumble and fall to the ground because from across the street, he was shot right between the eyes. Critical condition. Fractured skull.

Who in the world would expect a Federal officer to shoot a protester; who is either holding up a sign or a radio, between the eyes from across the street? Do you think that is accidental? They accidentally shot him in the head? It wasn’t accidental; it was deliberate. They are sending a message. A lot of other people got shot with these munitions. I am told that he is no longer in critical condition. Thank goodness for that, but it could have been very, very different. We still don’t know the ultimate outcome of this assault on a peaceful protester.

Pepper spray, using batons on veterans, shooting a peaceful protester in the head from a few yards away—that is not all that Trump’s secret police were up to. They decided to go through the streets and grab people and throw them into unmarked vans.

Here is one of those vans on the streets of Portland. Here are President Trump’s secret police, unmarked, throwing another protester into a van. One of the individuals who was treated in this fashion said he was terrified because he thought these camouflaged folks were the White extremists who come to make trouble, and was he being kidnapped? They would not answer the question when they were asked “Who are you?” They didn’t answer the question.

Secret police, unmarked, using pepper spray, batons, impact munitions, and tear gas on peaceful protesters, and then throwing people—grabbing them and throwing them into unmarked vans. What does that make you think of? What country are we talking about here? Are we talking about Syria? Are we talking about Duterte in the Philippines? Are we talking about Erdogan in Turkey? Are we talking about the Crown Prince in Saudi Arabia? Are we talking about Putin running Russia? We could be talking about this nation. Isn’t this one of their tactics, but this is unacceptable and outrageous and unconstitutional in a democratic republic.

President Trump coordinated this deployment of secret police and attacks on protesters, creating a big conflagration, a big explosion of protests in Portland. The protests had died down to just less than 100 actors and some bystanders in the late evening, and then I am told that on the days that followed these outrageous attacks, the protests multiplied—not one or two but fivefold or more. That is exactly what Trump wanted because he wanted to say: There is this dissent and trouble in the streets of Portland. And isn’t this the answer to your law-and-order President; I will take care of that trouble.

You create the trouble. You escalate the conflict so you can say “I am the one who can deescalate it” later. This is a classic example of that. A Member of this Senate should have the slightest sympathy for—a strong man in the Oval Office adopting the secret police tactics of the worst dictators from around the globe.

Some of the headlines that followed were things like this:

“Federal Law Enforcement Use Unmarked Vehicles To Grab Protesters Off Portland Streets.”

“A Navy vet asked federal officers in Portland to remember their [constitutional] oaths. Then they broke his hand.” You saw the pictures of them striking him with the batons.

“Federal Officers Deployed in Portland Didn’t Have Proper Training, H.R. momo said.” It’s a fact. Untrained, undisciplined folks, but they knew what the President wanted and that was to create an escalation of violence on the streets of our city.

You are probably wondering, didn’t the President call and talk to the Governor before he decided to deploy these secret police on the streets of Portland? No, he didn’t. Didn’t the DHS Secretary? No. How about the Department of Justice? The Attorney General? No. Surely they called the mayor and said: Before we deploy folks to patrol the streets with tear gas and batons and impact bullets, rubber bullets, pepper spray; before we beat up peaceful protesters and shoot them in the head, we want to talk to you, Mayor, about what is going on. Did the President call? Did the Secretary call, the Secretary of Homeland Security? Did the Secretary or the Attorney General call? Did the head of Customs and Border Protection, CBP, call before they sent in a secret and surprise operating group? Did the Marshals’ lead director, commissioner call? The answer is no, no, no, no and no. None of them called because they weren’t coming to coordinate, to help; they were coming to disrupt. They knew that if they asked to come, asked whether they were wanted, the answer would be no, you are not wanted because you are coming to inflame the violence and disruption.

The President was giving speeches, saying “Look at what a wonderful President I am because I am sending help to quell violence in Portland” while he was sending violence to create violence. This has to be one of the bigger lies he has told in his time as President. By various accounts, he tells a number of them every single day. But this lie to the American people is not just a little white lie; this is not just a little misrepresentation; this is something of constitutional input about who we are as a country. We don’t do secret police in our country. We don’t grab people off the streets and put them and send them to unmarked vans in our country—at least not until now.

You see, the President has looked at the polls that say we are not very happy. Americans are not very happy with the way you have executed the Presidency. We are certainly not very happy with the way you have managed this really big crisis, the COVID-19 pandemic. When there is a crisis, you start to see someone—can they rise to the occasion? Can they bring forth the best in people? Can they facilitate cooperation? Can they mobilize resources? Can they make the case in an effective and persuasive fashion?

The American people and those who support them want to know that President Trump could not rise to the occasion. He could not bring himself to bring people together. He could not make the case for a national strategy on how to tackle the coronavirus. He could not mobilize resources to address it in a timely fashion. Millions more are going to get sick as a result of his incompetence, and tens of thousands more will die because of the incompetence of President Trump.

What is a President running for reelection to do when his incompetence is revealed in its complete and total clarity to the Nation? You create a war. That is what you do. You create a war because a war might rally people to your side when we are being attacked. But in this case, the President couldn’t come up with an overseas war. ISIS? Too weak. The scary Ebola? Too long ago. North Korea? A completely ineffective strategy by the President of expressing his love for yet another dictator and that love not being returned in any effective policy changes. So what is left? Immigration. Oh, wait—he already played the rapist and murderer card and offended people throughout our Nation by snuffing out the lamp of Lady Liberty. What is left? You have to create a war inside the United States.

First came Washington, DC. He tried out the secret police strategy by deploying forces onto the steps of the Lincoln Memorial, unmarked, and nobody knew who the hell they were. Who
are these people who are on the Lincoln Memorial? Are they far-right extremists carrying guns? Are they Customs and Border Protection? Are they U.S. Marshals? Who are these people? Nobody knew. They were secret police at the time. They were there to protect the church.

And then he decided to test the strategy of using weapons against peaceful protesters across from the White House. There they are gathered together. There is this great tradition in America to protect the White House. What will the President see you do? You go to L’Enfant Plaza and you look up at the second story and you hold up your protest sign and you scream your position on something that you consider very important for America—the change you want to see or the man you object to. The President and his family look out those windows and say: I sure hate seeing those protesters.

But that is symbolic of the right to assemble and the freedom of speech in our country, which is protected by the extraordinary Constitution. What did President Trump do? Well, he walked off L’Enfant Plaza across from the White House so people couldn’t protest there. That is what this President thinks of protesters. He sees them as a threat to him. He doesn’t like freedom of assembly, and he doesn’t like freedom of speech, but what he does like is a good photo opportunity.

So the President decides to get the team together and we will go over and I will stand on the steps of the church and hold up a Bible. I still am a little confused about what his message was to do that. The thing is, to get to the steps of the church, he would have to come near these protesters he hates because he hates protesters. He doesn’t like Americans calling for change or criticizing his policies.

I am thinking back about this “wall of moms” that I showed you earlier—these moms laying down, forming a line, and saying: Don’t tear gas us. Don’t do shock grenades. Don’t shoot us with rubber bullets. Don’t pepper spray us.

And yet his forces did all those things. Where did he try this out first? He tried it in that area behind L’Enfant Plaza where the church steps were. His forces went out and attacked those protesters. Nobody saw violence of any kind. The police did nothing. The President said, “I love that.” And he went to L’Enfant Plaza and he held up a Bible in his hand and began to shout: I love the Bible. I think the Bible is a great book. I admire that principle of turning the other cheek by coming out and telling your team to tear gas and shoot peaceful protesters? Is that what the President wanted to do? And he actually did it—nothing but turning the other cheek, and I will show you how much I admire that principle of turning the other cheek by having his team gas and shoot people in that area close to L’Enfant Plaza, close to the steps of the church, or did the President want to come out and say: This Good Book talks about beating swords into plowshares, and I want to come out and show how I believe in the principle of beating swords into plowshares by having my team gas people and baton people and do these explosive flashbang grenades. Is that what the President was trying to do?

What message in the Bible was he trying to convey? Was he trying to convey the message that Jesus Christ talked about time and time again of the poor and the des- tructible, and he thought it was such an important message to carry to the United States that he would use force, tear gas, rubber bullets to clear the path so he could talk about how important it is to test the interest of the poor in America and how his policies might help them? No. We don’t know. I don’t think the President knew. He has never indicated that he is actually familiar with the contents of that book he was holding up, which makes it a particularly bizarre photo op.

But this was his first trial run of this strategy of using weapons against peaceful protesters, of using unmarked van abductions, of using tear gas, rubber bullets to clear the path so he could talk about how important it is to test the interest of the poor in America and how his policies might help them? No. We don’t know. I don’t think the President knew. He has never indicated that he is actually familiar with the contents of that book he was holding up, which makes it a particularly bizarre photo op.

And yet his forces did all those things. What does he talk about? He says: I want to take this strategy to Baltimore. He says: I want to take this strategy to Philadelphia. He says: I want to take this strategy to New York. And then he said: I want to take it to Chicago and I want to take it to Detroit and I want to take it to Oak- land, CA. What do those things have in common? And then he says: They are led by, but, instead, we will try a strategy of inciting violence with secret police, unmarked van abductions, use of pepper spray, batons, and flashbangs—the whole arsenal—and I will take it to all these cities where there are Demo- cratic mayors. They look at me. I am a law-and-order President, and I can quell all that trouble I created across this country.

You are probably thinking I made up these stories of cities the President talked about. Surely, the President wouldn’t take this incredibly hor- rorous secret police strategy and express that he wanted to take it on a trial run all across America so he could create violence in Democratic cities, but in his own words:

Who’s next? New York and Chicago and Philadelphia and Detroit and Baltimore and all of these—Oakland is a mess.

And he framed it as going to quell vi- olence, but, instead, it produces violence. It enflames. It accentuates. It outrages. It creates conflict.

I have here an article, and it is from FOX 32 News in Chicago: “Lightfoot confirms federal agents will help manage Chicago violence. Chicago has a Democratic mayor. Let’s go create trouble there.”

Mayor Lori Lightfoot had a different tone Tuesday regarding President Donald Trump’s decision to send federal agents to Chicago. “I’m hopeful that they will not be foolish enough to bring that kind of nonsense to Chicago,” the mayor said.

Well, what did she mean by “nonsense”? Is it the polite word for attacking peaceful protesters with batons and flashbangs and tear gas?

I am certainly not saying that Port- land didn’t have some tensions. The extremist groups on the right have made a failed trip out of Portland to cause trouble and the anti-fasc- ists have responded in kind, and that is what the local team has to manage and deescalate. They have succeeded in deescalating it to where it was a small group late at night. And when Trump came in and blew it all into a big crisis once again.

When I said that this is coordinated with his campaign, campaign ads went up. His strategy of creating chaos in America, then campaigning on it couldn’t be more transparent.

As President Trump deploys Federal agents to Portland, Ore., and threatens to
dispatch to other cities, his re-election campaign is spending millions of dollars on omni-
ous television ads that promote fear. . . . The influx of agents in Portland has led to scenes of confrontations and chaos that Mr. Trump and his aides have pointed to as they try to burnish a false narrative about Demo-
cratic elected officials allowing dangerous protest in their cities.

The Trump campaign is driving home that message with a new ad that tries to tie its dark portrayal of Democratic-led cit-
ies. There it is—campaign ads to fit his dark portrayal of Democratic-led cit-
ies.

The idea that not only would the President bring those secret police tactics to America—to our streets—just a few months after the 2020 campaign, but he would deploy them in his effort to cre-
ate conflict so he can win reelection, so he can have something that scares the American people. Don’t we have enough to be worried about already? Don’t we have a pandemic going on? And our communities? And then the New York Times?

A number of us worked to say: Mr. President, you need to have a national strategy on producing protective equipment to help stop the spread of this contagion. Mr. President, that should probably be a rapidly growing industry, not factories and putting them to work mak-
ing protective equipment and distrib-
it quickly. The President said, no, he’s not doing it. He is not act-
vating the Defense Production Act to have a national strategy to stop the spread of this disease.

I have two healthcare workers in my family. My son works in a doctor’s of-

cice recording the computer code on the symptoms and so forth. He is a medical student. My wife goes house to
-house visiting folks who are in hospice. They are in the final chapter of their life, and she coaches them and their family on care and support during this final chapter of our journey here on this planet. A number of the people she sees are very high risk because they are fragile and sick in that final chap-
ter, so they would be very affected if this disease were introduced. Some of them are in hospice care.

She has to be very careful that she doesn’t pick it up and bring it home to my elderly mother who lives in our house. My elderly mother is in her nineties. She probably wouldn’t want me to call her elderly in her nineties, but she is fragile, and she would be af-
fected. My son doesn’t want to bring it home or spread it. Both of them had trouble getting the protective equip-
ment they needed early in this pan-
demic because they didn’t have a na-
tional strategy to deal with it.

We needed to crank up all of the bio-

gle manufacturing capacity of America to produce the reagents so that people could be tested and get the results within hours or a day so that, if they were infected, even if they were asymptomatic they didn’t have the disease symptoms, but the lab said they had the disease, and they could spread it—that they would be quarantined, but the President said no.

So we put into the bill a requirement for the President to produce a national test strategy and produce a report with his test strategy. What did it read? It read our test strategy—our national strategy—was to leave it to the States. What kind of leadership is that to have the President have no idea of when the reagents or the tests and getting them around the country?

One thing we have done here is we have funded a lot of money to help communities buy tests because they are expensive. They should be free to the victims—to the people who are getting tested, that is. Every health expert has said you have to crank up this testing so that there is no wait time. It doesn’t help to get the results 7 or 10 days later.

I have been holding townhalls. I hold one in every county every year in Or-

gon. 36 counties. This year, I only got 21 in before the coronavirus made it impossible to hold them in person, but we have been doing it electronically. I keep hearing the re-
port from the county health agents that now testing has increased to its tak-
ing 7 days to get a response, 9 days to get a response, 11 days to get a re-

response. Why is that? It is because we didn’t have any national strategy for pro-
ducing tests. As the disease flares up and grows in magnitude in the Southern States, more and more re-
sources are getting diverted to those Southern States. So there are not the testing supplies because there is no na-
tional strategy.

Then the experts said: Well, you should have a contact tracing strategy, so, when people test positive, you can immedi-
ately find out who they have been in touch with so those people get immediately quarantined before they can pass it on to other people.

Yet that doesn’t work if you can’t get test results quickly, and it doesn’t work if you don’t have contact tracers. A number of us have worked to provide funding for contact tracers. ELIZABETH WARREN and I have introduced a bill that calls for 100,000 contact tracers across this country. There is $75 billion in the House’s bill for testing and trac-
ing across the country.

How did President Trump respond this last week? President Trump said: I don’t want any money for testing in this bill—no money for testing. He wants this stripped out; yet it is an es-

tential element for controlling the coronavirus.

I don’t think he will win on that one. I think the Members of this Chamber, on both sides of the aisle, care enough about the Americans who want to help with testing and contact tracing, but the President wants the testing stripped out.

Why does he want it stripped out? It is because, if you test more people, then you get more positives, and if you get more positives, it doesn’t look good. So he is choosing to have things look good rather than to contain the coronavirus.

If you proceed to offend people across the country by failing in leadership on protective equipment and failing in leadership on testing and failing in leadership on contact tracing, you need another plan, and we have the plan.

The President wants to test out his secret police and att-
acks on peaceful protesters in DC, magnify that experiment in Portland, and see if it creates more chaos. If it does, he will deploy that effort across the country. That is President Trump’s plan, and it is as wrong as anything could be. Secret policing has no place in the United States of America.

I introduced a simple amendment to the Defense Authorization Act, which deals with security powers and things like Customs and Border Protection and deals with things like U.S. Mar-
shals, and I said we are on that right now on the floor of the Senate. Let’s have this debate about secret policing, and we have just asked a few questions.

First, when the President sends agents anywhere in the country, they have to carry identification about who they work for. It is not that big a re-
quirement. It is about instead of putting a generic “police” or no marking at all, you put “CBP” or you put “U.S. Marshals,” or you put “Fed-

eral Protective Service” or one of a dozen other Federal police units that play different roles. That way, the Federal Protective Service, the American people will know who they are. Then you put unique identifiers on them so that, if they do something ter-
rible, like walk up and shoot a pro-
tester in the head, you would know who had done it. You could find out.

Now, some of my friends have said: Well, we are not sure we want to re-
quire names to be on the uniforms be-
cause there have been some cases in which people have been so outraged that they have harassed the families of the police officers or of these Federal agents. We don’t want that. OK. A number would work that could be used to identify someone after an egregious act. You could put the identifiers of our Federal agents who are doing a good job. That is pretty simple. Have an ID as to what agency you belong to and a unique identifier. You are no longer secret.

Then you can’t be deployed on some expanded mission of sweeping the streets. Your legitimate mission should be to protect a Federal monument or a Federal building, and you have to be at that Federal building or in the near vi-

imity of it or of the monument. That is pretty simple. If you want a broader mission, you have to coordinate with the mayor and the Governor and get their permission.

It is not a straightforward. Have a patch with the agency, a unique identi-
fier, and pursue your mission in the near vicinity of the Federal property.

What else? The President would have to tell the people of America how many people he is sending, from what agencies, and to what city for a little bit of trans-
parency. That is it.
This amendment that I am proposing to stop secret policing is simple; yet my colleagues are blocking it from being considered in this bill.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GARLAND). The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, in a moment, I will again ask for this important issue of deployment of secret police to be debated and voted on, on this floor.

That is what the U.S. Senate is for, to address the issues facing Americans, but I didn't want to ask until my colleague was here to respond from the Republican Caucus. When he is ready, I will make that motion.

I make this motion to send a couple of different messages. One, most importantly, is that secret policing has no place in America, and all Americans must stand arm in arm and say no. The second is, when there is an important issue like this, this is the Chamber in which it should be debated and voted on so we can hear the conflicting views.

There may be clauses in the amendment that I will propose that people won't like, insight that they can provide, or modifications that they would like to make to any amendment, but it can't happen unless this amendment is considered on the floor.

That is why, notwithstanding rule XXII, I ask unanimous consent to call up my amendment to stop secret policing. Amendment No. 2457, an amendment to limit Federal law enforcement officers for crowd control; that there be 2 hours for debate, equally divided between opponents and proponents; and that upon the use or yielding back of time, the Senate vote in relation to the amendment with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. President, in reserving the right to object, I, like the entire staff in the Chamber today and like the Presiding Officer for most of this time, has endured this for the last hour, an hour that has been very similar to the hour we had yesterday on the very same topic and with the very same motion to have the very same amendment passed in the Defense Authorization Act.

I am a member of the Committee on Armed Services. Prior to the Presiding Officer, I was presiding. I was honored to sit in that chair and watch the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services and the ranking Democrat of the Committee on Armed Services talk in glowing terms about each other and the bipartisan effort that has led to the National Defense Authorization Act that has considered 807 amendments to this point. As we sit here, 40 more amendments—20 by Republicans and 20 by Democrats—being hotlined for further consideration, for, hopefully, tomorrow's final passage.

The National Defense Authorization Act has been greatly debated. In fact, it has been the most debated bill that I have been part of since I got here. Not only that, the amendments that are represented in this 807 are almost, nearly, equally divided among the two parties represented in this great Chamber.

What we have been witnessing tonight is a diatribe—in some cases, fantasy but, in every case, an exaggeration and, in many cases, a fabrication. The good Senator from Oregon has shown us pictures of what democracy looks like. It is a self-governed. The exceptionalism of America is that we are self-governed.

Democracy also demands protocol in this Chamber, the most deliberative body in this world. Yet, without any warning—without any heads-up—here we are, dealing with a unanimous consent motion on an amendment that has already failed to get unanimous consent just in the last 24 hours on a bill that has already been debated for weeks and months. It included bipartisan amendments across the board. Then we are confronted with this breach of not only protocol but of—well, let's just say—common decency and respect for each other.

I do like to propose to my amendment, but the reason it couldn't be debated there was because he and most every one of his colleagues on the Democrat side other than three filibustered against Tim Scott's Justice Act. I don't think they want a solution. They want to have this crazy rhetoric, demagogue all day and all night, wherever they can have a demagogue, and they want to blame President Donald Trump for the actions of criminals.

Now, I have heard it all when I have heard, from the Senate floor, antifa referred to as the alternative to the police. I don't disagree. They are thugs.

So for these reasons—and I could think of dozens of others, but I will spare you all and the staff this late night, getting later—I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Oregon's postcloture has expired. Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MERKLEY. And I would invite my colleagues to stay if he would like to and yield to him if he wants to jump into the conversation.

Mr. CRAMER. I think we have had enough debate. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is further.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. President, I don't object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, my colleague has said that the facts I have presented tonight are a fabrication, to use his exact word. He has called it a breach of protocol. He has called it a violation of common decency.

I think we are here as a Chamber to address difficult, important issues in America. This is a difficult and important mission.

This is a new use of force in a manner that doesn't belong in the streets of America. It is important that we debate it.

I would be happy to have it be a standalone bill, come up right after this National Defense Authorization Act, and have it debated for 2 hours and voted on, because then we actually have a conversation and we have to take a position, and our constituents can see where we stand, and folks could propose an amendment to it if they didn't like the way I have written it. It is so simple. It says: Do what we have always done. Put ID about where you came from. Have a unique identifier. And don't go sweeping through the streets if your mission is to protect a Federal property. Stay that Federal property or work with the Governor or the mayor if you have a broader effort.

I don't think that it was a breach of protocol to ask this Chamber to consider that on this bill because there is a connection. We are talking about a bill that involves the use of force and how we govern in America.

I don't think it is a violation of common decency. My colleague does, and I would prefer that we actually have that conversation about the facts and about the argument we're making. The simple solution I proposed when we can actually take a vote or other people can offer amendments to it and modify it. That is this Chamber doing what it should be doing.

Mr. CRAMER. I am disappointed that my colleague is blocking this from being considered before this body. I do love this body, and I first came here when amendments were freely—The PRESIDING OFFICER. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. MERKLEY. Thank you, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. President, I am just going to reiterate my final point one final time, and I promise not to take more time than the Senator from Oregon is reasonable things.

He had his opportunity to have this amendment considered, debated, and voted on in the Justice Act, introduced by Senator Tim Scott, a bill that dealt specifically with police reform. It would have been the perfect place to have the debate, except that my colleague voted against cloture so we couldn't even proceed to the bill.
I don’t know how we could have made it any easier or better. In fact, when we took up the JUSTICE Act, he and his side were provided at least 20 amendment opportunities. We could have had the debate he seeks tonight at the appropriate time on the appropriate bill, and I am sorry that we didn’t do that.

Perhaps after tonight’s episode, he and his colleagues will reconsider, and perhaps before we are done this year, Senator Scott’s JUSTICE Act could be brought to the floor and we could have an open discussion and debate on amendments and on the bill and on all kinds of great ideas right here in the most august body in the United States. I hope that can happen.

With that, I yield the floor and wish you a good night.

MORNIG BUSINESS
Mr. CRAMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

Mr. GARDNER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CORONAVIRUS
Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, the Congress, our States, and the administration talk about ways to handle the immediate consequences of COVID-19. We must also talk about the aftermath, and Steve Case has written a provocative op-ed about the future.

Those of us in Congress should read and discuss it. It has to be considered in future planning.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this article be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, July 19, 2020]

THERE’S NO GOING BACK TO THE PRE-PANDEMIC ECONOMY—CONGRESS SHOULD RESPOND ACCORDINGLY

(By Steve Case)

This week, Congress will likely take up the next steps in the economic response to the COVID-19 pandemic. If the package is like previous efforts, it will focus on trying to turn back the clock to February 2020: treating the economy as if it were Sleeping Beauty, merely needing to be awakened from a long slumber.

But that approach will stop only by backing debt efforts to restore the old economic reality and focus on how to develop a new one.

Most of the $1 trillion that Congress has put into business support so far during the pandemic has been directed to preserving existing firms through the Paycheck Protection Program and the Main Street Relief Fund. Helping those businesses and their workers is vital, but that alone won’t fuel the economic recovery the country needs.

The pandemic has exposed that many of the businesses backed by PPP or Main Street are going to wind up shutting down. Even when they aren’t facing a global pandemic or economic crisis, many small and medium-size businesses fall in the United States every year. New businesses will be needed to replace the ones that permanently close. Moreover, the failure rate is likely to be higher, as many firms were on the wrong side of trends—such as the move to online shopping, convenience over physicalness— accelerate streaming content at home—that the pandemic lockdown has accelerated.

Another consideration: The protests stirred by the death of George Floyd in Minneapolis police custody have made clear how many Americans were left behind in the pre-coronavirus economy; restoring the way things were before the virus hit won’t address these needs.

Here are three ways Congress can help launch a new, more equitable era of entrepreneurship.

First: Make it easier for the earliest-stage start-ups to receive PPP dollars and for all start-ups to access the Main Street Relief Fund. PPP loans go to existing businesses to maintain jobs but not to new businesses that want to create them. Main Street loans go only to companies that are already profitable; most start-ups are not. That approach is backward: Studies show that nearly all net new job creation comes from start-ups, not established businesses.

A PPP revision should allow start-ups to obtain loans based on their plans to create jobs—with loan forgiveness granted only if those jobs don’t materialize. If they don’t, the start-ups should be required to repay the loans before any other obligations. And the barrier in the Main Street lending program that makes businesses ineligible for aid if they were not profitable in 2019 should be removed.

Second, the government needs to be a counterweight to private capital that exacerbates geographic disparities in opportunity as the country responds to the crisis. The pandemic is a staggering but adversity tends to be met by the creation of new industries and new businesses. This crisis will stir innovations in medicine, goods and services delivered at home, remote work and learning, and more. Where will these new firms grow? If the decision is left to the private sector alone, almost all of them will be in three states: New York, California and Massachusetts, which attract 75 percent of all venture capital.

Great ideas to respond to this crisis are spread widely across the country—but capital is not. Business assistance programs created by Congress should have a special focus on getting startups off the ground in places that have latched onto backing in the past. Sen. Amy Klobuchar (D-Minn.) and others have already proposed such legislation; members of Congress from these neglected areas should insist it is part of any Phase 4 bill.

Finally, lawmakers should step in to address unintended inequalities of opportunity that female and minority entrepreneurs caused by the earlier relief bills. Because these programs fund only existing businesses, they reinforce opportunity gaps. Communities and entrepreneurs get more PPP and Main Street aid; those that have lacked capital to get businesses off the ground in the past see little help now.

The solution would be for Congress to direct unused PPP funds to start-ups led by female entrepreneurs and entrepreneurs of color, creating opportunities where they have not existed before. The Main Street Lending program could be modified to extend special debt options to community development organizations and minority-focused accelerators to back a new wave of startups founded by historically underrepresented entrepreneurs.

There’s no going back to the pre-pandemic U.S. economy. Too much has changed; too many new needs exist. This is a rare opportunity to break with the past and create a better future. Congress should grab it.

VOTE EXPLANATION
Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, I voted in support of S. Amdt. 1788, which would reduce defense spending by 10 percent and invest that money into healthcare, education, and poverty reduction in communities with a poverty rate of 25 percent or more. To govern is to choose, and as we face unprecedented challenges at home, this defense budget is out of step with the values, priorities, and needs of the American people.

The unchecked growth in the defense budget is unsustainable and the Trump administration has exacerbated these challenges. We have a duty to ensure the readiness of our forces, and I have not voted to support the Armed Forces after years of costly overseas engagements. But massive spending increases without clear strategic direction do not make us safer.

We need to be thoughtful about our spending choices recognizing that every dollar spent on defense is a dollar not spent on healthcare, education, workforce training, and other critical areas of need.

The National Defense Authorization Act as it is currently written would spend $740.5 billion on defense. This represents 53 percent of total Federal discretionary spending and exceeds the defense budgets of the next 11 nations combined, including all the G-7 (the United States, Australia, South Korea, Germany, Japan, France, and the United Kingdom. It is more than twice the combined defense expenditures of China and Russia.

Topline defense spending has risen by more than $100 billion since President Trump took office; after the $74 billion cut proposed in this amendment, defense spending would still be above the fiscal year 2017 level.

Some of my colleagues have expressed unease about the across-the-board nature of these cuts, and I agree that a targeted approach is preferable. But I have seen the consequences of delaying difficult decisions and believe we can no longer wait to have difficult conversations about our defense budget.

In addition, the National Defense Authorization Act is not an appropriations bill, and this amendment simply reduces the total amount of money authorized to be spent on defense in the upcoming fiscal year. If the Appropriations Committee, on which I serve, will still have the task of making thoughtful, targeted reductions in areas of lower priority, while preserving funding for high-priority items. I encourage my colleagues to confront these challenges for the good of our country and make adjustments as needed during conference negotiations with the House while remaining under the cap set by this amendment.

I am glad that this amendment protects salaries and healthcare from cuts, and would have preferred that it go further in making targeted cuts in order
to reduce the impact elsewhere in the defense budget. In particular, we should have taken this opportunity to scale back our country’s trillion-dollar nuclear modernization efforts. Modernizing our nuclear weapons in a manner that makes it easier to use in more scenarios while abrogating our treaty responsibilities and doing nothing to bring Russia back to the nuclear negotiating table is a recipe for disaster.

However, my concerns with the particulars of this amendment do not change the plain fact that our national defense budget has grown out of control. In the midst of the worst economic downturn since the Great Depression, a pandemic that has taken the lives of more than 145,000 of our fellow Americans and shows no signs of slowing down, and the impending crises of homelessness and joblessness that we face if the Congress fails to provide relief, we simply cannot afford to continue this level of overinvestment in defense at the expense of other critical national priorities. For that reason, I supported this amendment.

REMEMBERING LORNE CRANER

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I would like to pay tribute to someone many of my colleagues knew and admired, Lorne Craner, who passed away on July 2 at the too young age of 61, a victim of cancer.

Lorne dedicated his professional life to advancing freedom and justice in the world. He served that cause faithfully as the longest tenured president of the International Republican Institute, IRI, as the Assistant Secretary of State for Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor in the George W. Bush administration, as Director of Asian Affairs on President George H.W. Bush’s National Security Council, and as an advisor to Members of Congress, including his foreign service aide to a newly elected Senator from Arizona, our late colleague, John McCain. He continued to advance American values abroad as president of the American Councils for International Education, as a board member of several distinguished organizations, including the Millennium Challenge Corporation.

I got to know Lorne when Senator McCain, who was IRI’s chairman, asked me to serve on its board. I saw the Institute thrive in size and reach under Lorne’s leadership, becoming one of the world’s most effective agencies for democratic development, respected by human rights advocates around the world and in both U.S. political parties.

Like John, Lorne was a tireless defender of the dignity of all human beings, the bedrock value that democracies are instituted to respect. Like John, Lorne fought the bad guys to defend the little guys. Toward that end, he usually exercised a little more skill at diplomacy than John sometimes possessed, but they shared an equal devotion to mankind’s right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Secretary of State Colin Powell awarded Lorne the Distinguished Service Medal, the State Department’s highest decoration.

Lorne and John shared, too, a dedication to the peaceful conduct of international relations. Both knew that our interests and values sometimes had to be defended by force of arms, but they were both so personally familiar with the costs of war that they worked hard to resolve international conflicts peacefully where possible and to make new friends of former enemies.

Lorne went to work for John in his last term as a Member of the House and his first term in the Senate, but their relationship began earlier than that. Lorne’s father, Air Force Colonel Bob Craner, resided for more than 2 years in the cell next to John’s in a Hanoi prison the POWs called, “the Plantation.” John described Colonel Craner as the only U.S. military officer he had ever served with and “probably the person I was closest too in my life that I wasn’t related to.” John was held in solitary confinement at the time, the hardest period of his imprisonment, and he credited Bob Craner, whom he constantly communicated with by tap code, “with keeping me sane.”

Despite the mistreatment of the POWs, John resolved early in his Senate career to help America reconcile with Vietnam, recognizing that the U.S. and Vietnam had shared interests in Southeast Asia, and that the cause of human dignity in the country where he had resided involuntarily for over 5 years could be served through friendly relations rather than hostile relations. The normalization of relations between the U.S. and Vietnam wouldn’t have happened when it did if not for John’s efforts to help bring it about. I think it is one of his greatest achievements.

And Lorne Craner, the son who was deprived of his father for 5 years by the Vietnam war, provided invaluable help in that effort.

Lorne travelled to Vietnam with John in 1990, where he helped John build productive partnerships with Vietnamese officials who would help resolve issues that were in the way of better relations. And from his positions in government and at the IRI, he continued to advance U.S. interests and his and his family’s shared vision of human dignity in Southeast Asia. Today, growing security and commercial ties between the two former enemies, symbolized by the port calls in Vietnam by U.S. Navy ships, including the USS John S. McCain, are a testament to both John and Lorne’s vision and effectiveness. They imagined a better future out of the resentments and rubble of war, and, with others, made it a reality. They were both men who believed to do good in the world was why we were here.

Lorne was deeply committed to his cause, a cause he never strayed from, for a day in his life, and we are all better for it. He was, too, as all who knew him will testify, a devoted father and husband, and his family’s loss is the most profound. He was a hard man to lose at such a young age, for his family and friends, and for the country and the world.

Lorne Craner, son of Robert and Audrey Craner, husband of Anne Craner, father to three beloved children, Isabelle, Alexander, and Charles, brother of Chrys, an American patriot, a man of justice, a peacemaker, and a friend to many, is gone. But his memory is a blessing to all who had the good fortune to have known him.

To his wife and children, the people who loved him most, as much as you hurt today, time will assuage your grief, and you will still feel his presence in your hearts. I lost my parents when I was a young man. I can say with confidence that the day will come when you will recall, without heartache, the good and honorable man who made his family and friends proud of him. I pray you will one day be reunited. God bless you.

Thank you.

65TH ANNIVERSARY OF MINOT AIR FORCE BASE

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. President, I want to congratulate the Minot Air Force Base on the 65th anniversary of its beginning.

On July 12, 1955, Minot, ND, community leaders and area residents gathered to break ground on land north of the city for what would become the Minot Air Force Base. One and a half years later, operations commenced at the base, and personnel and aircraft made their way to Minot, where they have enhanced our State and defended our Nation ever since. By the mid-1960s, it was recognized as one of the Nation’s largest military installations, with a population of nearly 19,000 military civilian men and women and their families. It was also recognized as having the largest housing village on a military base in the continental United States, with more than 2,450 homes.

The mission, aircraft, and staff have changed over these past seven decades. Today, the Minot Air Force Base supports two legs of the Nation’s nuclear triad and provides vital defense to our security. It is the only dual-wing nuclear-capable installation in the Nation, the 91st Strategic Wing and its B-52 bombers and the 91st Missile Wing, along with Minuteman III intercontinental ballistic missiles.

During these 65 years, the Minot community and State of North Dakota have remained constant in their support for the thousands of people who have been stationed at the Minot Air Force Base. We take pride in all they have done and continue to do to ensure peace throughout our world. We will continue to stand by them in the years ahead.

To the men and women of the Minot Air Force Base, you and all who came before you have faithfully served our
country and lived up to your motto, “Only The Best Come North.” Every day, you go to work carrying the weight of the world on your shoulders, willing to pay the ultimate sacrifice to protect our freedoms and keep us safe. Thank you for all you do to make America great.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

REMEMBERING TECHNICAL SERGEANT RALPH H. RAY

Mrs. CAPITTO. Mr. President, I rise to recognize Technical Sergeant Ralph H. Ray, who was a dedicated West Virginia serviceman in our U.S. Army Air Corps during World War II. T Sgt Ralph H. Ray is being honored by the renaming of a bridge on U.S. Route 60 that spans the Greenbrier River in his native Greenbrier County, WV.

T Sgt Ralph H. Ray graduated from Frankford High School at the age of 17 in 1940. He left his home in West Virginia to complete his enlisted physical for the U.S. Army Corps on January 7, 1942, and subsequently earned the rank of technical sergeant. He earned his airplane mechanic diploma at the Ford Factory in Michigan the spring of 1943 and then completed gunnery school in Laredo, TX.

During his service, T Sgt Ralph H. Ray was assigned to a top-notch flight crew with whom he trained for 3 months. He and his crew traveled to Trinidad, Brazil, Africa, Morocco, and Wales before reaching the Tibenham Base in East England. While serving as a flight engineer during World War II, he and his crew flew 30 successful missions before returning to the United States and spending the last 10 months of his enlistment at the Air Transport Corps in Miami, FL. This dedicated and diverse military service is certainly worthy of admiration.

After his release from the U.S. Army Air Corps, T Sgt Ralph H. Ray worked as an airplane mechanic for Bollinger Airport in Davis Creek, WV, and while there, he earned his civilian pilot’s license. He earned his airplane mechanic diploma at the Ford Factory in Michigan the spring of 1943 and then completed gunnery school in Laredo, TX.

TRIBUTE TO JEANNINE ABADIE

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Jeannine Abadie, the Walton County Teacher of the Year at Emerald Coast Middle School in Santa Rosa Beach, FL.

Jeannine is always working to help her students better understand mathematics and to improve her classroom to better suite their needs. She recently created a video app that provides tutorials for students. She specializes in curriculum design and assessment analysis for her math classes. Jeannine also mentors her colleagues in lesson planning and student achievement. She provides support and professional development for her colleagues to ensure their students are well equipped for college and their future educational careers.

Jeannine is a math instructor at Emerald Coast Middle School and has taught there for 7 years. Previously, Jeannine taught algebra at Northwest Florida State College. She received her master’s degree from the University of West Florida in mathematics and statistics and will soon graduate with her second master’s degree in instructional design and technology.

I convey my best wishes to Jeannine for her outstanding work as an educator. I look forward to hearing of her continued success in the years ahead.

TRIBUTE TO FAITH BENCH

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I honor Faith Bench, the Manatee County Teacher of the Year at Braden River Middle School in Bradenton, FL.

Faith has a special bond with her students who struggle with math. That is because she struggled with the subject when she was in school. She understands those who hate the subject at the beginning of the year and finds it deeply fulfilling to help grow each student’s problem-solving skills by the time they leave her class with greater confidence and appreciation for the subject.

Faith’s colleagues note that she works hard to make learning fun and engaging for her students each year. She is committed to tailoring her lesson plans to suit the individual needs of every student. In turn, Faith is inspired by her colleagues and believes that their work together is the key to an educator’s best work.

Faith teaches mathematics to seventh grade students at Braden River Middle School. Teaching is her passion, and she wants to help her students accomplish their dreams.

I thank Faith for the good work she has done for her students over the years. I look forward to learning of her continued good work in the coming years.

TRIBUTE TO WILLIAM FURIOSI

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I am pleased to honor William Furiosi, the Seminole County Teacher of the Year at Oviedo High School in Oviedo, FL.

William has taught AP biology, chemistry, and experimental research at Oviedo High School for the past 17 years. William aims to create a positive environment for students to think critically while studying science. He enjoys making complex scientific theories to help them better understand the component ideas behind what they are learning.

At the Seminole County Science Fair this year, 12 of his student’s science projects placed, with six first places, four second places, and two third places. His students say they benefit from his teaching style, finding it relatable and exciting during their classes.

I thank William for the good work he has done for his students over the years. I wish him all the best and look forward to learning of his continued success in the coming years.
TRIBUTE TO JAE GLASS

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I honor Jae Glass, the Clay County Teacher of the Year from Lake Asbury Junior High School in Green Cove Springs, FL.

Jae was named Teacher of the Year at Lake Asbury Junior High School in Green Cove Springs, FL. She was recognized by the Clay County School District and worked at Lake Asbury Junior High School. Jae has taught for 22 years and dedicates her time to being a positive role model for her students by engaging with them each day in her classroom. Throughout the school year, Jae’s students participate in more than traditional learning lectures. An example of an alternative activity includes her “book tasting day,” which allows students to snack at picnic tables while sampling from an array of books.

Jae believes it is important to make English relatable and fun to her students. She encourages them to use reading and writing as a creative means of expression. She also works to help her students that do not speak English as a first language by securing additional materials for her school.

I convey my sincere gratitude to Jae for her devotion to helping her students succeed in their future endeavors. I look forward to hearing of her continued success.

TRIBUTE TO EVAN GOULD

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I honor Evan Gould, the Clay County Teacher of the Year from Lake Asbury Junior High School in Green Cove Springs, FL.

Evan was named Teacher of the Year at Lake Asbury Junior High School in Green Cove Springs, FL. He received his degree in chemistry from the University of Edinburgh and studied to be a chemistry teacher at a university in England. Evan taught chemistry and general science in England before marrying his wife, moving to New York City, and teaching chemistry at Varsity High School around the world for 16 years.

Evan is a teacher for 30 years, with 22 years in Clay County. Outside of the classroom, Evan dedicates his time and talents to giving back to his community. He cofounded the Clay All-School Musical, which hosts an annual festival that brings in more than 500 drama students from across the region.

I extend my sincere thanks and gratitude to Evan for his many years working as a teacher and helping countless students achieve their dreams. I look forward to learning of his continued success in the coming years.

TRIBUTE TO JOLI HARTZOG

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I honor Joli Hartzog, the Washington County Teacher of the Year at Florida Panhandle Technical College in Chipley, FL.

Joli has been a teacher for more than 28 years. She is the adult education director and instructor for the Florida Panhandle Technical College and offers instruction at the pre-college level throughout the school year. Joli teaches all levels of students, including those seeking high school equivalency, professional testing preparation, personal enrichment, or other specialized certification.

Enrollment at Florida Panhandle Technical College remains open throughout the school year so the environment and format of Joli’s class is ever-changing. She works with students ranging from 16 to 66 years old who are working towards their GED, and she is able to modify her teaching style to match the composition of the current class. She is willing to meet with her students anytime, whether they arrive in her classroom, after class, or by appointment.

Joli finds the best part of teaching to be the family she has found at the school. She enjoys working with her fellow instructors and faculty and says they all work as a team. Joli considers this family to extend to her students and loves that she is able to help them achieve their life dreams.

I offer my sincere gratitude to Joli for her dedication to her students and extend my best wishes on her continued success in the years to come.

TRIBUTE TO KERI HEMRICK

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Keri Hemrick, the Collier County Teacher of the Year at Gulf Coast High School in Naples, FL.

Keri believes motivating her students to impact their community is one of the most important commitments she makes as a teacher. She aims to lead each student, whether they have a disability or a gift, towards increasing their achievements in school. She works to ensure their success upon leaving her classroom.

Keri’s students were excited to learn that she had received this award. They were proud to see her recognized for representing the family-like environment she cultivated in their classroom. Many students have credited her for helping them to understand the new subjects throughout the school year.

Keri is an exceptional education co-teacher, case manager, and chair of the exceptional student education department at Gulf Coast High School. She dedicates her life to making a difference by engaging her students with special instruction and services.

I extend my best wishes to Keri for her dedication to her students and her community and congratulate her on this award.

TRIBUTE TO WHITNEY JONES

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I am pleased to recognize Whitney Jones, the Nassau County Teacher of the Year from Wildlight Elementary School in Yulee, FL.

Whitney became a teacher to make a difference in the lives of her students by helping them to develop a passion for learning. Her teaching philosophy is that students will work hard when they are shown love and respect. She finds it humbling to watch her students grow and successfully learn new class subjects throughout the school year.

Whitney considers her role in her students’ lives to be one that offers encouragement, guidance, and compassion. She works with her colleagues to implement new teaching strategies and plans standards-based lessons to ensure students are prepared for the third grade when they leave her classroom.

Whitney began her teaching career at Yulee Primary School, teaching there for 5 years before becoming a second grade teacher at Wildlight Elementary School, where she has taught for the past 2 years as a team leader and grade level chair. She is also on her school’s action plan team, which works to create plans to help the lowest quartile students improve in school. I extend my best wishes to Whitney for her good work as a teacher and look forward to learning of her continued good work in the coming years.
TRIBUTE TO DEVON LAMONICA

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I honor Devon LaMonica, the Okaloosa County Teacher of the Year at Port Walton Beach High School in Port Walton Beach, FL.

Teaching was not the career Devon imagined for herself when studying forensics science in biochemistry at the University of Central Florida, but now she cannot imagine any other career for herself. Devon loves the opportunity to ignite a passion for science in her students and views teaching as a joy. She launched the biomedical science program at Port Walton Beach High School and continues to teach the entire program.

Devon earned her master’s degree in education at the University of West Florida and returned to work as an educator at Port Walton Beach High School, her own alma mater. She is nationally recognized as a Biomedical Science Master Teacher and trains new teachers in this field across our Nation. She has been a teacher for 15 years.

I extend my sincere thanks and gratitude to Devon for her work to teach her students. I look forward to hearing of her continued success in the years ahead.

TRIBUTE TO KAREN NEADS

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I am pleased to recognize Karen Neads, the DeSoto County Teacher of the Year from Memorial Elementary School in Arcadia, FL.

Karen was named Teacher of the Year in her 25th year of teaching, all of which she has taught kindergarten and in DeSoto County. Her favorite aspect of teaching is watching her students grow and the moment they enter her classroom with a blank slate and, by the end of the school year, are able to read and write.

I extend my sincere thanks and gratitude to Karen for her dedication to her students and look forward to hearing of her continued success in the years ahead.

TRIBUTE TO JACOB POELMA

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I am pleased to honor Jacob Poema, the Monroe County Teacher of the Year from Coral Shores High School in Tavernier, FL.

Jacob believes that, as a teacher, his impact is greater than the sum of his students’ test scores and homework grades. He strives to honor a student’s individuality while fostering a sense of community in the classroom. He knows that every student has a unique story and focuses on tailoring his teaching to engage each student in the best way they are able to learn. Jacob works to provide real-time language translations of his lectures so all of his students can master the material in their native language.

Jacob has taught biology in Monroe County for 4 years. He works with students in and out of the classroom by offering personalized teaching and mentorship opportunities, sponsors Coral Shores High School’s Gaming Club, announces sporting events, and volunteers at extracurricular and other community activities.

I extend my deepest gratitude to Jacob for his dedication to his students and efforts to improve the learning experience. I look forward to hearing of his continued success in the years to come.

TRIBUTE TO KATHLEEN RULING

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Kathleen Ruling, the Union County Teacher of the Year from Lake Butler Elementary School in Lake Butler, FL.

Kathy believes that every child is worthy of respect, as they have a unique story to tell. She views her job not as a line of work, but a place where she is preparing each student for their future. Her colleagues describe her as having a natural gift for teaching and working with children.

Whether by creating hands-on classroom experiences or diligently tracking each child’s progress, Kathy supports her student’s educational careers and is always willing to help, even after they leave her classroom.

As an elementary special education teacher for 38 years, Kathy has left a lasting legacy in Union County. In 1985,
she implemented the staggered start program for kindergarteners. In 1990, she founded the Tiger Cubs, a club that recognizes students for their positive attitude and encourages peers. Both of these programs are still in effect in the county.

I express sincere appreciation to Kathy for her many accomplishments and years of service to her students. I wish her continued success in the years to come.

TRIBUTE TO JOSIE STUMPF

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I am pleased to honor Josie Stumpf, the Volusia County Teacher of the Year at Holly Hill School in Holly Hill, FL.

Josie teaches fifth grade and has taught in Volusia County for nearly 20 years. She credits her success to Daytona Beach mayor Derrick Henry, who was her 11th grade teacher. She says Mayor Henry changed the course of her life, as it was not until she was in his class, where music and energy were incorporated into his lessons, that she realized learning could be fun. This motivated her to inspire others in the same way that he inspired her.

Josie strives to keep learning fun. An example of her creative teaching includes transforming her classroom to mimic a campground, a cafe, and many other different environments to better engage her students in the learning process.

Josie’s colleagues admire her seemingly natural ability to relate to students, which has inspired them to follow her lead. Josie’s enthusiasm for education extends beyond her own classroom, where she has been known to develop curriculum modules for language arts and regularly helps other teachers.

I extend my best wishes and gratitude to Josie for her dedication to students for nearly two decades, and I look forward to hearing of her continued success in the years to come.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Ms. Ridgway, one of his secretaries.

PRESIDENTIAL MESSAGE

REPORT RELATIVE TO THE CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO TRANSNATIONAL CRIMINAL ORGANIZATIONS THAT WAS ESTABLISHED IN EXECUTIVE ORDER 13581 ON JULY 24, 2011—PM 55

The President, Mr. President, and the Secretary of the Senate, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days before the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the Federal Register a notice that he has determined that the national emergency with respect to transnational criminal organizations declared in Executive Order 13581 of July 24, 2011, is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the Federal Register for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency with respect to transnational criminal organizations declared in Executive Order 13581 of July 24, 2011, is to continue in effect beyond July 24, 2020.

The activities of significant transnational criminal organizations have reached such scope and gravity that they threaten the stability of international political and economic systems. Such organizations are becoming increasingly sophisticated and are therefore more dangerous to the United States. They are increasingly entrenched in the operations of foreign governments and the international financial system, thereby weakening democratic institutions, undermining democratic governance, and undermining economic stability. These organizations facilitate and aggravate violent civil conflicts and increasingly facilitate the activities of other dangerous persons.

The activities of significant transnational criminal organizations continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States. For these reasons, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13581 with respect to transnational criminal organizations.

DONALD J. TRUMP,


MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

At 11:30 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bills:

S. 4148. An act to extend the Chemical Facility Anti-Terrorism Standards Program of the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes.

The enrolled bills were subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. GRASSLEY).

At 5:58 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the text of the bill (H.R. 1957) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modernize and improve the Internal Revenue Service, and for other purposes, and that the House has agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the title of the aforementioned bill.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, July 22, 2020, she had presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 4148. An act to extend the Chemical Facility Anti-Terrorism Standards Program of the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes.

S. 4209. An act to amend title IX of the Social Security Act to improve emergency unemployment relief for governmental entities and nonprofit organizations.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-5072. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasuries and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Prohibitions and Restrictions on Proprietary Trading and Certain Interests in, and Relationships With, Hedge Funds and Private Equities Funds” (RIN3235-AM70) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 10, 2020, to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-5073. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Relief for Taxpayers Affected by Ongoing Coronavirus Disease Pandemic, Related to Sport Fishing Equipment and Bows and Arrows Excise Tax Filing and Payment Deadlines” (Notice 2020-46) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 8, 2020, to the Committee on Finance.

EC-5074. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Notice of BIA-19 Relief and Other Guidance on Mid-Year Reductions or Suspensions of Contributions to Safe Harbor statute 401(k) and statute 401(m) Plans” (Notice 2020-52) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 8, 2020, to the Committee on Finance.

EC-5075. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Carryback of Consolidated Net Operating Losses” (RIN1545–BP94) (TD 9900)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 15, 2020, to the Committee on Finance.

EC-5076. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Vice Admiral Richard A. Brown, United States Navy, and an amendment to the Vice Admiral on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-5077. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness, transmitting a report on the approved retirement of General Terrence J.
O'Shaughnessy, United States Air Force, and his advancement to the grade of general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–5087. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Manpower), transmitting a report on the approved retirement of General James L. Lentz, United States Army, and his advancement to the grade of general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–5079. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Manpower), transmitting a report on the approved retirement of General James C. Vechery, United States Air Force, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–5080. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Manpower), transmitting a report on the approved retirement of General James M. Holmes, United States Air Force, and his advancement to the grade of general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–5081. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Manpower), transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Thomas C. Seammis, United States Army, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–5082. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Manpower), transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Bruce T. Crawford, United States Army, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–5083. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Manpower), transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Joseph L. Osterman, United States Marine Corps, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–5084. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Manpower), transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Michael A. Rocco, United States Marine Corps, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–5085. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Manpower), transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Vice Admiral Thomas J. Moore, United States Navy, and his advancement to the grade of vice admiral on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–5086. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Manpower), transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Todd T. Semonte, United States Army, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–5087. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Manpower), transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Thomas W. Bergeson, United States Air Force, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–5088. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Manpower), transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Vice Admiral David H. Lewis, United States Navy, and his advancement to the grade of vice admiral on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–5089. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Manpower), transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Major General Timothy J. Kinnane, United States Army, and his advancement to the grade of major general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–5090. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Manpower), transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General John J. Broadmeadow, United States Marine Corps, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–5091. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of an officer authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of lieutenant general in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777a, this will not cause the Department to exceed the number of frocked officers authorized; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–5092. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of nine (9) officers authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of lieutenant general in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777, this will not cause the Department to exceed the number of frocked officers authorized; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–5093. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of nine (9) officers authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of lieutenant general in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777, this will not cause the Department to exceed the number of frocked officers authorized; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–5094. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of an officer authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of rear admiral in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777, this will not cause the Department to exceed the number of frocked officers authorized; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–5095. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of an officer authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of rear admiral in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777, this will not cause the Department to exceed the number of frocked officers authorized; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–5096. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of an officer authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of rear admiral in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777, this will not cause the Department to exceed the number of frocked officers authorized; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–5097. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of an officer authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of rear admiral in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777, this will not cause the Department to exceed the number of frocked officers authorized; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–5098. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of an officer authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of rear admiral in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777, this will not cause the Department to exceed the number of frocked officers authorized; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–5099. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of three (3) officers authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of brigadier general in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777, this will not cause the Department to exceed the number of frocked officers authorized; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–5100. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of a rule entitled "Amendments to Procedures with Respect to Applications for Frocking of Officers Under the Department of Defense Stipend for Retirement Act," transmitted, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Amendments to Procedures with Respect to Applications Under the Investment Company Act of 1940” (HIN3285–AMS1) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President pro tempore of the Senate on June 30, 2020 to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–5101. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of an officer authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of major general or brigadier general in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777, this will not cause the Department to exceed the number of frocked officers authorized; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–5102. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of two (2) officers authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of major general or brigadier general in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777, this will not cause the Department to exceed the number of frocked officers authorized; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–5103. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of two (2) officers authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of rear admiral in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777, this will not cause the Department to exceed the number of frocked officers authorized; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–5104. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of three (3) officers authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of major general or brigadier general in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777, this will not cause the Department to exceed the number of frocked officers authorized; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–5105. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of an officer authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of brigadier general in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777, this will not cause the Department to exceed the number of frocked officers authorized; to the Committee on Armed Services.
States of America and the Government of the Republic of Nicaragua; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–5109. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Special Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Convention on Cultural Property Implementation Act, a report relative to actions taken from 2012–2018 to conclude new cultural property agreements with Belize, Bulgaria, Egypt, and Libya, and to extend agreements with Bolivia, Cambodia, China, Colombia, Cyprus, El Salvador, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Italy, Mali, Nicaragua, and Peru; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–5109. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Special Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Convention on Cultural Property Implementation Act, a report relative to actions taken from 2012–2018 to conclude new cultural property agreements with Belize, Bulgaria, Egypt, and Libya, and to extend agreements with Bolivia, Cambodia, China, Colombia, Cyprus, El Salvador, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Italy, Mali, Nicaragua, and Peru; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–5109. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Special Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Convention on Cultural Property Implementation Act, a report relative to actions taken from 2012–2018 to conclude new cultural property agreements with Belize, Bulgaria, Egypt, and Libya, and to extend agreements with Bolivia, Cambodia, China, Colombia, Cyprus, El Salvador, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Italy, Mali, Nicaragua, and Peru; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–5109. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Special Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Convention on Cultural Property Implementation Act, a report relative to actions taken from 2012–2018 to conclude new cultural property agreements with Belize, Bulgaria, Egypt, and Libya, and to extend agreements with Bolivia, Cambodia, China, Colombia, Cyprus, El Salvador, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Italy, Mali, Nicaragua, and Peru; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–5109. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Special Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Convention on Cultural Property Implementation Act, a report relative to actions taken from 2012–2018 to conclude new cultural property agreements with Belize, Bulgaria, Egypt, and Libya, and to extend agreements with Bolivia, Cambodia, China, Colombia, Cyprus, El Salvador, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Italy, Mali, Nicaragua, and Peru; to the Committee on Finance.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were transmitted:

By Mr. WICKER, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation:

* Michael P. O‘Rielly, of New York, to be a Member of the Federal Communications Commission for a term of five years from July 1, 2019.

* Joel Szabat, of Maryland, to be Under Secretary of Transportation for Policy.

* Mary A. Tomasi, to be Under Secretary of Commerce for Economic Affairs.

* Michael J. Walsh, Jr., of Virginia, to be General Counsel of the Department of Commerce.

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, for the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation I report favorably the following nomination lists which were printed in the RECORD, on the dates indicated, and ask unanimous consent to save the expense of reprinting on the Executive Calendar that these nominations lie at the Secretary’s desk for the information of Senators.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

* Coast Guard nomination of Peter H. Imbrie, to be Lieutenant.

* Coast Guard nominations beginning with Nicholas C. Custer and ending with Nicole L. Guidelines, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 17, 2020.

By Mr. JOHNSON for the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs:

EC–5110. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Federal Election Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission’s Semiannual Report of the Independent Office for the period from October 1, 2019 through March 31, 2020; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.


EC–5115. A communication from the Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary, Department of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Revising the Beryllium Standard for General Industry” (RIN 1218–AD22) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 14, 2020; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Ms. KLOBUCAR): S. 4259. A bill to codify a statutory definition for long-term care pharmacies; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. VON HOLLEN, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. SMITH, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. ROSEN, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. WARNER, and Ms. KLOBUCAR): S. 4262. A bill to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to develop an action plan, make targeted grants, and develop public awareness campaigns with respect to COVID–19 and the disproportionate impact of the COVID–19 pandemic on racial and ethnic minorities and other vulnerable populations; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself, Mr. BURDEN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. JONES, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. COONS, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. CASEY, Mr. Kaine, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. Reid, Mr. BROWN, Ms. Smith, Mr. MEEKLEY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. CANTWELL, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. HASSAN, Mrs. MURAY, Mr. HENRICH, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. KING, Mrs. SHARRETT, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. VON HOLLEN, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. WARNER, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. UDALL, Mr. BINKEN, Mr. SCHATZ, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. WARREN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. KLOBUCAR, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. TEFERER, Mr. PETERS, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. MURKOWSKI, and Mr. MANCHIN): S. 4263. A bill to amend the Voting Rights Act of 1965 to revise the criteria for determining which States and political subdivisions subject to section 4 of the Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAHAM (for himself, Ms. CAPITTO, and Mr. ROUNDS): S. 4264. A bill to require personal protective equipment to be acquired from domestic producers for the Strategic National Stockpile to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. LEE: S. 4265. A bill to amend the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 to require the submission of certain reports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. CRUZ: S. 4266. A bill to provide civil liability for injuries in law enforcement free zones, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRUZ (for himself, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. RUBIO, and Mr. DURBIN): S. 4267. A bill to designate the area between the intersections of 16th Street, Northwest and Fuller Street, Northwest and 16th Street, Northwest and Easter Street, Northwest in Washington, District of Columbia, as “Oswaldo Paya Way”; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Ms. HASSAN (for herself and Mr. BURRI):
S. 4268. A bill to improve the coordination between the paycheck protection program and employee retention tax credit; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MANCHIN (for himself and Mr. GARDNER): S. 4282. A bill to amend the Community Mental Health Services Block Grant to authorize a set-aside for crisis care services and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. HERNÉN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. CASEY, Ms. CORTEZ Mastro, and Ms. ROSEN): S. 4281. A bill to provide funding for States to improve their unemployment insurance technology systems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BAYH of Indiana, Mr. AKYANDER, and Mr. CRUZ: S. 4284. A bill to provide for emergency education funding; to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish tax credits to encourage individual and corporate taxpayers to contribute to scholarships for students entering eligible scholarship-granting organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MANCHIN (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. CRAPPO, and Mr. TESTER): S. 4285. A bill to establish a pilot program to support efforts to provide fare-free transit service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. MARKEY: S. 4286. A bill to authorize appropriations to improve coordination between Federal agencies to support efforts to provide fare-free transit service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. TESTER: S. 4288. A bill to establish the Badger-Two Medicine Health Care System; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. ROYBAL-CALDERON: S. 4289. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish tax credits to encourage individual and corporate taxpayers to contribute to scholarships for students entering eligible scholarship-granting organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BAYH of Indiana, Mr. AKYANDER, and Mr. CRUZ: S. 4284. A bill to provide for emergency education funding; to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish tax credits to encourage individual and corporate taxpayers to contribute to scholarships for students entering eligible scholarship-granting organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MANCHIN (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. CRAPPO, and Mr. TESTER): S. 4285. A bill to establish a pilot program to support efforts to provide fare-free transit service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. MARKEY: S. 4286. A bill to authorize appropriations to improve coordination between Federal agencies to support efforts to provide fare-free transit service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. TESTER: S. 4288. A bill to establish the Badger-Two Medicine Health Care System; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. ROYBAL-CALDERON: S. 4289. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish tax credits to encourage individual and corporate taxpayers to contribute to scholarships for students entering eligible scholarship-granting organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BAYH of Indiana, Mr. AKYANDER, and Mr. CRUZ: S. 4284. A bill to provide for emergency education funding; to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish tax credits to encourage individual and corporate taxpayers to contribute to scholarships for students entering eligible scholarship-granting organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MANCHIN (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. CRAPPO, and Mr. TESTER): S. 4285. A bill to establish a pilot program to support efforts to provide fare-free transit service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. MARKEY: S. 4286. A bill to authorize appropriations to improve coordination between Federal agencies to support efforts to provide fare-free transit service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. TESTER: S. 4288. A bill to establish the Badger-Two Medicine Health Care System; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. ROYBAL-CALDERON: S. 4289. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish tax credits to encourage individual and corporate taxpayers to contribute to scholarships for students entering eligible scholarship-granting organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BAYH of Indiana, Mr. AKYANDER, and Mr. CRUZ: S. 4284. A bill to provide for emergency education funding; to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish tax credits to encourage individual and corporate taxpayers to contribute to scholarships for students entering eligible scholarship-granting organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MANCHIN (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. CRAPPO, and Mr. TESTER): S. 4285. A bill to establish a pilot program to support efforts to provide fare-free transit service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. MARKEY: S. 4286. A bill to authorize appropriations to improve coordination between Federal agencies to support efforts to provide fare-free transit service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. TESTER: S. 4288. A bill to establish the Badger-Two Medicine Health Care System; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. ROYBAL-CALDERON: S. 4289. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish tax credits to encourage individual and corporate taxpayers to contribute to scholarships for students entering eligible scholarship-granting organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BAYH of Indiana, Mr. AKYANDER, and Mr. CRUZ: S. 4284. A bill to provide for emergency education funding; to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish tax credits to encourage individual and corporate taxpayers to contribute to scholarships for students entering eligible scholarship-granting organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MANCHIN (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. CRAPPO, and Mr. TESTER): S. 4285. A bill to establish a pilot program to support efforts to provide fare-free transit service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. MARKEY: S. 4286. A bill to authorize appropriations to improve coordination between Federal agencies to support efforts to provide fare-free transit service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. TESTER: S. 4288. A bill to establish the Badger-Two Medicine Health Care System; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. ROYBAL-CALDERON: S. 4289. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish tax credits to encourage individual and corporate taxpayers to contribute to scholarships for students entering eligible scholarship-granting organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BAYH of Indiana, Mr. AKYANDER, and Mr. CRUZ: S. 4284. A bill to provide for emergency education funding; to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish tax credits to encourage individual and corporate taxpayers to contribute to scholarships for students entering eligible scholarship-granting organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MANCHIN (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. CRAPPO, and Mr. TESTER): S. 4285. A bill to establish a pilot program to support efforts to provide fare-free transit service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. MARKEY: S. 4286. A bill to authorize appropriations to improve coordination between Federal agencies to support efforts to provide fare-free transit service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. TESTER: S. 4288. A bill to establish the Badger-Two Medicine Health Care System; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. ROYBAL-CALDERON: S. 4289. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish tax credits to encourage individual and corporate taxpayers to contribute to scholarships for students entering eligible scholarship-granting organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BAYH of Indiana, Mr. AKYANDER, and Mr. CRUZ: S. 4284. A bill to provide for emergency education funding; to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish tax credits to encourage individual and corporate taxpayers to contribute to scholarships for students entering eligible scholarship-granting organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MANCHIN (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. CRAPPO, and Mr. TESTER): S. 4285. A bill to establish a pilot program to support efforts to provide fare-free transit service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. MARKEY: S. 4286. A bill to authorize appropriations to improve coordination between Federal agencies to support efforts to provide fare-free transit service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. TESTER: S. 4288. A bill to establish the Badger-Two Medicine Health Care System; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. ROYBAL-CALDERON: S. 4289. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish tax credits to encourage individual and corporate taxpayers to contribute to scholarships for students entering eligible scholarship-granting organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BAYH of Indiana, Mr. AKYANDER, and Mr. CRUZ: S. 4284. A bill to provide for emergency education funding; to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish tax credits to encourage individual and corporate taxpayers to contribute to scholarships for students entering eligible scholarship-granting organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MANCHIN (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. CRAPPO, and Mr. TESTER): S. 4285. A bill to establish a pilot program to support efforts to provide fare-free transit service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. MARKEY: S. 4286. A bill to authorize appropriations to improve coordination between Federal agencies to support efforts to provide fare-free transit service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. TESTER: S. 4288. A bill to establish the Badger-Two Medicine Health Care System; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. ROYBAL-CALDERON: S. 4289. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish tax credits to encourage individual and corporate taxpayers to contribute to scholarships for students entering eligible scholarship-granting organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.
Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish a tax credit for construction of new all-electric homes.

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1210, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase and make permanent the exclusion for benefits provided to volunteer firefighters and emergency medical responders.

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1703, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reform the low-income housing credit, and for other purposes.

At the request of Ms. HIRONO, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1964, a bill to support educational entities in fully implementing title IX and reducing and preventing sex discrimination in all areas of education, and for other purposes.

At the request of Ms. HIRONO, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2579, a bill to direct the Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy to carry out programs and activities to ensure that Federal science agencies and institutions of higher education receiving Federal research and development funding are fully engaging their entire talent pool, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) and the Senator from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG) were added as cosponsors of S. 2815, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint a coin commemorating the National Purple Heart Honor Mission.

At the request of Ms. HARRIS, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2862, a bill to establish a community wildfire defense grant program, and for other purposes.

At the request of Ms. MCSALLY, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2886, a bill to prohibit the use of animal testing for cosmetics and the sale of cosmetics tested on animals.

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3176, a bill to amend the Forestry Assistance Act of 1991 and the United States-Israel Strategic Partnership Act of 2014 to make improvements to certain defense and security assistance provisions and to authorize the appropriations of funds to Israel, and for other purposes.

At the request of Ms. ROSEN, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 3328, a bill to award grants to States to establish or improve, and carry out, Seal of Bilingualism programs to recognize high-level student proficiency in speaking, reading, and writing in both English and a second language.

At the request of Mr. BENNET, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEYHAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3559, a bill to provide emergency financial assistance to rural health care facilities and providers impacted by the COVID–19 emergency.

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3606, a bill to provide for the establishment of a Health Force and a Resilience Force to respond to public health emergencies and meet public health needs.

At the request of Ms. ROSEN, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 3631, a bill to establish a loan program for borrowers of student loans for whom the Department of Education has asserted a right to borrower defense discharge.

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) were added as cosponsors of S. 3693, a bill to amend the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 to foster efficient markets and increase competition and transparency among packers that purchase livestock from producers.

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3745, a bill to direct the Secretary of Education to provide relief to borrowers of student loans for whom the Department of Education found misrepresentation by the institution of higher education or a State attorney general to have asserted a right to borrower defense discharge.

At the request of Mr. BENNET, the names of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURRE), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. Klobuchar), the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. Baldwin), the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. Roberts), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. Alexander) and the Senator from Utah (Mr. Romney) were added as cosponsors of S. 3814, a bill to establish a loan program for businesses affected by COVID–19 and to extend the loan forgiveness period for paycheck protection program loans made to the hardest hit businesses, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. Shaheen) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3819, a bill to encourage the protection and promotion of internationally recognized human rights during the novel coronavirus pandemic, and for other purposes.

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. Blumenthal) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3840, a bill to protect the continuity of the food supply chain of the United States in response to COVID–19, and for other purposes.

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. Kaine) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3855, a bill to ensure ethical and accountable use of COVID–19 relief funds, to prevent corruption and bias in the disbursement and supervision of those funds, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. Brown), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. Coons), the Senator from Washington (Mrs. Murray) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. Casey) were added as cosponsors of S. 3866, a bill to prohibit the use of funds for an explosive nuclear weapons test.

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. Barrasso) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3995, a bill to limit the authority of States or other jurisdictions to tax certain income of employees for employment duties performed in other States or taxing jurisdictions, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. Romney) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3997, a bill to strengthen the security and integrity of the United States scientific and research enterprise.

At the request of Mr. CARDOZI, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. Durbin) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4014, a bill to provide for supplemental loans under the Paycheck Protection Program.

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. Stabenow) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4019, a bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to designate Juneteenth National Independence Day as a legal public holiday.

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the names of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. Sanders), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. Wyden) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. Warren) were added as cosponsors of S. 4084, a bill to prohibit biometric surveillance by the Federal Government without explicit statutory authorization and to withhold certain Federal public safety grants from State and local governments that engage in biometric surveillance.
At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4089, a bill to amend title 11, United States Code, to improve protections for pension plans and retirees in business bankruptcies.

S. 4117
At the request of Mr. CRAMER, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4117, a bill to provide automatic forgiveness for paycheck protection program loans under $150,000, and for other purposes.

S. 4150
At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4150, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to provide assistance to certain providers of transportation services affected by the novel coronavirus.

S. 4158
At the request of Mr. HAWLEY, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4158, a bill to examine the extent of the reliance of the United States on foreign producers for personal protective equipment during the COVID–19 pandemic and produce recommendations to secure the supply chain of personal protective equipment.

S. 4162
At the request of Mrs. FISCHER, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4162, a bill to provide certainty for airport funding.

S. 4172
At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4172, a bill to provide emergency funding for child welfare services provided under parts B and E of title IV of the Social Security Act, and for other purposes.

S. 4182
At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Ms. EINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4182, a bill to provide nursing homes with resources for responding to the COVID–19 public health emergency to protect the health and safety of residents and workers, to reauthorize funding for programs under the Elder Justice Act of 2009, and for other purposes.

S. 4190
At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4190, a bill to authorize the Director of the United States Geological Survey to establish a regional program to assess, monitor, and benefit the hydrology of saline lakes in the Great Basin and the migratory birds and other wildlife dependent on those habitats, and for other purposes.

S. 4193
At the request of Mr. PETERS, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4193, a bill to develop and nationally disseminate accurate, relevant, and accessible resources to promote understanding about African-American history.

S. 4204
At the request of Mr. JOHNSON, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4204, a bill to establish an Interagency Task Force to analyze preparedness for national pandemics, and for other purposes.

S. 4209
At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) were added as cosponsors of S. 4209, a bill to limit the use of Federal law enforcement officers for crowd control, and for other purposes.

S. 4233
At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4233, a bill to establish a payment program for unexpected loss of markets and revenues to timber harvesting and timber hauling businesses due to the COVID–19 pandemic, and for other purposes.

S. 4241
At the request of Ms. HARRIS, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4241, a bill to establish a grant program to provide funds for health care entities to establish or improve bias and anti-racism training to help reduce racial and ethnic disparities in COVID–19 testing, treatment, health outcomes, and vaccine access.

S. 4252
At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 4252, a bill to provide funding for States to improve their unemployment compensation programs, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 509
At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. HAWLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 509, a resolution calling upon the United Nations Security Council to adopt a resolution extending the dates by which Annex B restrictions under Resolution 2231 are currently set to expire.

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN), the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) and the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 578, a resolution condemning the Government of Iran’s state-sponsored persecution of its Baha’i minority and its continued violation of the International Covenants on Human Rights.

AMENDMENT NO. 1857
At the request of Mr. ROMNEY, the names of the Senator from Nebraska (Ms. Sasse) and the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1855 intended to be proposed to S. 4049, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2051
At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2051 intended to be proposed to S. 4049, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2328
At the request of Mr. YOUNG, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2328 intended to be proposed to S. 4049, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2552
At the request of Mr. HAWLEY, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mrs. LOEFFLER) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2552 intended to be proposed to S. 4049, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2433
At the request of Mr. MANCHIN, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2433 intended to be proposed to S. 4049, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.
the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2437

At the request of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the amendment of Mr. DURBIN was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2437 intended to be proposed to S. 4049, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2437

At the request of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the names of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 2437 intended to be proposed to S. 4049, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2437

At the request of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 2437 intended to be proposed to S. 4049, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2437

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 2437 intended to be proposed to S. 4049, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2437

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the names of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) and the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 2437 intended to be proposed to S. 4049, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2437

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the names of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 2437 intended to be proposed to S. 4049, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2437

At the request of Mr. VAN HOLLEN, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2437 intended to be proposed to S. 4049, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2437

At the request of Mr. VANDERPLAS, the names of the Senator from New Mexico (Ms. HAUKSBAKER) and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. NEUMANN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 2437 intended to be proposed to S. 4049, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2437

At the request of Mr. VANDERPLAS, the names of the Senator from New Mexico (Ms. HAUKSBAKER) and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. NEUMANN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 2437 intended to be proposed to S. 4049, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

STATISTICAL HILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION

By Mr. KAIN (for himself and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. 4269. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve maternal health and promote safe motherhood, to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. KAIN. Mr. President. There are significant racial and ethnic inequities in maternal and infant mortality rates in the United States. According to the CDC, the maternal mortality rate for non-Hispanic Black women in 2018 is more than 2.5 times higher than the maternal mortality rate of non-Hispanic white women, and the infant mortality rate of non-Hispanic Black women is more than 2.3 times higher than the infant mortality rate of non-Hispanic white women. Any pregnant woman choosing to have a child should be able to do so safely without regard to income, race, ethnicity, employment status, or any other socio-economic factor. This is why Senator MURKOWSKI and I are introducing the Mothers and Newborns Success Act, which aims to reduce maternal and infant mortality, ensure that all infants can grow up healthy and safe, and protect women’s health before, during, and after pregnancy. Our legislation supports innovation in maternal health delivery and improves data collection on maternal mortality and maternal deaths. The bill will help ensure that women are matched with birthing facilities that are risk-appropriate for their particular needs to improve maternal and neonatal care and outcomes. The legislation strengthens support for women during the critical postpartum period, the year after birth, and will help ensure pregnant women get the vaccinations they need and are aware of maternal health warning signs. The bill promotes much needed research and the use of telehealth to help high-risk expectant mothers in geographically-isolated areas. The Mothers and Newborns Success Act is a significant step toward reducing racial, ethnic, and geographic inequities in maternal and infant health. I am glad that my colleague Rep. Terri Sewell will be introducing companion legislation in the House of Representatives. Given COVID-19’s disproportionate impact on the health and well-being of women of color and recent research from the CDC which finds that pregnant women with COVID-19 are more likely to be hospitalized and admitted to the ICU, this legislation is especially timely. No woman should fear for her or her child’s health because of her race. We need to ensure more women of color and their children, particularly Black women and children, receive equitable care. COVID-19 and its impact on pregnant women has only underscored the need for action. By advancing evidence-based policies to improve maternal and infant health outcomes, this bill will work to reduce and eliminate preventable maternal and infant mortality in the United States. I’m calling on my Senate colleagues to support this bill and include it in the next coronavirus relief package so we can enact positive systemic changes to make sure more women and newborns thrive and have the maximum chance for success.

By Mr. THUNE (for himself and Ms. ENZI):

S. 4275. A bill to require recipients of Pandemic Unemployment Assistance to provide employment documentation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD. There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 4275

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

SECTION I. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Pandemic Unemployment Assistance Integrity Act”.

SEC. 2. PANDEMIC UNEMPLOYMENT ASSISTANCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2102(a) of the Relief for Workers Affected by Coronavirus Act (contained in subtitle A of title II of division A of the CARES Act (Public Law 116–136)) is amended—

(i) in paragraph (3)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) in clause (i), by striking “and” at the end; and

(ii) by inserting after clause (ii) the following:

“(iii) provides documentation substantiating employment or self-employment or the planned commencement of employment or self-employment not later than 21 days after the date on which the individual submits an application for assistance under this section or is directed by the State Agency to submit such documentation or has shown good cause under the applicable State law for failing to submit such documentation by the deadline, in accordance with section 625.6(e) of title 20, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor thereto, except that such documentation shall not be required if the individual previously submitted such information to the State agency for the purpose of obtaining regular or other unemployment compensation; and”; and

(B) in subparagraph (B)—

(i) in clause (1), by striking “or” at the end;

(ii) in clause (1), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; or”; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

“(iii) in accordance with section 625.6(e)(2) of title 20, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor thereto, an individual who does not provide documentation substantiating employment or self-employment or the planned commencement of employment or self-employment under subparagraph (A)(iii) is provided a reasonable period of time to do so following: (1) by redesigning paragraphs (4) and (5) as paragraphs (5) and (6), respectively; and (2) by inserting after paragraph (5) the following:

“(4) DOCUMENTATION SUBSTANTIATING EMPLOYMENT OR SELF-EMPLOYMENT OR THE PLANNED COMMENCEMENT OF EMPLOYMENT OR SELF-EMPLOYMENT.—By submitting to the State agency for purposes of obtaining regular or other unemployment compensation, an individual who does not provide documentation substantiating employment or self-employment or the planned commencement of
employment or self-employment’ means docu-
mentation provided by the individual sub-
stantiating employment or self-employment and wages earned or paid for such employ-
ment or self-employment, or such documenta-
tion related to the planned commencement of employment or self-employment.’’.

(b) The Act (as so amended) shall increase the amount of unemployment assistance (as defined in section 2102 of the Relief for Workers Affected by Coronavirus Act (contained in subtitle A of title II of division A of the CARES Act (Public Law 116-136)) be submitted by any individual who applies for pandemic unemployment assistance under this Act and receives such assistance on or after the date of enactment of this Act shall submit documenta-
tion substantiating employment or self-
employment or the planned commence-
ment of employment or self-employment (as defined in section 2102 of the Relief for Workers Affected by Coronavirus Act (contained in subtitle A of title II of division A of the CARES Act (Public Law 116-136)) on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) Prior Applicants.—Any individual who applied for pandemic unemployment assistance (as defined in section 2102 of the Relief for Workers Affected by Coronavirus Act (contained in subtitle A of title II of division A of the CARES Act (Public Law 116-136)) before the enactment of this Act and receives such assistance on or after the date of enactment of this Act shall submit documenta-
tion substantiating employment or self-
employment or the planned commence-
ment of employment or self-employment (as defined in section 2102) not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act or the individual will be ineligible to receive pandemic unemployment assistance under this section 2102.

By Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mr. CRUZ):

S. 4284. A bill to provide for emergency education freedom grants, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish tax credits to encour-
age individual and corporate taxpayers to contribute to scholarships for students through eligible scholarship-granting organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, today, Senator Tim Scott of South Carolina and I introduce the School Choice Now Act, which does two things: It protects students who have been attending private schools from the heartbreakening loss of scholarships, and it gives families more options for their children's education at a time that school is more important than ever.

I have been working to find ways to help parents pursue the education that best meets their child's needs for a long time, since 1979, when I began to be the Governor of Tennessee.

In 1986, we Governors got together in something called Time for Results. I was chairman of the National Gov-
ernors Association. The vice chairman was the Arkansas Governor, Bill Clinton, and we devoted the Governors' at-
tention for an entire year to one sub-
ject—education.

There were six points. One of those points way back then was to find ways to give parents more choices of schools for their children.

Then, later on, in 1992, when Presi-
dent George H.W. Bush was in office and I was Education Secretary, I helped the President develop some-
ting we called the GI Bill for Kids, which was Federal funds for a $1,000 scholarship to work with cities and States, like Milwaukee in Wisconsin, that were trying to give low-income families more choices of good schools for their children.

Then, my last act as Education Sec-
retary was to decide what they call start-from-scratch schools in Min-
nesota, created by the Democratic-
Farmer-Labor Party. There were about a dozen of them, as I remember, and I wrote every school district in the coun-
try and asked them to start one of these start-from-scratch schools, which were the forerunners of today's public charter schools.

Today, we have 7,500 public charter schools.

Then, in 2005, I tried something I called the Pell Grant for Kids, a $500 scholarship that would follow every middle- and low-income child in America to an accredited program of their choosing.

Some people said: Wait a minute. You can't call the Pell grant a voucher.

I said: That is precisely what the Pell grant is. The Pell grant is a voucher that a college student can take to any accredited college—public, private, or religious. Why can't we do that for ele-
mentary and secondary schools?

In 2005, we had a hurricane named Katrina, creating devastation on the gulf coast, and Senator Ted Kennedy and I and Senator Jeffords and others worked together to provide $1.2 billion Federal dollars in one-time emergency assistance for the 2005–2006 school year so students enrolled in public or non-
public schools—children who were dis-
placed by the hurricane—could enroll in public or private schools while their families recovered. They got scholar-
ships of up to $6,000.

And, more recently, I suggested a Scholarship for Kids Act. I said: Why don't we give a State like Tennessee, Ohio, or North Dakota, the opportunity to take most of the Federal dollars and turn them into scholarships for the lowest income students in their State? That scholarship would amount to $2,100 if we just took the existing money we had and spent it that way.

So that is the strategy that we fol-
lowed in this country for many, many years, ever since 1944, with the GI bill for veterans.

We all remember what that was. The veterans came home and a grateful na-
pinion gave them a scholarship and said: Take it anywhere you want, to any col-
lege or accredited school. Take it to Notre Dame, take it to Yeshiva, take it to a historically Black college, take it to Ohio State, take it to Tennessee, take it to the Presbyterian school.

And they have done that, and the GI bill may be one of the most certainly successful pieces of legislation ever en-
acted.

Last year, there were over $23 billion in Federal Pell grants and more than $91 billion in Federal loans that fol-
lowed students to public and private colleges of their choice.

Now, the Federal Government also provides vouchers to help pay for childcare. The Child Care and Develop-
ment Incentives Grant, as negotiated by John Sununu when he was Chief of Staff for H.W. Bush in 1990, and what does that mean is basically give money to States and States then give vouchers, just like Pell grants for college, so they give them to working moms, and they have to go pick the childcare center that is best for their child.

The Federal Government, in 2019, provided $8.7 billion and States another $1.2 to provide vouchers to 1.3 million children.

So I think you can see where I am going with this. It is that the idea of giving parents choices of schools is not a new idea. We have done it in colleges since 1944. We do it with childcare. We do it in community colleges. Why not don't do it with elementary and secondary education? Why not give low-income families more of the same choices of good schools that wealthy families have?

Now, during COVID-19, children in all 50 States have been affected by the disease. There are 100,000 public schools across our country serving 50 million students. That are another 35,000 private schools serving 5 million students. Many of those schools, public or private, are choosing not to reopen in person this fall.

Many schools are failing to provide high-quality distance learning. The students who will suffer the most from this are the low-income children—the children from families where both par-
ents work away from home every day or where the only parent works away from home every day, children with no internet, families who can't afford to put a child in a private school if the public school is not.

These are the parents who have the greatest need and the children who have the greatest need. We should ad-
dress that need as we think about how to deal with COVID-19.

Just as more families need more op-
tions, there are fewer scholarships available to help them choose private schools because there has been less charitable giving as a result of the pan-
demic.

So for low-income students attending private schools on a scholarship, that can mean a heartbreaking end to their time at school and a transfer to a new school that may not meet their needs at all.

That is why Senator Scott and I and others of us recommend that Congress first provide sufficient funding for all of our schools—100,000 public schools and 35,000 private—so they can safely open this fall with as many students physically present as possible.

I have suggested that the cost of this to the taxpayers could be as much as $70 billion. The House of Representa-
tives has appropriated $58 billion.
If Congress were to agree on the higher number, $70 billion, that would be about $1,200 for every one of the 55 million public and private school students in the country.

The School Choice Now Act that Senator DUCKWORTH and I are offering is about the 5.7 million of those 55 million children who attend the 35,000 nonpublic, private, or religious schools. It provides scholarships to students to have the opportunity to return to the private school they attended before the pandemic. Their students gain a new opportunity to attend private school by doing two things: One, providing one-time emergency funding for scholarship-granting organizations. These are nonprofits that do the important work of helping students attend private schools in each State. These scholarship-granting organizations will use this one-time funding to provide families with direct educational assistance, including private school tuition as well as other school expenses.

No. 2, this act would provide permanent dollar-for-dollar Federal tax credits for contributions to those scholarship-granting organizations. What this means is that any American taxpayer who makes a charitable donation to one of these nonprofits that provide scholarships to students will receive a credit on their Federal taxes equal to the amount the taxpayer donated. The same goes for private companies that make donations to these organizations. The School Choice Now Act is not a Federal mandate. States are free to create their own tax credit scholarship programs that work for the unique needs of students in their States. States that don’t want to support scholarships to private schools are not required to accept these funds. They can be returned to the Secretary, and the funds will be redistributed to States that want the funds.

This bill is about one of the great principles of American democracy: the principle of equal opportunity. For me, equal opportunity means creating an environment in which the largest number of people can begin at the starting line. When everyone is at the starting line in America, anything is possible. Giving children more opportunity to attend a better school is the real answer to inequality in America.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 655—DECLARING RACISM A PUBLIC HEALTH CRISIS

Whereas the United States ratified over 390 treaties with sovereign indigenous communities, has broken the promises made in such treaties, and has historically failed to carry out its treaty responsibilities to Native Americans, including American Indians, Alaska Natives, and Native Hawaiians, as made evident by the chronic and pervasive underfunding of Federal programs for the Service and Tribal, Urban Indian, and Native Hawaiian health care, the vast health and socioeconomic disparities faced by Native American people, and the inaccessibility of many Federal public health and social programs in Native American communities;

Whereas people of Mexican and Puerto Rican descent, who became Americans through conquest, were subject to, but never full members of the polity of the United States and experienced widespread discrimination in employment, housing, education, and health care;

Whereas the immoral paradox of slavery and freedom were wrong trudges throughout the Nation’s history, as African Americans lived under the oppressive institution of slavery from 1619 through 1865, endured the practices and laws of segregation during the Jim Crow Era, and continue to face the ramifications of systemic racism through unjust and discriminatory structures and policies;

Whereas, before the enactment of the Medicare program, the United States’ health care system was highly segregated, and, as late as the mid-1960s, hospitals, clinics, and doctors’ offices throughout Northern and Southern States complied with Jim Crow laws and were completely segregated by race—leaving Black communities with little to no access to health care services;

Whereas, between 1956 and 1967, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and the Legal Defense and Education Fund litigated a series of court cases to eliminate discrimination in hospitals and professional associations;

Whereas the landmark case Simkins v. Moses H. Cone Memorial Hospital, 323 F.2d 959 (1963), challenged the Federal Government’s use of public funds to expand, support, and subsidize, segregated hospitals and professional associations, and provided justification for title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act and the Medicare hospital certification program—establishing Medicare beneficiaries’ access to quality health care, and policy guidelines that applied to every hospital that participated in the Federal program;

Whereas, in 1967, President Lyndon B. Johnson established the Civil Rights Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders, which concluded that white racism is responsible for the pervasive discrimination and segregation in employment and housing, resulting in deepened racial division and continued exclusion of Black communities from the benefits of economic growth;

Whereas the United States has laws and policies, including Latinos, Asian Americans, and Pacific Islanders, were not assured non-discriminatory access to Federally-funded services, including health services, during the signing of Executive Order 13166 in 2000;

Whereas the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act included provisions to expand the Medicare program—the first time in the United States—established a Federal prohibition against discrimination on the basis of race, color, national origin, sex, age, or disability in certain health programs, building on other Federal civil rights laws;

Whereas the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act required reporting to Congress on health disparities based on race, color, national origin, sex, age, or disability; and several Federal programs have been established to address some, but not all, of the health outcomes that are disproportionately experienced by communities of color, including sickle cell disease, tuberculosis, infant mortality, and HIV/AIDS;

Whereas the National Center for Chronic Disease Prevention and Promotion works to raise awareness of health disparities faced by minority populations in the United States, such as Native Americans, African Americans, Asian Americans, and Latino Americans, aiming to reduce risk factors for groups affected by such health disparities;

Whereas the United States’ health care system and other economic and social structures remain fraught with racism and racial, ethnic, sex (including sexual orientation and gender identity), and class biases that lead to health inequity and health disparities;

Whereas life expectancy rates for Black and Native American people in the United States are significantly lower than those of white people in the United States;

Whereas disparities in health outcomes are exacerbated for LGBTQIA+ people of color;

Whereas disparities in health outcomes are worsened for people of color with disabilities due to bias and inequitable access to health care;

Whereas several States with higher percentages of Black, Latino, and Native American populations have not expanded their Medicaid programs to expand and protect minority communities from access to health care to this day;

Whereas 16 States have failed to take advantage of the Federal option to expand access to Medicaid and the Children’s Health Insurance Program to lawfully-residing immigrant children within the first 5 years of lawful status, and 28 States have failed to do so for similarly-situated pregnant women;

Whereas, between 2016 and 2018, the child uninsured rate increased from 4.7 percent to 5.2 percent and the 12 percent children’s uninsured rate increased from 7.7 percent to 8.1 percent, and children of color are far more likely than white people in the United States, such as Native Americans, African Americans, and Latino Americans, aiming to reduce risk factors for groups affected by such health disparities;

Whereas the National Center for Chronic Disease Prevention and Promotion works to raise awareness of health disparities faced by minority populations in the United States, such as Native Americans, African Americans, Asian Americans, and Latino Americans, aiming to reduce risk factors for groups affected by such health disparities;

Whereas the National Center for Chronic Disease Prevention and Promotion works to raise awareness of health disparities faced by minority populations in the United States, such as Native Americans, African Americans, Asian Americans, and Latino Americans, aiming to reduce risk factors for groups affected by such health disparities;

Whereas the history and persistence of racism, anti-Semitism, and anti-LGBTQIA+ hostilities have worsened for people of color with disabilities due to bias and inequitable access to health care;

Whereas several States with higher percentages of Black, Latino, and Native American populations have not expanded their Medicaid programs to expand and protect minority communities from access to health care to this day;

Whereas disparities in health outcomes are exacerbated for LGBTQIA+ people of color;

Whereas disparities in health outcomes are worsened for people of color with disabilities due to bias and inequitable access to health care;

Whereas several States with higher percentages of Black, Latino, and Native American populations have not expanded their Medicaid programs to expand and protect minority communities from access to health care to this day;

Whereas disparities in health outcomes are exacerbated for LGBTQIA+ people of color;

Whereas disparities in health outcomes are worsened for people of color with disabilities due to bias and inequitable access to health care;
Whereas, racism and segregation in the United States contribute to poor health outcomes by segmenting Black, Latino, and Native American communities from opportunity; Whereas, for decades, discriminatory housing practices, such as redlining, systematically excluded people of color from housing, robbing them of capital in the form of low-cost, stable mortgages and opportunities to build wealth, and the Federal government used its financial power to segregate renters in newly-built public housing; Whereas, environmental injustices, such as proximity and exposure to toxic waste or hazardous air pollutants, continue to harm the health of communities of color, low-income, and marginalized Indigenous communities around the Nation; Whereas social inequities such as differing access to quality health care, healthy food and safe drinking water, safe neighborhoods, education, job security, and reliable transportation affect health risks and outcomes; Whereas, during the COVID-19 pandemic, the effects of discrimination are seen in COVID-19 infection, hospitalization, and mortality rates—disproportionately high among Black, Latino, and Native American populations compared to the overall population—exacerbating health disparities and highlighting barriers to care for Black, Latino, and Native American patients across the United States; Whereas, because of racial and ethnic disparities, people of color are more likely to have less effective home care, and chronic conditions, which lead to higher COVID-19 morbidity and mortality rates; Whereas people of color are overrepresented in the United States living under poor air quality conditions, which can increase the likelihood of COVID-19 morbidity and mortality; Whereas the pandemic has worsened barriers for Black, Latino, and Native American households that suffer from disproportionately higher rates of food insecurity; Whereas Black and Latino workers make up a disproportionate number of frontline workers, are less likely to receive paid sick leave or have the ability to work from home, and have been excluded from many forms of relief readily available to other groups; Whereas people of color are disproportionately impacted by the criminal justice and immigration enforcement systems and face a higher risk of contracting COVID-19 within prison populations and detention centers due to the over-incarceration of people of color; Whereas, during the COVID-19 pandemic, an increased use of anti-Asian rhetoric has resulted in Asian Americans experiencing harassment, assaulted, and scapegoated for the pandemic; Whereas communities of color continue to bear the burdens of inequitable social, economic, and health policies, practices, and investments that cause deep disparities, hurt, harm, danger, and mistrust; Whereas over 40 percent of Latinos report being discriminated against or harassed because they are Hispanic; Whereas approximately 24 percent of the Latino population in the United States identifies as “Afro-Latino” and is thus potentially subject to both race and national origin discrimination; Whereas, because of racism, Black people in the United States share a unique set of challenges and experiences that require heightened levels of awareness and risk while performing everyday tasks—such as jogging in neighborhoods, driving while Black, or playing in a park—that are not experienced by other populations; Whereas Black, Latino, and Native American people are 3 times more likely to be killed by police than white people in the United States, and police violence is the 6th leading cause of death for young Black men; Whereas the police brutality and violence experienced by Black people in the United States adversely impacts mental health among Black communities; Whereas Black communities led the Nation in mourning the killings of Ahmaud Arbery, Breonna Taylor, George Floyd, Elijah McClain, and when Black Americans—calling for justice and long-term changes to dismantle systems of oppression; Whereas throughout our Nation’s history, people of color have been at the forefront of civil rights movements for essential freedoms, human rights, and equal protection for marginalized groups and continue to fight for racial and environmental justice; Whereas a public health issue is defined as meeting the following 4 criteria: (1) the condition affects many people, is seen as a threat to the public, and is continuing to increase, (2) the condition is distributed unfairly, (3) preventable measures could reduce the effects of the condition, (4) those preventive measures are not yet in place; Whereas racism meets the criteria of a public health issue and alerts the Nation to the need to enact immediate and effective cross-governmental efforts to address root causes of institutional racism and their downstream impacts; and Whereas such discrimination requires the response of the Government to empower those communities that are impacted: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate— (1) supports the resolutions drafted, introduced, and adopted by cities and localities across the Nation declaring racism a public health crisis; (2) declares racism a public health crisis in the United States; (3) commits to— (A) establishing a nationwide strategy to address health disparities and inequity across all sectors in society; (B) dismantling systemic practices and policies that perpetuate racism; (C) advancing reforms to address the social determinants of health—especially for Black, Latino, and Native American people in the United States, and other people of color; and (4) places a charge on the Nation to move forward with urgency to ensure that the United States stands firmly in honoring its moral purpose of advancing the self-evident truths that all people are created equal, that they are endowed with certain unalienable rights, and that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

SENATE RESOLUTION 656—RECOGNIZING THE IMPORTANCE OF THE BLUEBERRY INDUSTRY TO THE UNITED STATES AND DESIGNATING JULY 2020 AS “NATIONAL BLUEBERRY MONTH”

Ms. STABENOW (for herself, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. KING, and Ms. COLLINS) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary: S. Res. 656

Whereas the blueberry is a fruit native to North America; Whereas blueberries were first— (1) managed and harvested as wild blueberries by the native Wabanaki through specialized burning practices that are still used in 2020; and (2) processed and dried in food and medicines by Native Americans, who introduced blueberries to early colonists, which led to new uses and forms of blueberries, including those that established traditions still observed in 2020; Whereas the pioneering work conducted in New Jersey in the early 1900s by Elizabeth Whiting and Dr. George Durfee, a botanist at the Department of Agriculture, to domesticate wild lowbush blueberries resulted in the development of the hybrid for cultivated highbush blueberries; Whereas, because of those early efforts, highbush blueberries are large, sweet, juicy berries that can be commercially produced and shipped; Whereas wild blueberries— (1) are small and sweet; and (2) are not planted, but still grow and are harvested where they have naturally oc-
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 Whereas the blueberry industry in the United States, including both highbush and wild blueberries, is an important agricultural industry with an annual economic impact of more than $7 billion.

 Whereas highbush and wild blueberry production in the United States has continually increased, with particular growth during the first 2 decades of the 21st century, reaching a total harvest of 700,000,000 pounds in 2019;

 Whereas blueberries—are
 (1) low in fat; and
 (2) a source of fiber, vitamins, and minerals;

 Whereas blueberries are being studied to examine the role that the berries may play in promoting good health in areas such as cardiovascular health, brain health, exercise, insulin response, and gut health; and

 Whereas blueberries are harvested in the United States from March through early September, with the peak of the harvest occurring in July; Now, therefore, be it

 RESOLVED by the Senate of the United States of America, in exercise of the powers vested in it by the Constitution and laws of the United States:

 AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

 SA 2487. Mr. ENZI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2301 proposed by Mr. INHOFE to the bill S. 4049, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table:

 (1) by redesigning subsection (e) as subsection (f); and
 (2) by inserting after subsection (d) the following new subsection:

 "(e) PROCESS APPLICABLE TO MEMBER DISCLOSURE.—The regulations required by subsection (a) shall—
 (1) establish a phrase that enables a member of the armed forces to trigger a referral of the member by a commanding officer or supervisor for an evaluation;
 (2) require a commanding officer or supervisor to make such referral as soon as practicable following disclosure by the member to the commanding officer or supervisor of the phrase established under paragraph (1); and
 (3) ensure that the referral process protects the confidentiality of the member in a manner similar to the confidentiality provided for members making restricted reports under section 1565b(b) of this title.
"

 SA 2488. Ms. MCSALLY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2301 proposed by Mr. INHOFE to the bill S. 4049, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table:

 (1) by redesigning subsection (e) as subsection (f); and
 (2) by inserting after subsection (d) the following new subsection:

 "(e) PROCESS APPLICABLE TO MEMBER DISCLOSURE.—The regulations required by subsection (a) shall—
 (1) establish a phrase that enables a member of the armed forces to trigger a referral of the member by a commanding officer or supervisor for an evaluation;
 (2) require a commanding officer or supervisor to make such referral as soon as practicable following disclosure by the member to the commanding officer or supervisor of the phrase established under paragraph (1); and
 (3) ensure that the referral process protects the confidentiality of the member in a manner similar to the confidentiality provided for members making restricted reports under section 1565b(b) of this title.
"

 SA 2489. Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2301 proposed by Mr. INHOFE to the bill S. 4049, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table:

 Add at the end of subsection G of title XII the following:

 SEC. 1287. UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR GLOBAL MEDIA

 (a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the "U.S. Agency for Global Media Reform Act".
 (b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the Office of Cuba Broadcasting should—
 (1) remain an independent entity of the United States Agency for Global Media; and
 (2) continue taking steps to ensure that the Office is fulfilling its core mission of promoting freedom and democracy by providing the people of Cuba with objective news and information programming.
 (c) AUTHORITY OF THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER.—LIMITATION ON CORPORATE LEADERSHIP OF GRANTEES.—The Chief Executive Officer of the United States International Broadcasting Act of 1994 (22 U.S.C. 6204) is amended—

 (1) in subsection (a)—
 (A) in paragraph (20), by inserting "in accordance with subsection (c)" before the period at the end;
 (B) by striking paragraph (21) and
 (2) by striking "in accordance with subsection (c)", which is hereby deleted.
 (d) INTERNATIONAL BROADCASTING ADVISORY BOARD.—Section 306 of the United States International Broadcasting Act of 1994 (22 U.S.C. 6204) is amended—

 (1) by striking subsections (a) through (e) and
 (2) by adding at the end of the section the following:

 "(a) COMPOSITION OF THE ADVISORY BOARD.—
 (1) In general.—The Advisory Board shall consist of 7 members, of whom—
 (A) 1 shall be the Secretary of State;
 (B) 2 shall be the President, and
 (C) 1 shall be the Chairman of the Senate, in accordance with subsection (c).
 (2) Conforming amendments.—The amendments made by this section shall be applied to the advisory board established by section 306 of the United States International Broadcasting Act of 1994 (22 U.S.C. 6204) as if such section were amended by the amendments made by this section.
of the members appointed under paragraph (1)(A) as Chair of the Advisory Board.

“(3) PARTY LIMITATION.—Not more than 3 members of the Advisory Board appointed under paragraph (1)(A) may be affiliated with the same political party.

“(4) TERMS OF OFFICE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), members of the Advisory Board shall serve for a single term of 4 years, except that, of the first group of members appointed under paragraph (1)(A),

“(i) 2 members who are not affiliated with the same political party, shall be appointed for terms ending on the date that is 2 years after the date of the enactment of the U.S. Agency for Global Media Reform Act;

“(ii) 2 members who are not affiliated with the same political party, shall be appointed for terms ending on the date that is 6 years after the date of the enactment of the U.S. Agency for Global Media Reform Act; and

“(iii) 2 members who are not affiliated with the same political party, shall be appointed for terms ending on the date that is 4 years after the date of the enactment of the U.S. Agency for Global Media Reform Act; and

“(B) SECRETARY OF STATE.—The Secretary of State shall serve as a member of the Advisory Board for the duration of his or her tenure as Secretary of State.

“(5) VACANCIES.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The President shall appoint, with the advice and consent of the Senate, members to fill vacancies on the Advisory Board occurring before the expiration of a term.

“(B) TERMS.—Any members appointed pursuant to subparagraph (A) shall serve for the remainder of such term.

“(C) SERVICE BEYOND TERM.—Any member whose term of service has expired may serve without pay as a member of the Advisory Board until a qualified successor has been appointed and confirmed by the Senate.

“(D) SECRETARY OF STATE.—When there is a vacancy in the office of Secretary of State, the Acting Secretary of State shall serve as a member of the Advisory Board until a new Secretary of State is appointed.

“(2) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (c);

“(3) by amending subsection (c), as redesignated—

“(A) in the subsection heading, by inserting "ADVISORY" before "Board"; and

“(B) in paragraph (2), by inserting "who are" before "qualified individuals"; and

“(4) by striking subsections (e) and (f) and inserting the following new subsections:

"(e) APPOINTMENT OF HEADS OF NETWORKS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The heads of Voice of America, Office of Cuban Broadcasting, RFE/RL, Inc., Radio Free Asia, the Middle East Broadcasting Networks, the Open Technology Fund, or any other grantee authorized under this Act may be appointed or removed at the discretion of the Chief Executive Officer.

“(2) REMOVAL.—The Chief Executive Officer may, with the advice and consent of the Advisory Board, remove any member of the Advisory Board.

“(3) QUORUM.—A quorum of the Advisory Board shall consist of 4 members of the Advisory Board, excluding the Chief Executive Officer.

“(4) DECISIONS.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), decisions of the Advisory Board shall be made by majority vote, a quorum being present.

“(5) CLOSING PROCEEDINGS.—The Advisory Board may in closed sessions in accordance with section 552b of title 5, United States Code.

“(e) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—The United States International Broadcasting Act of 1994 (22 U.S.C. 6201 et seq.) is amended—

“(1) in section 304—

“(A) in the section heading, by striking "BROADCASTING BOARD OF GOVERNORS" and inserting "UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR GLOBAL MEDIA";

“(B) in subsection (a), by striking "Broadcasting Board of Governors" and inserting "United States Agency for Global Media";

“(C) in subsection (b)(1), by striking "Broadcasting Board of Governors" and inserting "United States Agency for Global Media"; and

“(D) in subsection (c), by striking "Board" each place such term appears and inserting "Agency";

“(2) in section 305—

“(A) in subsection (a)—

“(i) in paragraph (6), by striking "Board" and inserting "Agency";

“(ii) in paragraph (13), by striking "Board and inserting "Agency";

“(iii) in paragraph (20), by striking "Board" and inserting "Agency"; and

“(iv) in paragraph (22), by striking "Board" and inserting "Agency";

“(B) in subsection (b), by striking "Board" each place such term appears and inserting "Agency";

“(C) in subsection (c), by striking "Board" and inserting "Agency";

“(D) in subsection (g), by striking "Board" each place such term appears and inserting "Agency";

“(E) in subsection (h)(5), by striking "Board" and inserting "Agency"; and

“(F) in subsection (i), in the first sentence, by striking "Board" and inserting "Agency"; and

“(G) in section 309—

“(A) in subsection (c)(1), by striking "Board" each place such term appears and inserting "Agency";

“(B) in subsection (e), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking "Board" and inserting "Agency";

“(C) in subsection (f), by striking "Board" each place such term appears and inserting "Agency"; and

“(D) in subsection (g), by striking "Board" and inserting "Agency";

“(5) in section 310(d), by striking "Board" and inserting "Agency";

“(6) in section 310(a), by striking "Broadcasting Board of Governors" and inserting "United States Agency for Global Media";

“(7) in section 310(b), by striking "Board" and inserting "Agency";

“(8) by striking section 312;

“(9) in section 313(a), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking "Board" and inserting "Agency";

“(10) in section 314—

“(A) by striking (4) the terms ‘Board’ and ‘Chief Executive Officer of the Board’ mean the Broadcasting Board of Governors and inserting the following:

'(4) the terms ‘Agency’ and ‘Chief Executive Officer of the Board’ mean the United States Agency for Global Media and the Chief Executive Officer of the United States Agency for Global Media, respectively;' and

“(B) in paragraph (3)—

“(i) by striking ‘includes’— and inserting ‘means the corporation having the corporate title described in section 308; and

“(ii) by striking subparagraphs (A) and (B); and

“(11) in section 316—

“(A) in subsection (a)(1), by striking ‘Broadcasting Board of Governors’ and inserting ‘United States Agency for Global Media’;

“(B) in subsection (c), by striking ‘Broadcasting Board of Governors’ and inserting ‘United States Agency for Global Media’;

“(C) RULEMAKING.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the United States Agency for Global Media may not revoke part 531 of title 22, Code of Federal Regulations, which took effect on June 11, 2020, without explicit authorization by an Act of Congress.

“(g) SAVINGS PROVISIONS.—Section 310 of the United States International Broadcasting Act of 1994 (22 U.S.C. 6389) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

'(d) MAINTENANCE OF PROPRIETARY INFORMATION.—No consolidation of grantees authorized under subsection (a) involving any grantee shall result in any legal transfer of ownership of any proprietary information or intellectual property to the United States Agency for Global Media or any other Federal entity.

'(e) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in the United States International Broadcasting Act of 1994 or any other provision of law may be construed to make the Open Technology Fund or any successor entity with any other grantee.''

Mr. ROUNDS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to
amendment SA 2301 proposed by Mr. INHOFE to the bill S. 4049, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle D of title XII, insert the following:

SEC. 1242. FEASIBILITY STUDY ON INCREASED ROTATIONAL DEPLOYMENTS TO GREECE AND ENHANCEMENT OF UNITED STATES-GREECE DIPLOMATIC ENGAGEMENT.

(a) Feasibility Study.—

(1) In general.—The Secretary of Defense shall conduct a study on the feasibility of increased rotational deployments of members of the Armed Forces to Greece, including to Souda Bay, Alexandroupoli, Larissa, Volos, and Stefanovikelo.

(2) Element.—The study required by paragraph (1) shall include an evaluation of any infrastructure investment necessary to support such increased rotational deployments.

(3) Report to Congress.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the results of the study required by paragraph (1) that includes the estimated costs associated with such increased rotational deployments.

(b) Diplomatic Engagement.—The Secretary of Defense is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, July 22, 2020, at 2 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, July 22, 2020, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

The Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, July 22, 2020, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, July 22, 2020, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, July 22, 2020, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON WATER AND POWER

The Subcommittee on Water and Power is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, July 22, 2020, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

Glioblastoma Awareness Day

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of and the Senate now proceed to S. Res. 617.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 8:55 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, July 23, 2020, at 9:30 a.m.
IN HONOR OF THE LIFE OF CHIEF
SHAWN BABENDURE

HON. KEVIN BRADY
OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 2020

Mr. BRADY. Madam Speaker, I rise to honor the life and service of Shawn Babendure, a husband, father, coach, U.S. Army veteran and District Chief of the Spring, Texas Fire Department who tragically passed away this week much too young and far too early.

A native Texan, born and raised in Houston, Shawri leaves a legacy of a lifetime of service to his community and his country which began when Shaw joined the Champions Fire Department in 1990 while attending Cypress Creek High School.

His service continued when he enlisted in the United States Army in 1993. He served honorably and well for nearly four years as a Communications Repair Specialist with the 11th Armored Cavalry Regiment at Fort Irwin, California, the Army’s National Training Center. He distinguished himself as an expert marksman and earned his paratrooper wings. He was awarded the National Defense Service Medal, the Good Conduct Medal, the Army Commendation Medal for his service.

Shortly after his military service, Shawn earned his Bachelor of Science degree from the University of Houston. Shawn worked in the financial services industry where he served as Vice President of Wealth Management for a global wealth management firm, a position he still held at the time of his death.

In 2007, Shawn chose to serve his community once again and returned to public service as a fireman at the Spring Fire Department. Shawn's work ethic and professionalism were evidenced by his promotion to positions of increasing responsibility at the Spring Fire Department where he impressively earned more than ten professional certificates for every facet of fire, rescue and emergency service and rose in rank from fireman to District Chief.

Shawn’s love for his community and his contagious laughter were hallmarks of his personality and his service and he passed on his care and compassion for others by training and mentoring the next generation of firefighters.

I join the entire Spring community in honoring Chief Babendure’s lifetime of service and join his wife, Jessica, and their children, Sophia and Harrison, in mourning their loss. Chief Babendure will be deeply mourned and greatly missed.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. RICHARD HUDSON
OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 2020

Mr. HUDSON. Madam Speaker, I was unknowingly exposed to someone who later tested positive for Coronavirus. Out of an abundance of caution and for the health and well-being of my colleagues, I am in self-quarantine until Thursday, July 23, 2020 at 12:01 a.m. As such, I had to miss this vote series.

Had I been present, I would have voted NAY on Roll Call No. 139; NAY on Roll Call No. 140; NAY on Roll Call No. 141; NAY on Roll Call No. 142; YEA on Roll Call No. 143; NAY on Roll Call No. 144; NAY on Roll Call No. 145; NAY on Roll Call No. 146; NAY on Roll Call No. 147; NAY on Roll Call No. 148; NAY on Roll Call No. 149; NAY on Roll Call No. 150; YEA on Roll Call No. 151; and YEA on Roll Call No. 152.

WILLIAM M. (MAC) THORNBERY
NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2021

SPEECH OF
HON. JOHN GARAMENDI
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 20, 2020

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of the fiscal year 2021 National Defense Authorization Act. I would like to start by thanking Chairman SMITH, Ranking Member THORNBERY, and the House Armed Services Committee staff who have worked many long nights putting together this year's NDAA. The bill that is before the House is a good bill and I encourage my colleagues to support its passage.

As the Chairman of the Readiness Subcommittee, I believe the bill upholds our responsibility to provide congressional oversight of and support to the sustainment, logistics, infrastructure, and readiness of our military. I'd like to take a moment and thank my staff for their tireless work—the Readiness Subcommittee staff, Brian Garrett, Jeanine Womble, Melanie Harris, Jay Vallario, John Muller, Dave Sienicki, and Sean Falvey, and my personal staff, Bradley Bottoms, Betsy Thompson, Marcus Jones, and Danusia Hubah. I am proud of the Readiness Subcommittee's contribution to this year's bill and I'd like to highlight the following provisions.

The Readiness portion of the bill continues to emphasize the need to address vulnerabilities in installation and energy resiliency, both in response to climate change and to ensure the Department can continue to operate when fuel supplies and utilities are disrupted. The bill requires the Department to report on efforts to consider fuel consumption, distribution, and logistics and the steps being taken to decrease consumption of fossil fuels by 30 percent to reduce the number of resupply convoys and oilers required in a contested environment;

requires the Department to institute energy metering on critical military facilities to assess their energy requirements and to ensure resilient power sources for these facilities;

strengthens an existing preference for the purchase of electric or hybrid vehicles for official business on military installations; and

requires a report on the implementation of provisions from last year's NDAA to include installation master planning, updates to building codes, sea-level rise modeling, and climate assessment tools.

Last year's NDAA made sweeping reforms in response to concerns that courageous military families raised regarding the management, oversight, and condition of military family housing. This year, we pick up where we left off. The bill:

requires a report on known environmental hazards in government-owned housing and requires the Department to report on the feasibility of standardizing privatized housing performance metrics; and

requires partners to put funding of maintenance and recapitalization of housing units ahead of fees that enrich corporate management in all future and renegotiated privatized housing agreements.

Similarly, we build on previous efforts to address PFAS contamination around military installations. The bill:

requires the Department of Defense to notify the congressional defense committees when there has been an uncontrolled release of a PFAS-containing firefighting agent that may impact human health or the environment;

requires the Department of Defense to publish on a public website the results of drinking and treated water PFAS testing conducted on military installations or former defense sites;

makes technical corrections to ensure all National Guard installations are eligible for funding for PFAS remediation in our National Guard communities; and

requires the Department to survey and report on technologies that will help facilitate the on-time phase-out of PFAS containing firefighting agents.

While the Department of Defense talks a lot about modernization and development of new capabilities, we must ensure that the appropriate focus remains on the sustainment of these weapon systems and the logistics required to move and supply them in a conflict. To that end, the bill:

requires the Department to examine and periodically report on the sustainment and logistics requirements, gaps, and mitigations necessary to support force structure, power projection, and other elements of the national defense strategy;

helps ensure Congress continues to receive timely and relevant information regarding both...
domestic and overseas infrastructure requirements and posture of U.S. forces; and requires a report on bulk fuel management strategies in the Indo-Pacific to meet current and future requirements.

In partnership with the Government Accountability Office, this bill leverages their expertise to assist the subcommittee with continued oversight on topics that include F-35 operations and sustainment, Air Force use of contract air support services, and aviation and ship maintenance. The previous reports and analytical work produced by GAO helped inform the readiness mark and I’d like to take this opportunity to thank the members of the GAO’s Defense Capabilities and Management team for their support of this subcommittee’s oversight work.

Next, the health and safety of our military and civilian personnel remain a priority for this subcommittee. Following a review of a number of fatal ground vehicle training mishaps, the subcommittee is concerned that the Department’s approach to collecting, reporting, and analyzing vehicle mishap data may be insufficient and that the ability to share lessons learned or put in place mitigations to prevent future mishaps. To that end, the bill includes a reporting requirement that will help clarify responsibilities for collecting and analyzing mishap data, how data is being used to identify mishaps, and requirements the Department is taking to standardize data collection.

In addition to concerns with ground vehicle mishaps, the committee has identified critical failures and safety issues in the munitions enterprise. To start addressing these concerns, the bill requires a report on munitions safety waivers and mishaps, an assessment of the resilience of the munitions enterprise, and clarifies the role and authority of the Chairman of the Defense Explosives Safety Board.

The bill also supports the civilian workforce of the Department of Defense by addressing a pay disparity affecting the Department’s wage-grade civilian workforce and including non-title 5 employees who were left out of last year’s Paid Parental Leave provision.

This year’s NDAA also begins a unified, whole-of-government approach that leverages the best attributes of the government and commercial fleets to increase resiliency in our maritime logistics. The bill includes several provisions, that together, establish a National Maritime Logistics Fleet approach by strengthening U.S.-flagged vessel requirements for the transportation of military cargo and fuels, creating a Tanker Security Program to address the shortfall in U.S.-flagged, U.S.-crewed tankers, and requiring the Navy to initiate an affordable, domestic built sealift ship. Strengthening our maritime logistics will also enhance our readiness capabilities by improving the over-arching defense industrial base that supports each branch of our armed services.

Additionally, this year’s NDAA supports the missions at Travis and Beale Air Force Bases in my district. The funds authorized in this bill to a report on KC-46 operations at Travis Air Force Base and enable Beale Air Force Base to continue to support intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (ISR) and multi-domain operations.

I’m also proud that this NDAA includes a 3 percent pay raise for our troops and includes language from two of my bills, H.R. 2617, the Occupational and Environmental Transparency Health Act, to require the DOD and VA to retroactively update records based on information contained in the Burn Pit Registry, since many veterans’ health records do not account for their exposures, and H.R. 4710, the Pharmaceutical Independence Long-Term Readiness Reform Act, to require the DOD to identify the vulnerabilities faced by our country’s dependence on Chinese pharmaceuticals and the steps needed to secure the supply chain. This bill helps advance our military’s near-term readiness goals and drives the Department to plan for and take action against long-term threats.

The over-arching defense industrial base that supports our military’s capabilities by improving U.S.-flagged vessel requirements for the transportation of military cargo and fuels, creating a Tanker Security Program to address the shortfall in U.S.-flagged, U.S.-crewed tankers, and requiring the Navy to initiate an affordable, domestic built sealift ship.

Master Gunnery Sergeant Green currently serves with Manpower and Reserve Affairs, at the Promotions Branch. She is the Senior Enlisted Staff Non-commissioned Officer, responsible for the Special Selection Board for Officer Promotion Packages.

Master Gunnery Sergeant (MgySgt) Rongalett “Ronnie” Green, of Little Rock, Arkansas, enlisted in the Marine Corps, in 1990 as a 0111 (0111, Administrative Chief). Following basic training and military occupational school, she has served at each level of administration, such as: Squadron, Battalion, Consolidated Administrative Center, Staff, Secretariat, and Group. During her career, she participated in military training exercises, in Japan and South Korea, has two successful tours as a Marine Corps Drill instructor, at both recruit training depots, Parris Island, South Carolina and San Diego, California, training male and female recruits.

MgySgt Green spent two years, at Marine Corps Forces Europe, where she attended the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) School. She has participated in two deployments, Marine Central Command, Forward located in Djibouti, Africa (OIF) and Afghanistan (OEF). MgySgt Green served as the Senior Enlisted Advisor and Security Manager at Marine Corps University, Quantico, VA. MgySgt Green served on Capitol Hill as a 2015 Marine Corps Congressional Fellow in the U.S. Senate, and later became the Senior Enlisted Advisor to the Legislative Director to the Commandant, Marine Corps Office of Legislative Affairs. She was the Senior Enlisted Advisor for the White House Military Office (WHMO). She has a Bachelor’s Degree, in Human Resources with the University of Maryland University College, a Master’s of Science Degree, in Organization Leadership, an Executive certificate in Strategic Human Resources Leadership with Cornell University, and currently studying for a certificate in Project Management at Syracuse University.

MgySgt Green’s awards and decorations include: The Presidential Service Badge, Meritorious Service Medal (x2); Navy and Marine Corps Commendation Medal; Navy and Marine Corps Achievement Medal (x3); Navy Unit

Hon. Jackie Walorski
Congresswoman
Wednesday, July 22, 2020

Mrs. WALORSKI. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Margaret and Sylvester “Syl” Walorski of Englewood, Colorado, on their 65th wedding anniversary.

Margaret and Syl met at a U.S.O. dance in the summer of 1951 just before Syl left for the Korean War. Placing their loves and lives in God’s hands, Margaret and Syl sent each other countless letters during Syl’s deployment and could not wait to be reunited. Syl returned to the U.S. and presented Margaret with a ring and a marriage proposal as soon as he could. They were married on August 22, 1955.

To finish school and secure a bright future for his family, Syl moved with Margaret to South Bend, Indiana, where they had two children. However, having briefly stayed at a military base in Colorado after being discharged, Syl felt drawn to the state’s breathtaking sites, fresh air, and freedom. So in 1958 the couple moved to Englewood, Colorado, where they continued to grow their family and build a beautiful life together. A true embodiment of the American Dream, Margaret and Syl bought their first home in 1959 and have lived there ever since.

Sixty-five years of marriage is a marvelous accomplishment that speaks volumes about their compassion and the tremendous foundation of respect, gratitude, and faith they share with one another. Stronger together, Margaret and Syl have found the more love they have for each other, the more they have to offer others. They have always been active in their church and community, and their children watched as they led their lives in service to the Lord and as shining examples of the American spirit.

Their lasting commitment not only to each other but also to their five children, 15 grandchildren, and 17 great-grandchildren is rooted in their devotion and faithfulness. Having dedicated themselves to teaching their children strong American values while working hard and giving back to those in need, they have touched the lives of countless people in their community and across the country. I feel blessed to know such compassionate, tenacious, and whole-hearted people who make this nation and the world a better place with everything they do.

Madam Speaker, I would like to extend my sincerest congratulations to Aunt Margaret, Uncle Syl, and their entire family. It is my hope that their love continues to grow stronger with each passing year.

Hon. J. French Hill
Congressman
Wednesday, July 22, 2020

Mr. Hill of Arkansas, Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Rongalett D. Green, Master Gunnery Sergeant, United States Marine Corps, who will retire from that organization after over 30 years of distinguished service to our country; August 6, 1990 through September 30, 2020. The mission of the United States Marine Corps is as America’s expeditionary force in readiness since 1775, the U.S. Marines are forward deployed to win our Nation’s battles swiftly and aggressively in times of crisis. We fight on land, sea, and air, as well as provide forces and detachments to naval ships and ground operations.

Master Gunnery Sergeant Green currently serves with Manpower and Reserve Affairs, at the Promotions Branch. She is the Senior Enlisted Staff Non-commissioned Officer, responsible for the Special Selection Board for Officer Promotion Packages.

Master Gunnery Sergeant (MgySgt) Rongalett “Ronnie” Green of Little Rock, Arkansas, enlisted in the Marine Corps, in 1990 as a 0111 (0111, Administrative Chief). Following basic training and military occupational school, she has served at each level of administration, such as: Squadron, Battalion, Consolidated Administrative Center, Staff Secretariat, and Group. During her career, she participated in military training exercises, in Japan and South Korea, has two successful tours as a Marine Corps Drill instructor, at both recruit training depots, Parris Island, South Carolina and San Diego, California, training male and female recruits.

MgySgt Green spent two years, at Marine Corps Forces Europe, where she attended the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) School. She has participated in two deployments, Marine Central Command, Forward located in Djibouti, Africa (OIF) and Afghanistan (OEF). MgySgt Green served as the Senior Enlisted Advisor and Security Manager at Marine Corps University, Quantico, VA. MgySgt Green served on Capitol Hill as a 2015 Marine Corps Congressional Fellow in the U.S. Senate, and later became the Senior Enlisted Advisor to the Legislative Director to the Commandant, Marine Corps Office of Legislative Affairs. She was the Senior Enlisted Advisor for the White House Military Office (WHMO).

She has a Bachelor’s Degree, in Human Resources with the University of Maryland University College, a Master’s of Science Degree, in Organization Leadership, an Executive certificate in Strategic Human Resources Leadership with Cornell University, and currently studying for a certificate in Project Management at Syracuse University.

MgySgt Green’s awards and decorations include: The Presidential Service Badge, Meritorious Service Medal (x2); Navy and Marine Corps Commendation Medal; Navy and Marine Corps Achievement Medal (x3); Navy Unit

HON. J. FRENCH HILL
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 2020
West Virginia's first TV nightly news anchors. Shirley accepted and quickly became the face of WOAY TV & Radio.

Of WOAY TV & Radio, Thomas offered him a once-in-a-life-time-opportunity for media greatness. Shirley was appointed to represent West Virginia's Senate District 11 in 1994 by Governor Caperton. He later retired from WOAY in 1997 and began to focus fully on public service rather than entertainment. Between 1994 and 2008, Shirley was elected and subsequently re-elected to Senate District 11 three times.

Shirley kept audiences watching for decades through the way he handled fan interviews and intense competitor interactions.

Shirley was named to the West Virginia Senate District 11 in 1994 by Governor Caperton. He later retired from WOAY in 1997 and began to focus fully on public service rather than entertainment. Between 1994 and 2008, Shirley was elected and subsequently re-elected to Senate District 11 three times. He was later elected to the West Virginia House of Delegates from 2016 to 2018.

Between both Chambers, Shirley selflessly served the people of Fayette County in the West Virginia Legislature for sixteen years. I had the honor of working along side him in the House of Delegates. I witnessed first-hand his integrity, honesty, and straight forwardness in the Legislature. He was truly a man of the people.

A list of Shirley's other accomplishments includes—one of West Virginia's Representatives to the National Democratic Convention from 1972 to 2016, Fayette County Democratic Executive Committee Member, Member of the West Virginia Broadcasting Hall of Fame, one of Saturday Night Live's first guests in America, a lifetime member of the Oak Hill United Methodist Church, husband, and father to three children.

May God bless Shirley Dean Love. I wish I could thank him for all he did for the great State of West Virginia. He will always be remembered by his family, friends, and countless people he touched throughout his life. I send my sincerest condolences to his wife, children, and grandchildren.

TRIBUTE TO NOHA KOLKAILAH—CALIFORNIA’S 24TH CONGRESSIONAL WOMEN OF THE YEAR

HON. SALUD O. CARBAJAL OF CALIFORNIA IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 2020

Mr. CARBAJAL. Madam Speaker, each year, through the Women of the Year Award, my office extends special recognition to women on the Central Coast who have made a difference in our community. I would like to recognize one outstanding Women of the Year Award recipient, Noha Kolkailah of Arroyo Grande, California.

Noha currently serves as the Principal and Director of Olive View Charter School in San Luis Obispo. She has been a fierce champion for education and social justice for many years. After the 2016 election, Noha mobilized the Muslim community to speak out for a positive and just future for all people at the Women’s March SLO. The following year, she organized a “Get to Know Your Muslim Neighbors” event attended by over 800 people, advocating for compassion, kindness, commitment to diversity and unity, global awareness, and responsibility. She also helped start the Muslim Student Association at Cal Poly.

Noha founded the Peace Academy of the Sciences and Arts, which offers an enriching summer program for children ages 6 to 11, with a focus on self-awareness, global citizenship, social justice, and environmental awareness. Through real-world applications, students are empowered to learn more about each other, embrace differences, and learn how to build on each other’s strengths in a way that inspires creative innovation.

Despite experiencing prejudice, Noha remains a compassionate advocate for a world in which we can co-exist in peace and harmony, and leads with her heart, courage and kindness. She is a strong Muslim woman and she is not afraid to speak her truth, setting the example for others to do the same. Her work on the Central Coast in educating the community at large on the issues marginalized communities face, her tireless efforts to bring people together in understanding and accepting differences, and her resilience in facing adversity with grace make Noha a wonderful asset to our community. As a champion for youth, women, and the marginalized, we are so lucky to have Noha in our district.

I ask all Members to join me today in honoring an exceptional woman of California’s 24th Congressional District, Noha Kolkailah, for her incredible service to her community.
on a study colloquium for a doctoral dissertation writing. Rev. Vivian spent the rest of his life working to bring about social change and improving the lives of those in poverty, and his work has been praised by many.

He was a great contributor to positive change in America and may rest in peace.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BEN RAY LUJÁN
OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 22, 2020

Mr. LUJÁN. Madam Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 148 on H.R. 6395, I mistakenly recorded my vote as Yes when I should have voted No.

WILLIAM M. (MAC) THORNBERY
NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2021

SPREECH OF

HON. PETER A. DEAFAZIO
OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 20, 2020

Mr. DEAFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I will vote in support of H.R. 6395, the William M. (Mac) Thornberry National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) for Fiscal Year (FY) 2021. Make no mistake: I have opposed NDAA legislation in previous years, and I still have concerns about a number of provisions included in this year’s legislation, but this year's Democratic-led legislation also contains numerous policy priorities that I strongly support.

First, this legislation grants our men and women in uniform a well-deserved pay raise. This is the very least we can do for those who continue to make extraordinary sacrifices for our country.

As Chair of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, I fought to successfully include vital provisions important to Oregon coastal communities. This includes the Maritime Transportation System Emergency Relief Act, which authorizes the Maritime Administration to provide financial assistance to stabilize and ensure the reliable functioning of the U.S. Maritime Transportation System in the event of a national emergency or disaster, as well as the Elijah E. Cummings Coast Guard Authorization Act of 2020, legislation to authorize funds for, reinforce, and support the United States Coast Guard.

Given the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee’s jurisdiction over the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), I am proud that this legislation makes a long-overdue correction to ensure that the more than 45,000 FAA employees, as well as VA and other federal civilian employees who were inexcusably left out of last year’s bill, receive twelve weeks of paid parental leave. I am also pleased that this legislation prohibits the Department of Defense from excluding federal civilian employees from their collective bargaining rights.

As a long-time advocate for strengthening Congress’s constitutional authority to declare war and limiting executive authority to engage in armed conflict without Congress’s consent, I strongly support this bill’s provisions to prohibit U.S. participation in the Saudi-led coalition’s war in Yemen without congressional authorization. I also voted in strong support of an amendment, which was adopted to prohibit President Trump’s emergency and unnecessary proposals to initiate new nuclear weapons testing.

Given President Trump’s ongoing and disturbing use of force on peaceful protesters exercising their First Amendment rights—including his use of National Guard service members to quell peaceful protesters outside the White House—I am pleased that an amendment which I voted for, and which was adopted, will add crucial oversight and transparency guardrails when a President deploys active military duty within the United States. I am also a strong supporter of this legislation’s provision to require federal law enforcement officers deployed in response to public protests to visibly display their name and agency on their uniform. This requirement is especially crucial given the use of unidentifiable federal agents and unmarked vehicles to detain peaceful protesters in Portland, Oregon.

I am pleased this legislation includes provisions to bolster our country’s COVID–19 response, including of reg important funding for the Maritime Security Program (MSP) to enable MSP carriers to keep their ships fully crewed despite the lack of cargo as a result of COVID—19. To further increase our country’s pandemic preparedness and response, this legislation establishes a Preparedness and Resilience National Security Fund and provides additional funding to the Department of Defense’s (DOD’s) Cooperative Threat Reduction Program to focus on detecting and confronting biological threats. I also strongly support an amendment—which I co-sponsored—to ensure the president finally uses the Defense Production Act to its full extent in order to meet our country’s most critical needs to combat COVID—19, including securing vital personal protective equipment, testing supplies, and more for our frontline healthcare workers and citizens in Oregon and across the country.

Furthermore, this legislation accelerates the closure of the Guantansmo Bay detention facility by lifting a restriction on transfer of current detainees. This unnecessary prison—estimated to be the most expensive in the world—costs approximately $540 million each year to house 40 prisoners and has been used as a top recruiting tool by terrorists. This prison has been a black eye for the U.S., eroding relationships with our allies, undermining U.S. missions abroad, and staining U.S. troops and citizens at risk of retaliation.

While Congress must do much more to achieve racial justice in this country, H.R. 6395 takes first steps to move closer to this goal. I am pleased that H.R. 6395 takes the long-overdue step of establishing a Pandemic DOD fund to change the names of all military bases and infrastructure named for Confederate individuals within one year, prohibits display of the Confederate flag on DOD installations, and adds diversity requirements for DOD military and civilian personnel.

This legislation includes modest steps to improve the identification of and care for veterans exposed to burn pits. I am also pleased this bill includes provisions to assist student loan borrowers who have privately held debt, providing $10,000 in immediate assistance to pay down the student loan. These students received no financial relief under the CARES Act. This provision will ensure the 200,000 servicemembers who owe nearly $3 billion in student loan debt receive some form of student debt relief during the pandemic.

This bill includes necessary provisions that help to address PFAS and PFOA contamination on military bases that pose a public health threat to our military members and Americans living near installations. It requires the DOD to make public vital information about the level of PFAS contaminates in drinking water and groundwater at these sites. Although more can always be done to protect our environment, the bill makes an effort to fund climate change research initiatives and includes several public lands bills that will help to preserve and protect parts of America’s wilderness for generations to come. It also makes strides toward protecting our most spectacular natural treasures, like ensuring the area around the Grand Canyon will not be polluted or scarred by mining.

While I strongly support many provisions in this year’s NDAA, I believe this legislation should have included additional provisions to reduce the Pentagon’s bloated defense spending, take back Congress’s constitutional war powers authority, and more.

I believe this legislation could have made responsible cuts to our defense budget without jeopardizing the safety of our troops or under-mining our national security. For years, Congress has continued to increase the Pentagon’s budget despite overwhelming evidence of its waste and abuse of taxpayer money. That’s why I supported an amendment to responsibly reduce the Pentagon budget while eliminating exceptions to protect some members, civilian employees, and the vital Defense Health Program from this reduction.

In particular, I have always opposed the DOD’s Overseas Contingency Operations (OCO) account, a fiscal imperative fund that is not counted in the budget, recklessly adds to our mounting debt, and has no congressional/oversight. OCO is a Pentagon slush fund that gives a blank check to fund endless wars that Congress hasn’t authorized. I will continue fighting to finally eliminate this irresponsible fund.

I have long supported a financial audit of the Pentagon. Unlike every other federal
agency, the DOD has yet to pass a financial audit. For two years in a row, the Pentagon has spectacularly failed full audits, both of which highlighted numerous examples of waste and abuse. It is ridiculous to provide the Pentagon a massive spending increase—as this bill does—when the Pentagon cannot even account for how it spends taxpayer money. That’s why I offered an amendment to require and incentivize each DOD component to pass an audit by FY25. Unfortunately, my amendment did not receive a vote.

Along with Yemen, I believe this legislation should have included more provisions to take back Congress’s constitutional war powers authorities. That’s why I cosponsored an amendment to prevent the president from using unauthorized force against Iran and voted in support of an amendment to accelerate withdrawal of U.S. troops from Afghanistan. I also believe this legislation should have repealed the long-outdated 2001 and 2002 authorizations for the use of military force (AUMFs), as well as prohibited funding for the deployment of dangerous low-yield nuclear weapons. However, I encouraged that this year’s House Defense Appropriations bill repeals both the 2001 and 2002 AUMFs and prevents use of funds for any unauthorized use of force against Iran.

I am also disappointed that several amendments I supported were not made in order, including amendments to add several diseases to the VA’s list of presumptive diseases connected to Agent Orange, to curb the Pentagon’s 1033 program that transfers surplus military equipment to local law enforcement agencies, to block the Trump administration’s cruel ban on transgender individuals serving in the military, and my amendment to abolish the military draft. I also believe this legislation could have done far more to prevent the president from raiding billions more in funding for his unnecessary, ineffective border wall.

The bottom line is that fiscal responsibility and accountability at the DOD would allow for taxpayer funds to be better spent supporting the needs of our troops, meeting our obligations to veterans, and ensuring our legitimate defense needs are prioritized while also bolstering underfunded domestic priorities. I strongly encourage the Senate to keep the strong House NDAA provisions and not water the bill down.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION
HON. HARLEY ROUDA
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 22, 2020
Mr. ROUDA. Madam Speaker, at the advice of the Office of the Attending Physician, I voted on agreeing to Amendment No. 29 offered by Rep. Takano printed in H. Rept. 116–457, on the Motion to Recommit with Instructions to H.R. 6395, and passage of H.R. 6395 by proxy pursuant to section 3(c) of House Resolution 965 and in accordance with regulation C.6. Due to this recommendation, I was unable to vote on agreeing to Amendment No. 11 offered by Rep. Dean printed in H. Rept. 116–457. Had I been present or been permitted to vote by the Office of the Clerk or the Office of the Attending Physician, I would have voted yea on rollcall No. 149.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS
Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur. As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED
JULY 28
10 a.m. Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation
To hold hearings to examine building a stronger and more resilient seafood sector.

2:30 p.m. Committee on Armed Services
To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Lieutenant General D. VanHerk, USAF, to be general and Commander, United States Northern Command/Commander, North American Aerospace Defense Command, and General James H. Dickinson, USA, to be general and Commander, United States Space Command.

3 p.m. Committee on Veterans’ Affairs
To hold hearings to examine VA telehealth during and beyond COVID-19, focusing on challenges and opportunities in rural America.

JULY 29
10 a.m. Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
To hold hearings to examine the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau’s semi-annual report to Congress.

10:15 a.m. Committee on Finance
To hold hearings to examine building a stronger and more resilient seafood sector.

2:30 p.m. Committee on Indian Affairs
To hold an oversight hearing to examine preparing to head back to class, focusing on how to safely reopen Bureau of Indian Education schools.

JULY 30
9:30 a.m. Committee on Armed Services
To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Anthony J. Tata, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary of Defense for Policy.
AUGUST 4

2:30 p.m.
Committee on Armed Services
To hold hearings to examine the findings and recommendations of the Cyber-space Solarium Commission.  SD-106
Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S4363–S4431

Measures Introduced: Thirty-two bills and two resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 4258–4289, and S. Res. 655–656. Pages S4421–22

Measures Reported:

S. 2525, to require the Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology to conduct a study of personal protective equipment worn by firefighters to determine the prevalence and concentration of per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. Page S4421

Measures Passed:

Reinforcing American-Made Products Act: Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation was discharged from further consideration of S. 4065, to make exclusive the authority of the Federal Government to regulate the labeling of products made in the United States and introduced in interstate or foreign commerce, and the bill was then passed. Pages S4397–99

Driftnet Modernization and Bycatch Reduction Act: Senate passed S. 906, to improve the management of driftnet fishing, after agreeing to the committee amendment. Pages S4398–99

Glioblastoma Awareness Day: Committee on the Judiciary was discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 617, designating July 22, 2020, as “Glioblastoma Awareness Day”, and the resolution was then agreed to. Page S4431

Measures Considered:

National Defense Authorization Act—Agreement: Senate continued consideration of S. 4049, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2021 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, taking action on the following amendments proposed thereto: Pages S4365–97, S4399–S4414

Adopted:

By 94 yeas to 6 nays (Vote No. 136), Tester Modified Amendment No. 1972 (to Amendment No. 2301), to expand the list of diseases associated with exposure to certain herbicide agents for which there is a presumption of service connection for veterans who served in the Republic of Vietnam. (Pursuant to the order of Thursday, July 2, 2020, the amendment having achieved 60 affirmative votes, was agreed to.) Pages S4370–71, S4375

Rejected:

By 23 yeas to 77 nays (Vote No. 135), Sanders/Markey Amendment No. 1788 (to Amendment No. 2301), to reduce the bloated Pentagon budget by 10 percent and invest that money in jobs, education, health care, and housing in communities in the United State in which the poverty rate is not less than 25 percent. (Pursuant to the order of Thursday, July 2, 2020, the amendment having failed to achieve 60 affirmative votes, was not agreed to.) Pages S4371–75

Pending:

Inhofe Amendment No. 2301, in the nature of a substitute. Page S4365 McConnell (for Portman) Amendment No. 2080 (to Amendment No. 2301), to require an element in annual reports on cyber science and technology activities on work with academic consortia on high priority cybersecurity research activities in Department of Defense capabilities. Page S4365

During consideration of this measure today, Senate also took the following action:

By 87 yeas to 13 nays (Vote No. 137), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn, having voted in the affirmative, Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on Inhofe Amendment No. 2301 (listed above). Pages S4375–76

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the bill at approximately 9:30 a.m., on Thursday, July 23, 2020; and that all time during recess, adjournment, morning business, and Leader remarks count post-cloture on Inhofe Amendment No. 2301, as amended. Page S4431
Message from the President: Senate received the following message from the President of the United States:

Transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the continuation of the national emergency with respect to transnational criminal organizations that was established in Executive Order 13581 on July 24, 2011; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs. (PM–55)

Messages from the House: Enrolled Bills Presented: Executive Communications: Executive Reports of Committees: Additional Cosponsors: Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: Additional Statements: Amendments Submitted: Authorities for Committees to Meet: Record Votes: Three record votes were taken today. (Total—137) Adjournment: Senate convened at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 8:55 p.m., until 9:30 a.m. on Thursday, July 23, 2020. (For Senate’s program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today’s Record on page S4431.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

UNITED STATES AND CHINA

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Subcommittee on Economic Policy concluded a hearing to examine the United States and China, focusing on winning the economic competition, after receiving testimony from J. Christopher Giancarlo, Willkie Farr and Gallagher, Jersey City, New Jersey; Tim Morrison, Hudson Institute, and Martijn Rasser, Center for a New American Security, both of Washington, D.C.; and Lisa D. Cook, Michigan State University, East Lansing.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

S. 933, to improve data collection and monitoring of the Great Lakes, oceans, bays, estuaries, and coasts, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 1730, to direct the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to make grants to State and local governments and nongovernmental organizations for purposes of carrying out climate-resilient living shoreline projects that protect coastal communities by supporting ecosystem functions and habitats with the use of natural materials and systems, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 3152, to require the Federal Communications Commission to incorporate data on maternal health outcomes into its broadband health maps, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 3771, to require the Secretary of Commerce to establish the Federal Advisory Committee on the Development and Implementation of Artificial Intelligence, with an amendment;

S. 3891, to require the Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology to advance the development of technical standards for artificial intelligence, to establish the National Program to Advance Artificial Intelligence Research, to promote research on artificial intelligence at the National Science Foundation, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 3958, to amend title 49, United States Code, to permit the use of incentive payments to expedite certain federally financed airport development projects, with an amendment;

S. 4144, to amend the Dingell-Johnson Sport Fish Restoration Act with respect to sport fish restoration and recreational boating safety;

S. 4162, to provide certainty for airport funding; and

The nominations of Joel Szabat, of Maryland, to be Under Secretary of Transportation for Policy, Michael P. O’Rielly, of New York, to be a Member of the Federal Communications Commission, Michael J. Walsh, Jr., of Virginia, to be General Counsel, and Mary A. Toman, of California, to be Under Secretary Economic Affairs, both of the Department of Commerce, and routine lists in the Coast Guard,

WATER AND POWER LEGISLATION

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Water and Power concluded a hearing to examine S. 2718, to provide for the conduct of certain water security measures in the State of New Mexico, S. 3811, to provide financial assistance for projects to address certain subsidence impacts in the State of California, S. 4188, to provide for drought preparedness and improved water supply reliability, S. 4189, to provide for drought preparedness and improved water supply reliability, and an original bill entitled, “Water-Energy Technology Demonstration and Deployment Act”, after receiving testimony.
from Senators Feinstein and Udall; Aubrey Bettencourt, Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Water and Science; Dan Keppen, Family Farm Alliance, Klamath Falls, Oregon; and Joe S. Whitworth, The Freshwater Trust, Portland, Oregon.

ZOONOTIC DISEASE
Committee on Environment and Public Works: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the increased risk of zoonotic disease from illegal wildlife trafficking, after receiving testimony from Catherine E. Semcer, Property and Environment Research Center, Bozeman, Montana; Jonathan Epstein, EcoHealth Alliance, New York, New York; and Dan Ashe, Association of Zoos and Aquariums, Washington, D.C.

COMPETITION WITH CHINA
Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee concluded a hearing to examine advancing effective United States competition with China, focusing on objectives, priorities, and next steps, after receiving testimony from Stephen E. Biegun, Deputy Secretary of State.

BUSINESS MEETING
Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

- S. 4204, to establish an Interagency Task Force to analyze preparedness for national pandemics, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;
- S. 4210, to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to authorize the transfer of certain equipment during a public health emergency, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;
- S. 4153, to require the Federal Emergency Management Agency to evaluate the National Response Framework based on lessons learned from the COVID–19 pandemic, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;
- S. 4157, to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to expand the authority of the National Infrastructure Simulation and Analysis Center, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;
- S. 4158, to examine the extent of the reliance of the United States on foreign producers for personal protective equipment during the COVID–19 pandemic and produce recommendations to secure the supply chain of personal protective equipment, with amendments;
- S. 4133, to modernize the REAL ID Act of 2005, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;
- S. 4165, to repeal section 692 of the Post-Katrina Emergency Management Reform Act of 2006, with an amendment;
- S. 3997, to strengthen the security and integrity of the United States scientific and research enterprise, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;
- S. 4200, to establish a program to facilitate the adoption of modern technology by executive agencies, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;
- S. 4077, to amend the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 to provide for regulatory impact analyses for certain rules;
- S. 92, to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that major rules of the executive branch shall have no force or effect unless a joint resolution of approval is enacted into law;
- S. 4138, to amend title 5, United States Code, to make permanent the authority of the United States Patent and Trademark Office to conduct a telework travel expenses program;
- S. 4222, to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to require Federal agencies to submit to the Comptroller General of the United States a report on rules that are revoked, suspended, replaced, amended, or otherwise made ineffective;
- S. 3287, to modify the governmentwide financial management plan, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;
- S. 3455, to prohibit certain individuals from downloading or using TikTok on any device issued by the United States or a government corporation, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;
- S. 4024, to establish in the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency of the Department of Homeland Security a Cybersecurity Advisory Committee, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;
- S. 2967, to establish the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations of the United States to facilitate the fullest cooperation, coordination, and mutual accountability among all levels of government, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;
- S. 3658, to establish an Office of Equal Rights and Community Inclusion at the Federal Emergency Management Agency, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;
- S. 3058, to promote innovative acquisition techniques and procurement strategies;
- S. 3896, to amend title 5, United States Code, to require the Director of the Office of Personnel Management to establish and maintain a public directory of the individuals occupying Government policy and supporting positions, with amendments;
- S. 4224, to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to assess technology needs along the Southern border and develop a strategy for bridging such
gaps, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;  
H.R. 1313, to amend the Implementing Recommendations of the 9/11 Commission Act of 2007 to clarify certain allowable uses of funds for public transportation security assistance grants and establish periods of performance for such grants, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute; 
H.R. 4727, to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish a mentor-protégé program, with an amendment; 
H.R. 542, to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish the National Urban Security Technology Laboratory, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute; 
S. 3461, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2600 Wesley Street in Greenville, Texas, as the “Audie Murphy Post Office Building”; 
S. 3462, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 909 West Holiday Drive in Fate, Texas, as the “Ralph Hall Post Office”; 
S. 3839, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2719 South Webster Street in Kokomo, Indiana, as the “Opha May Johnson Post Office”; 
S. 4126, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 104 East Main Street in Port Washington, Wisconsin, as the “Joseph G. Demler Post Office”; and 
The nominations of Derek Kan, of California, to be Deputy Director of the Office of Management and Budget, and Mark A. Robbins, Carl Ezekiel Ross, and Elizabeth J. Shapiro, each to be an Associate Judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia.

COLLEGE ATHLETICS
Committee on the Judiciary: Committee concluded a hearing to examine protecting the integrity of college athletics, after receiving testimony from Dan Radakovich, Clemson University, Clemson, South Carolina; Matthew J. Mitten, Marquette University Law School, Milwaukee, Wisconsin; George Wrighster, Unafraid Show, Los Angeles, California; Mark Emmert, National Collegiate Athletic Association, Indianapolis, Indiana; Ramogi Huma, National College Players Association, Norca, California; William C. Miller, Jr., American Gaming Association, Washington, D.C.; and Heather Lyke, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

2020 GENERAL ELECTION PREPARATIONS
Committee on Rules and Administration: Committee concluded a hearing to examine 2020 general election preparations, after receiving testimony from Tre Hargett, Tennessee Secretary of State, Nashville; Mac Warner, West Virginia Secretary of State, Charleston; Rick Stream, Saint Louis County Election Board, St. Louis County, Missouri; and Kristen Clarke, Lawyers’ Committee for Civil Rights Under Law, Washington, D.C.

NOMINATIONS
Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Christopher C. Miller, of Virginia, to be Director of the National Counterterrorism Center, who was introduced by Senator Grassley, and Patrick Hovakimian, of California, to be General Counsel, both of the Office of the Director of National Intelligence, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action
Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 15 public bills, H.R. 7718–7732; and 1 resolution, H. Res. 1061, were introduced.

Additional Cosponsors:

Report Filed: A report was filed today as follows: 
H. Res. 1060, providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 7608) making appropriations for the Department of State, foreign operations, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2021, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 116–459).
the Jayapal motion to concur in the Senate amendment to H.R. 2486, to reauthorize mandatory funding programs for historically Black colleges and universities and other minority-serving institutions, with an amendment specified in section 4(a) of H. Res. 891, by a yea-and-nay vote of 233 yeas to 183 nays, Roll No. 153. Pages H3624–42, H3666

Fostering Undergraduate Talent by Unlocking Resources for Education Act: The House agreed to the Jayapal motion to concur in the Senate amendment to H.R. 2486, to reauthorize mandatory funding programs for historically Black colleges and universities and other minority-serving institutions, with an amendment specified in section 4(b) of H. Res. 891, by a yea-and-nay vote of 231 yeas to 184 nays, Roll No. 154. Pages H3624–42, H3666–67

Taxpayer First Act: The House agreed to the Grijalva motion to concur in the Senate amendments to H.R. 1957, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modernize and improve the Internal Revenue Service, by a yea-and-nay vote of 310 yeas to 107 nays, Roll No. 155. Pages H3642–57, H3667–68

Agreed to amend the title so as to read: “To direct the Joint Committee on the Library to replace the bust of Roger Brooke Taney in the Old Supreme Court Chamber of the United States Capitol with a bust of Thurgood Marshall to be obtained by the Joint Committee on the Library and to remove certain statues from areas of the United States Capitol which are accessible to the public, to remove all statues of individuals who voluntarily served the Confederate States of America from display in the United States Capitol, and for other purposes.”

Unanimous Consent Agreement—Consideration of H.R. 7573: Agreed by unanimous consent that debate under clause 1(c) of rule XV on the motion to suspend the rules relating to H.R. 7573 be extended to one hour. Pages H3657–58

Suspensions: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measure:

Directing the Architect of the Capitol to replace the bust of Roger Brooke Taney in the Old Supreme Court Chamber of the United States Capitol with a bust of Thurgood Marshall to be obtained by the Joint Committee on the Library and to remove certain statues from areas of the United States Capitol which are accessible to the public, to remove all statues of individuals who voluntarily served the Confederate States of America from display in the United States Capitol: H.R. 7573, amended, to direct the Architect of the Capitol to replace the bust of Roger Brooke Taney in the Old Supreme Court Chamber of the United States Capitol with a bust of Thurgood Marshall to be obtained by the Joint Committee on the Library and to remove certain statues from areas of the United States Capitol which are accessible to the public, to remove all statues of individuals who voluntarily served the Confederate States of America from display in the United States Capitol, by a 2/3 yea-and-nay vote of 305 yeas to 113 nays, Roll No. 156. Pages H3657–65, H3668–69

Agreed to amend the title so as to read: “To direct the Joint Committee on the Library to replace the bust of Roger Brooke Taney in the Old Supreme Court Chamber of the United States Capitol with a bust of Thurgood Marshall to be obtained by the Joint Committee on the Library and to remove certain statues from areas of the United States Capitol which are accessible to the public, to remove all statues of individuals who voluntarily served the Confederate States of America from display in the United States Capitol, and for other purposes.”

Presidential Message: Read a message from the President wherein he notified Congress that the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13581 with respect to significant transnational criminal organizations is to continue in effect beyond July 24, 2020—referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed (H. Doc. 116–137). Pages H3668–69

Senate Referral: S. 3989 was held at the desk.

Senate Message: Message received from the Senate today appears on page H3642.


Adjournment: The House met at 9 a.m. and adjourned at 9:50 p.m.

Committee Meetings

EXAMINING THE NATIONAL RESPONSE TO THE WORSENING CORONAVIRUS PANDEMIC: PART II

Committee on Homeland Security: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Examining the National Response to the Worsening Coronavirus Pandemic: Part II”. Testimony was heard from Peter T. Gaynor, Administrator, Federal Emergency Management Agency.

LEGISLATIVE MEASURES

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee for Indigenous Peoples of the United States held a hearing on H.R. 958, the “Native Youth and Tribal Officer Protection Act”; H.R. 6237, the “PRC for Native
Veterans Act’; H.R. 6535, the ‘‘Coverage for Urban Indian Health Providers Act’’; and H.R. 7119, the ‘‘Alaska Native Tribal Health Consortium Land Transfer Act of 2020’’. Testimony was heard from Jason O’Neal, Assistant Deputy Director, Bureau of Indian Affairs—Office of Justice Services, Department of the Interior; Rear Admiral Michael D. Weahkee, Director, Indian Health Service, Department of Health and Human Services; and public witnesses.

F–35 JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER: ENSURING SAFETY AND ACCOUNTABILITY IN THE GOVERNMENT’S TRILLION DOLLAR INVESTMENT

Committee on Oversight and Reform: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “F–35 Joint Strike Fighter: Ensuring Safety and Accountability in the Government’s Trillion Dollar Investment”. Testimony was heard from Lieutenant General Eric T. Fick, Program Executive Officer, F–35 Joint Program Office, Department of Defense; Theresa Hull, Assistant Inspector General, Department of Defense; Ellen Lord, Under Secretary for Acquisitions and Sustainment, Department of Defense; Diana Maurer, Director, Defense Capabilities and Management, Government Accountability Office; and a public witness.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE, FOREIGN OPERATIONS, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2021

Committee on Rules: Full Committee held a hearing on H.R. 7608, the “Department of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 2021” [State, Foreign Operations, Agriculture, Rural Development, Interior, Environment, Military Construction, and Veterans Affairs Appropriations Act, 2021]. The Committee granted, by record vote of 8–4, a structured rule providing for consideration of H.R. 7608, the “State, Foreign Operations, Agriculture, Rural Development, Interior, Environment, Military Construction, and Veterans Affairs Appropriations Act, 2021”. The rule provides one hour of general debate on the bill equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. The rule provides that an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116–59 shall be considered as adopted and the bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended. The rule provides that clause 2(e) of Rule XXI shall not apply during consideration of the bill. Section 2 of the rule provides that following debate, each further amendment printed in the Rules Committee report not earlier considered as part of amendments en bloc pursuant to section 3 shall be considered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, may be withdrawn by the proponent at any time before the question is put thereon, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question. Section 3 of the rule provides that at any time after debate the chair of the Committee on Appropriations or her designee may offer amendments en bloc consisting of further amendments printed in the Rules Committee report not earlier disposed of. Amendments en bloc shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for 30 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their designees, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question. The rule waives all points of order against the amendments printed in the Rules Committee report and amendments en bloc described in section 3. The rule provides that during consideration of the amendments described in sections 2 and 3, it shall not be in order to use a decrease in Overseas Contingency Operations funds to offset an amendment that increases an appropriation not designated as Overseas Contingency Operations funds or vice versa. The rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions. Testimony was heard from Chairman Lowey, and Representatives Rogers of Kentucky, Bishop of Georgia, Fortenberry, McCollum, Joyce of Ohio, Wasserman Schultz, Carter of Texas, Jackson Lee, Titus, Burgess, Crawford, Gianforte, González-Colón of Puerto Rico, Graves of Louisiana, Grothman, and Stauber.

21ST CENTURY SBA: AN ANALYSIS OF SBA’S TECHNOLOGY SYSTEMS

Committee on Small Business: Subcommittee on Investigations, Oversight, and Regulations held a hearing entitled “21st Century SBA: An Analysis of SBA’s Technology Systems”. Testimony was heard from Guy Cavallo, Deputy Chief Information Officer, Small Business Administration.

SAFETY FOR ALL: ENDING SEXUAL HARASSMENT IN THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

Committee on Veterans’ Affairs: Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations; and Women Veterans Task Force held a joint hearing entitled “Safety for All: Ending Sexual Harassment in the Department of Veterans Affairs”. Testimony was heard from Pamela Powers, Acting Deputy Secretary, Department of
Veterans Affairs; Cindy Brown Barnes, Director, Education, Workforce, and Income Security, Government Accountability Office; and a public witness.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THURSDAY,
JULY 23, 2020

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Subcommittee on Communications, Technology, Innovation, and the Internet, to hold hearings to examine the state of United States spectrum policy, 10 a.m., SR–253.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: to hold an oversight hearing to examine the impacts of the COVID–19 pandemic on users of public lands, forests, and national parks, 10 a.m., SD–366.

Committee on Foreign Relations: to hold hearings to examine the nominations of Lisa S. Kenna, of Vermont, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Peru, Leora Rosenberg Levy, of Connecticut, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Chile, Aldona Z. Wos, of North Carolina, to be Ambassador to Canada, and William W. Popp, of Missouri, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Guatemala, all of the Department of State, 10 a.m., SD–106.

Committee on the Judiciary: business meeting to consider S. 4212, to amend title 28, United States Code, to strip foreign sovereign immunity of certain foreign states to secure justice for victims of novel coronavirus in the United States, and the nominations of David W. Dugan, and Stephen P. McGlynn, both to be a United States District Judge for the Southern District of Illinois, John W. Holcomb, to be United States District Judge for the Central District of California, Hala Y. Jarbou, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Michigan, Iain D. Johnston, and Franklin Ulyses Valderrama, both to be a United States District Judge for the Northern District of Illinois, Brett H. Ludwig, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Wisconsin, R. Shireen Matthews, and Todd Wallace Robinson, both to be a United States District Judge for the Southern District of California, Christy Criswell Wiegand, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Pennsylvania, and Roderick C. Young, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Virginia, 10 a.m., SD–325.

Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship: to hold hearings to examine capital access for minority small businesses, focusing on COVID–19 resources for an equitable and sustainable recovery, 10 a.m., SD–430.

House

Committee on Agriculture, Subcommittee on Commodity Exchanges, Energy, and Credit, hearing entitled "On Farm Energy Production: Impacts on Farm Income and Rural Communities", 10 a.m., 1300 Longworth and Webex.


Committee on Foreign Affairs, Full Committee, hearing entitled “The Trump Administration’s FY2021 Foreign Assistance Budget Request”, 9:30 a.m., 2172 Rayburn and Webex.

Committee on the Judiciary, Full Committee, markup on H.R. 2678, the “No President is Above the Law Act”; H.R. 7694, the “Abuse of the Pardon Prevention Act”; and to Ratify Subcommittee Assignments, 10 a.m., CVC–200 and Webex.

Committee on Natural Resources, Full Committee, hearing entitled “The Transformation of the Puerto Rico Electric Power Authority (PREPA)”, 3:30 p.m., 1324 Longworth and Webex.


Committee on Veterans’ Affairs, Full Committee, hearing on H.R. 6039, to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to seek to enter into an agreement with the city of Vallejo, California, for the transfer of Mare Island Naval Cemetery in Vallejo, California, and for other purposes; H.R. 6082, the “Forgotten Vietnam Veterans Act”; H.R. 4908, the “Native American PACT Act”; H.R. 2791, the “Department of Veterans Affairs Tribal Advisory Committee Act of 2019”; H.R. 4526, the “Brian Tally VA Employment Transparency Act”; H.R. 3582, to amend title 38, United States Code, to expand the scope of the Advisory Committee on Minority Veterans, and for other purposes; H.R. 96, to amend title 38, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to furnish dental care in the same manner as any other medical service, and for other purposes; H.R. 4281, the “Access to Contraception Expansion for Veterans Act”; H.R. 3010, the “Honoring All Veterans Act”; H.R. 7163, the “VA FOIA Reform Act of 2020”; H.R. 7111, the “Veterans Economic Recovery Act of 2020”; H.R. 2435, the “Accelerating Veterans Recovery Outdoors Act”; H.R. 7287, to clarify the licensure requirements for contractor medical professionals to perform medical disability examinations for the Department of Veterans Affairs; H.R. 3228, the “VA Mission Telehealth Clarification Act”; H.R. 6141, the “Protecting Moms Who Served Act”; H.R. 6493, the “Veterans Benefits Fairness and Transparency Act”; H.R. 7445, to amend title 38, United States Code, to expand eligibility for home loans from the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to certain members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces; legislation on the Burial Equity for Guards and Reserves Act of 2020; legislation to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend
certain employment and reemployment rights to members of the National Guard who perform State active duty; and legislation to amend title 38, United States Code, to clarify the scope of procedural rights of members of the uniformed services with respect to their employment and reemployment rights, and for other purposes, 10 a.m., HVC–210 and Webex.


Joint Meetings

Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe: to hold hearings to examine human rights at home, focusing on media, politics and safety of journalists, 11 a.m., Webex.
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