



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 166

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 15, 2020

No. 159

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
September 15, 2020.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JAMES P. MCGOVERN 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.

CASEY COUNTY FLOODING

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

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to encourage this body to keep Casey County, Kentucky, in your thoughts and prayers.

On Sunday, the community experienced flooding that impacted multiple businesses, roads and homes in the area.

This is not the first time the community has experienced flood waters, with the "great flood" that occurred in 2010.

The community came together during that flood, and I know they will once again unite to tackle this tremendous challenge.

Casey County is a resilient community where people look out for each other and help their neighbors in times of need. As they continue to weather this challenge, I would like to encourage anyone in or around Casey County to reach out to my office for any assistance they may need moving forward.

HONORING TOMMY WILLETT

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize my dear friend, political teacher, community leader, and statesman, Tommy Willett, who passed away on September 8.

Tommy served as my Monroe County Judge/Executive from 2011 to 2018. Under his steady leadership, Monroe County saw unique and unprecedented cooperation among various elected officials, which was clearly reflected in his running unopposed for reelection on 2014.

I knew Tommy Willett my entire life. He owned Pure Drug Pharmacy in Tompkinsville and was always active in the world-famous Monroe County political scene. As a young, aspiring candidate for public office, Tommy took me under his wing and taught me so much about grass-roots organization, political strategy, and get-out-to-vote techniques.

Tommy's beloved wife, Elizabeth Young Willett, preceded him in death. Ms. Willett was my high school English teacher, and one of the best ever at Monroe County High School. Tommy is survived by his two, fine sons, James and Scott Willett.

Judge Willett lived a life of public service and professional achievement. He was a true Monroe County success story who will be deeply missed.

HONORING DR. LEANN DALTON COOPER

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Dr. Leann Dalton Cooper,

who has been selected by the Kentucky Family Medicine as the State's top, young doctor. She is a native of Russell County and a graduate of the University of Kentucky College of Medicine. For the past 3 years, she has practiced medicine in Russell County. Dr. Cooper will receive the award at a ceremony in Louisville on September 25.

Mr. Speaker, I join with everyone in Russell County and throughout the Commonwealth in honoring her on this outstanding statewide achievement.

HONORING SENIOR CENTERS

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the valuable services that our senior centers in Kentucky are providing for senior citizens throughout the First Congressional District.

Along with essential workers, senior centers have provided crucial services to our elderly populations during the COVID-19 pandemic.

As the country has learned to adapt to different times, senior centers have also modified their services. For instance, the Union County Senior Services organization had to cancel potlucks, exercise classes, and bingo sessions. While those in-person activities were unfortunately suspended, the dedicated servants who make up this organization dramatically increased options for home delivery and meal pickup for area residents.

In addition to providing meals, the Union County Senior Services also distributes food grocery items for the senior citizens. Just recently, they even hit a tremendous milestone of 15,000 meals prepared since the beginning of the pandemic. Their tremendous contributions have been replicated in the entire region, showing that Kentuckians truly have each other's backs during times of need.

As a lead Republican cosponsor of the Supporting Older Americans Act of 2020, I understand the critical services

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

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



Printed on recycled paper.

H4385

senior centers provide for the elderly. I stand today to recognize all the hard work and dedications these centers provide throughout the First District of Kentucky.

JUSTICE FOR ALL

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

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, and still I rise, as a liberated Democrat to say that the moral movement for justice everywhere cannot condone injustice anywhere. We cannot allow ourselves to be induced to believe that there is a binary choice, that we must choose either peace officers or peaceful protesters.

No, there is a righteous choice. And the righteous choice will cause us to conclude that we must choose justice for the police just as we choose justice for the protestors. Crimes committed against the police must be punished and crimes committed by the police must be punished.

We are a Nation of laws, and if the law is to prevail, all criminals must be punished. But not only must they be punished; they must be punished expeditiously against those who commit crimes against people just as we would have them be punished expeditiously against those who commit crimes against the police. "Injustice anywhere," as Dr. King put it, "is a threat to justice everywhere."

Mr. Speaker, I stand and I rise as a liberated Democrat to say we cannot condone crimes against the police nor can we condone crimes committed by the police.

SOLIDARITY WITH BELARUS

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong solidarity with the citizens and the political dissidents of Belarus.

On August 9, 2020, Belarus held its presidential election with its incumbent President, Alexander Lukashenko, claiming victory with over 80 percent of the vote. Both the United States and the European Union have called the elections "neither fair or free," as the Lukashenko regime restricted ballot access for candidates, prohibited local independent observers, and employed intimidation tactics against opposition candidates.

Mass protests erupted following the election. Tens of thousands of protestors took to the street to express their disapproval of Lukashenko and his administration. His regime responded with excessive force to quell the protests, including the use of live and rubber ballots, leading to thousands of Belarusian citizens being either detained or arrested. It appears likely that violent crackdowns will continue.

Mr. Speaker, included in these arrests are several opposition leaders, including former presidential candidates Sergei Tikhonovskiy, Viktor Babaryka, Coordination Council members Liliya Vlasova, Sergei Dylevsky, Maria Kalesnikava, and Maxim Znak, as well as several of their staff and volunteers, Svetlana Tikhonovskaya, the opposition presidential nominee, was forced to flee the country, as was opposition leader Veronika Tsepkalo and her husband, former presidential nominee, Valery Tsepkalo.

None of the dissidents have been given a fair trial, and all of them have had their human rights denied. As I think about the current situation in Belarus, I am reminded of President Ronald Reagan's speech to Soviet dissidents at Spaso House in 1988. President Reagan made two things clear that day: The United States' commitment to human rights are, and will continue to be, fundamental and unwavering, and that through strength, determination, and prayer, there is nothing you cannot conquer.

Reagan also said in that speech, "While we press for human rights through diplomatic channels, you press with your very lives, day in, day out, year after year, risking your jobs, your homes, your all."

Mr. Speaker, while the people of Belarus continue their tireless fight for human rights, the United States should be working with our European partners and allies to impose new sanctions on those responsible not only for voter repression, but also for the violent crackdowns that follow the election.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a list of 28 individuals.

BELARUS SANCTIONS RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Alexander Lukashenko, President (Notes: Ordering the blatant falsification of presidential voting, commission of acts of violence against peaceful protesters, torture of detainees, inhumane detention conditions, persecution of political opponents and journalists.)

2. Lydia Yermishina, Chairwoman, Central Election Commission (Notes: Multiple cases of election fraud and falsification, criminal misconduct concerning the tabulation of balance and miss reporting election results.)

3. Yuriy Karaev, Minister of Interior (Notes: Commission of acts of violence against peaceful protesters, torture of detainees, inhumane detention conditions, persecution of political opposition and journalists.)

4. Valeriy Vakaluchik, Director, KGB (Notes: Ordering and implementing acts of violence against peaceful protesters, torture of detainees, inhumane detention conditions, persecution of political opposition and journalists.)

5. Viktor Lukashenko, counselor to the president on national security (Notes: Organization and implementation of violence against peaceful protesters, torture of detainees, inhumane detention conditions, persecution of political opposition and journalists.)

6. Dimitri Lukashenko, son of Alexander Lukashenko (Notes: Sanctions imposed by extension to family members.)

7. Dimitriy Balaba, special police unit, Minsk (Notes: Commission of acts of violence against peaceful protesters, torture of

detainees, inhumane detention conditions, persecution of political opposition and journalists.)

8. Ivan Kubrakov, Director of Minsk police department (Notes: Commission of acts of violence against peaceful protesters, portrait detainees, inhumane detention conditions, persecution of political opposition and journalists.)

9. Roman Golovchenko, Prime Minister (Notes: Organization of falsification of elections.)

10. Igor Sergeenko, Head of presidential administration (Notes: Organization of falsification of elections.)

11. Viktor Sheyman, Chief Manager of the President (Notes: Persecution of political opponents of Alexander Lukashenko.)

12. Dimitriy Pavlichenko, Head of the Association of Veterans of the Special Forces of the Ministry of Internal Affairs, Ex-commander of Military Unit 3214; Ex-commander of SOBR. (Notes: Unofficially commanded the special forces who violently dispersed protesters in Minsk.)

13. Ivan Tertel, Chairman of the State Control Committee (Notes: The official initiator of the Belgazprombank case and the arrest of presidential candidate Viktor Babariko along with his relatives, friends, and employees.)

14. Oleg Slizhevsky, Minister of Justice (Notes: Sanctions imposed by extension to leading officials on account of the Belarusian government's suppression of free and fair elections and subsequent abuses.)

15. Petr Miklashevich, President of the Constitutional Court (Notes: Sanctions imposed by extension to leading officials on account of the Belarusian government's suppression of free and fair elections and subsequent abuses.)

16. Valentin Sukalo, President of the Supreme Court (Notes: Sanctions imposed by extension to leading officials on account of the Belarusian government's suppression of free and fair elections and subsequent abuses.)

17. Aleksandr Konyuk, Prosecutor General (Notes: Provision of official justification for the brutal crackdowns on protesters and involvement in the manufactured prosecution of members of the opposition.)

18. Ivan Noskevish, Chairman of the Investigative Committee (Notes: Falsification of criminal cases against protesters.)

19. Vladimir Karanik, Minister of Health (Notes: Dissemination of misinformation about the orchestration of medical protests.)

20. Ivan Eysmont, Chairman of State Broadcasting "Belteleradiocompany" (Notes: Organization of falsification of elections.)

21. Igor Lutskiy, Minister of Information (Notes: Organization of falsification of elections.)

22. Viktor Hrenin, Minister of Defense (Notes: Sanctions imposed by extension to leading officials on account of the Belarusian government's suppression of free and fair elections and subsequent abuses.)

23. Major General Yuri Nazarenko, Deputy Minister of the Interior and Commander of the Interior Armed Forces, former Chief of Staff of the Lukashenko Security Service (Notes: Commission of acts of violence against peaceful protesters, torture of detainees, inhumane detention conditions, persecution of political opposition and journalists.)

24. Vladimir Zhiznevsky, Commander of the Internal Army Unit No. 3214 (Notes: Commission of acts of violence against peaceful protesters, torture of detainees, inhumane detention conditions, persecution of political opposition and journalists.)

25. Alexander Bykov, Commander of the Special Rapid Reaction Force (COBP) (Notes: Commission of acts of violence against

peaceful protesters, torture of detainees, inhumane detention conditions, persecution of political opposition and journalists.)

26. Alexander Barsukov, Deputy Minister of Internal Affairs—Head of the Public Security Police (Notes: Commission of acts of violence against peaceful protesters, torture of detainees, inhumane detention conditions, persecution of political opposition and journalists.)

27. Natalia Kachanova, Head of the Council of the Republic of the National Assembly (Notes: Organization of falsification of elections.)

28. Andrey Ravkov, Secretary of State of the Security Council (Notes: Commission of acts of violence against peaceful protesters, torture of detainees, inhumane detention conditions, persecution of political opposition and journalists.)

Mr. SHIMKUS. This new round of sanctions should send a clear and direct message that any attempts to interfere with the Belarusian people's inalienable rights to freedom, democracy, and the rule of law will not be tolerated.

Mr. Speaker, let it be clear to the Belarusian people: We, the people of the United States, hear their cry for freedom, democracy, and the rule of law. We stand behind them.

IN HONOR OF PATRICK HENRY BEAUREGARD

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with a heavy heart to honor the life and service of a truly exceptional young man whom I had the great fortune of meeting and working with, Patrick Henry Beauregard, who was taken from us far too soon on September 6, 2020, after a courageous and awe-inspiring battle with colorectal cancer.

Many of you know that my own faith has been greatly influenced by the teachings of the Jesuits, and in particular, the idea that we ought to live our lives as men and women for others.

Mr. Speaker, Patrick Beauregard embodied this idea in every way. Patrick was born in Portland, Maine, and grew up in Medfield, Massachusetts. He attended Thayer Academy in Braintree, Massachusetts, and Providence College in Providence, Rhode Island, where he met the love of his life, Amanda.

After graduating from college, Patrick decided to serve our country by enlisting in the United States Marine Corps where he was an intelligence analyst. And during his service, Patrick received commendations for exceptional leadership, initiative, loyalty, and dedication to duty.

Patrick's stage 4 colorectal cancer diagnosis in September 2017 at the age of 29—a month after marrying his beloved wife, Amanda—changed everything. I think some of us would be tempted to give in to the uncertainty and doubt. But Patrick remained positive through surgeries, immunotherapy, and over 40 rounds of chemotherapy.

But what inspires me most about Patrick is that in the midst of this awful situation, he saw an opportunity to do good. Even as he fought his own disease with incredible grace and resilience, he used his voice to speak out and to bring the issue of colorectal cancer to the attention of researchers, donors, elected officials, and other young people at risk for the disease. He appeared on the news, advocated for patients, and worked with groups like the Prevent Cancer Foundation, to educate the public about the alarming increase of young onset colorectal cancer.

Mr. Speaker, Patrick Beauregard truly lived his life in service to others. From serving on the Alumni Association Board at Thayer Academy, to serving in the United States Marine Corps, to serving as an advocate so that we can prevent this terrible disease, Patrick is an inspiration to all of us, and he embodies the ideas of service and self-sacrifice this Nation was built on.

His incredible strength and tenacity allowed him to accomplish his final goal of meeting his son, Noah Patrick, on July 10, 2020. Noah, your dad was a great man, but more importantly, he was a very good man, who did his very best to serve those around him and made our world a better place.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the people of Massachusetts, cancer patients and survivors around the world, and the entire United States Congress, please join me in honoring the life and service of Patrick Henry Beauregard and praying for his family and friends and all those who hold him in their heart.

□ 0915

REMEMBERING LEROY JORDAN

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember Leroy Jordan. He was a beloved educator and community leader who passed away on September 5, 2020.

Leroy was a native of Murphysboro, Illinois, and a graduate of Southern Illinois University at Carbondale. Leroy was hired by Iles Elementary School in Springfield, becoming the first Black male teacher in the district. He later served on that district's school board, including two terms as school board president. He also went on to become the vice president of academic affairs at Sangamon State University, which is now known as the University of Illinois at Springfield.

He was a dedicated servant and leader to his community. He advocated for freedom and justice, perhaps most notably in his involvement in a 1974 desegregation lawsuit that created a busing system that helped balance the White and Black populations in Springfield's public schools and encouraged the hiring of more minority teachers.

Leroy was a legend in the city of Springfield, both in and out of the classroom. He was active in the Springfield Diocese, serving as the director of Black Catholic Ministries and instrumental with the Springfield Dominican Anti-Racism Team. He was also a member of Prince Hall Freemasons and Kappa Alpha Psi Fraternity, Inc.

For so many, including our mutual good friend Irv Smith, Leroy was a friend, a role model, and a mentor. He will truly be missed.

My prayers are with his wife, Johnetta; four daughters; and grandchildren.

CONGRATULATING DOVE, INC.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Dove, Inc., on celebrating 50 years of dedicated service to their community. Formed in July of 1970, Dove has seen considerable growth in both their organization and the impact they have made on their community.

Dove is a coalition of religious organizations that has excelled in their mission to address unmet human needs and social injustices. Their ministry, shared through a network of volunteers and advocates, aims to empower individuals to become self-reliant by encouraging clients' freedom to make responsible decisions and determine their future based on informed opinions.

For half a century, community leaders at Dove have provided some of the most vulnerable in their community a place where they are cared for with dignity and compassion while on their path toward healing and self-sufficiency.

Dove provides services on important issues, such as domestic violence, homelessness, emergency financial assistance, and prevention education programming to K through third grade students. They currently impact thousands of citizens every year through their various community service programs.

Again, congratulations to Dove, Inc., on their 50th anniversary. I wish them and those they serve nothing but the best in the years to come.

CONGRATULATING THOMAS J. WICKHAM

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I would be remiss not to offer heartfelt congratulations to somebody who, over the last 8 years, has not just been a colleague but has become a friend while standing up at that same Speaker's rostrum when we were in the majority. The gentleman is none other than the House Parliamentarian, Tom Wickham.

Tom has helped so many people on our side of the aisle. Now, as the other side has taken the majority, you have gotten to witness firsthand what I learned from Tom and the great people who work in the House Parliamentarian's Office during my 6 years in the majority and being able to be up in that chair working directly with him.

Tom is somebody who I think everybody got to know very well as someone who is actually very fair at administering the rules of this House. But I

always enjoyed most walking by his office and harassing him if his favorite baseball team wasn't doing that well or if his favorite college football team may have lost to one of the others in the Big Ten.

An institution like the House of Representatives will move on from all of us who are here now, but this one is a hard one to replace.

I thank Tom Wickham for his service, and I wish the best to Jason Smith, his successor.

PROTECTING MILKWEED MILE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. STEVENS) for 5 minutes.

Ms. STEVENS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the incredible efforts of the Thelander and Zarate families, who have spearheaded a conservation and awareness program for thousands of beautiful monarch butterflies that began their lives as caterpillars in Michigan's 11th District before attempting the 2,000-mile migration to central Mexico every year.

A couple of years ago, Maecy Zarate, who was then just 8 years old, petitioned the Highland Township board to establish the Milkweed Mile, a beautiful stretch of land along highway M-59 in Highland Township that provides a sanctuary for monarchs.

Along this stretch of road, which is designated as a no-mow zone, milkweed is left to grow and thrive freely, creating an ideal environment for monarch caterpillars to complete their lifecycle.

Each summer, these conservation efforts culminate in the Highland Monarch Butterfly Festival, an annual celebration of these amazing butterflies, in an effort to raise awareness of this species that has seen their global populations plummet in recent years.

I was honored to visit the Highland Monarch Butterfly Festival in August of 2019, and it was so inspiring to meet young Michiganders passionate about conservation and biodiversity in our great State.

This is also part of the work that we are doing on the House Science, Space, and Technology Committee, to protect and to promote biodiversity throughout the world.

The Thelander family also tags and releases hundreds of monarchs every year. One butterfly, named Jeronimo, was tracked all the way from Michigan's 11th District to central Mexico last year, beating the odds and completing a grueling 1,900-mile journey over 3 months.

This is significant and symbolic. It is symbolic because of the journey that we are on as a Nation right now in somewhat uncertain and troubling times but with an end goal to reach the other side.

The monarch sanctuary along Milkweed Mile provides a special opportunity for young people to get involved in real conservation efforts right in

their backyard. As Maecy says, "If there's no milkweed, there's no monarchs."

I look forward to working with monarch lovers all over Michigan to protect Milkweed Mile as a sanctuary for years to come.

I ask this Chamber to join me in recognizing the inspiring efforts of the next generation of conservationists who are making a difference in our community through their passion and dedication for these beautiful butterflies. I could not be more proud of their efforts, and I look forward to learning more about their progress in next year's Highland Township Monarch Festival.

REMEMBERING LIEUTENANT GENERAL BRENT SCOWCROFT

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

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise in final salute to the service of a man who loved the United States and devoted his life to her service, Lieutenant General Brent Scowcroft.

General Scowcroft died August 6, 2020, and leaves behind his loving daughter, Karen, and her family. His devoted friends, colleagues, and loyal longtime staff members are left with terrific memories of a man who served two Presidents and had delivered his wise counsel to them.

General Scowcroft was the only American to serve two Presidents, President Gerald Ford and President George H.W. Bush, as their National Security Advisor.

In September 1991, President Bush asked me to leave the Treasury Department and join the White House staff, directing his Economic Policy Council. General Scowcroft was a member of that group and always made significant, substantive, and humorous contributions to our meetings when he was awake.

Brent was renowned among his colleagues for his long hours, dedicated work, and daily care for his long-ailing, beloved wife, Jackie. That made late afternoon meetings a bit of a struggle.

President Bush initiated the Scowcroft Award to that Cabinet Secretary or senior staffer that nodded off in a meeting, as former staffer and now President of the Council on Foreign Relations Richard Haass described, in the most ostentatious manner. One of those nod-offs occurred in the Roosevelt Room, with his head resting on my shoulder.

During those White House years, my wife, Martha, served General Scowcroft as his deputy legal adviser. Our family extends our heartfelt condolences to Brent's family and his scores of friends around the world.

HONORING THE LIFE OF RICHARD COLBURN BUTLER, III

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy

of one of Arkansas's great historic preservationists, and my lifelong friend, Richard Butler, III, who recently passed away at the age of 82.

Richard was born in 1937 in Little Rock, where his father, Dick, was a philanthropist for whom the Butler Center for Arkansas Studies is named.

After receiving his law degree from the University of Arkansas, Richard practiced law for a few years before becoming a trust officer at the Commercial National Bank of Little Rock.

His attention to detail and historic architecture led to wonderful projects in Old Washington, Arkansas. For his devoted work, Richard was known in our State as Mr. Preservationist.

Richard had a passion for teaching people about the history of Arkansas and was a steadfast supporter of churches and the arts.

He was an inspiration and friend to many across our State, and I extend my respect, affection, and prayers to his friends, family, and loved ones.

HONORING THE LIFE OF DICKSON FLAKE

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to honor the life and legacy of one of Arkansas's great businesspeople and civic leaders, Dickson Flake, who passed away peacefully on Tuesday, June 30, at the age of 81.

Throughout his life, Dickson's accomplishments knew no bounds, as he played major roles in crucial Little Rock developments, including the Arkansas BlueCross BlueShield headquarters and the Arkansas Department of Human Services.

Dickson started his career in 1965 after finishing at the University of Michigan with a master's degree in business with high distinction. Because of his dedication, he was awarded the Arkansas Real Estate Association Realtor of the Year in 1971 and was inducted into the Arkansas Real Estate Hall of Fame in 2011. He was named the 2020 Business and Professional Leader of the Year by the Rotary Club of Little Rock.

With the passing of Dickson Flake, Martha and I lost a good friend. Like many in central Arkansas, I lost a wise counselor.

In this time of thanks and reflection, Martha and I extend our condolences and prayers to his family.

LOS ANGELES OFFICERS AMBUSHED

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

Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, just last weekend, a 31-year-old mother and a 24-year-old man in Los Angeles were ambushed. They were shot at pointblank range by a coward who targeted them for no reason except for the uniform that they wear.

These two police officers were attacked in the very community where they serve, the community that they have sworn to protect.

It is hard to believe, but this story gets worse. As these two police officers were in the hospital fighting for their lives, protestors stood outside, blocking ambulance entrances and chanting: "We hope they die."

What has become of American cities? When did this behavior become acceptable or even fathomable?

This ambush demonstrates total disregard for human life. It is an affront to American values.

Thankfully, by the grace of God and the skill of first responders and trauma medical teams, these brave police officers are expected to recover from their injuries. We are fortunate that they are on the mend, and my prayers are with them on their road to recovery.

Frankly, this time, we truly were fortunate. This time, we expect that a mother will return home to her family. We expect that a young police officer will return to his normal life.

Indeed, this time, we are fortunate. But what about the next time? Will we let this happen again?

Mr. Speaker, as a Nation, we cannot allow this malicious and wicked behavior to continue. We cannot stand by as police officers are shot at pointblank range. We cannot stand by while protestors scream "We hope they die" at critically injured public servants. We must restore law and order to all American cities.

In this Chamber, we should dispense with the Democrats' political games and enact commonsense, bipartisan solutions such as the JUSTICE Act, which was introduced by Senator TIM SCOTT and Congressman PETE STAUBER, to increase police transparency and accountability while supporting our law enforcement community and equipping them with the resources that they need to safely protect our communities.

We cannot stand on the sidelines and leave our law enforcement officers vulnerable to attacks. This is not the time to turn our backs on the police; this is not the time to dismantle the police; and this is definitely not the time to defund the police. We must protect the American people; we must restore law and order; and we must back the blue.

□ 0930

LAW AND ORDER IN OUR COMMUNITIES

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

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my wholehearted support for our Nation's law enforcement community. Members of this very Congress have called to defund the police, and when they say "defund police," they mean it literally. They want to strip away support for the officers who keep our communities safe.

Our men and women in blue deserve the utmost respect as they put their lives on the line every day to protect and serve their communities. We wit-

ness now, more than ever, just how dangerous this job is.

We are a nation of law and order, and that is why I will always back the blue.

PRESIDENT TRUMP SUPPORTS OUR VETERANS

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as a veteran of the United States Marine Corps to thank President Trump and his administration for all the outstanding work he has done for our veterans and the members of the military. During a time when our country has needed it most, President Trump has shown robust support for our brave men and women in uniform.

Our Armed Forces serve our Nation with honor, and it is our duty to provide them with the resources they need to keep Americans safe. We are building our military and making sure it comes to be the strongest force in the world.

TRUCK DRIVERS APPRECIATION WEEK

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Truck Drivers Appreciation Week.

As a Representative from the "Crossroads of America," I know firsthand just how important truck drivers are to our community and to our Indiana economy. Over 80 percent of Hoosiers depend on the trucking industry to keep their businesses moving.

As a businessman, I understand the important role trucking plays in the American economy, and it is my hope that Truck Drivers Appreciation Week brings attention to driver safety and financial support for this working community.

RICHARD G. LUGAR POST OFFICE

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 3105, a bill to designate the facility of the U.S. Postal Service located in Indianapolis as the Richard G. Lugar Post Office.

Senator Lugar was a true statesman who led a life of honor and service to Indiana and this country. As mayor of Indianapolis, Dick Lugar's vision transformed our State's capital city. As an Indiana Senator, he left a lasting legacy on domestic and global affairs.

The Hoosier State is greater and our Nation is stronger because of Richard G. Lugar. I am proud and humbled to stand with my colleagues to honor the life of this great Hoosier.

INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENTS TO I-70

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring attention to important and positive news regarding infrastructure in the Hoosier State.

The U.S. Department of Transportation is awarding a grant of \$22.5 million to the Indiana Department of Transportation to improve the infrastructure on I-70.

Hoosiers deserve the best infrastructure, and that means making sure our interstates are as safe and efficient as possible. I hear from constituents frequently about I-70, and I am glad to announce a huge improvement is heading toward the Sixth District.

Thank you to the Trump administration for continuing to be committed to

improving the infrastructure of our Nation.

RECOGNIZING HOOSIER FARMERS

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the amazing Hoosier agricultural community.

Farmers across our Nation work hard each day ensuring our friends, family, and neighbors can put food on the table. This devoted community has recently been put to the test with COVID-19, and they have stood up to the challenge to keep America fed.

I recently had the privilege of holding a farmers roundtable in my district to hear directly from this community how I can better represent them in Congress. As Indiana's Sixth District Representative, I will always support Hoosier farmers and our ag and ethanol communities.

CONGRESS MUST GET BACK TO WORK

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge Congress to get back to substantive work in our Nation's Capital.

The definition of Congress is "a national legislative body, especially that of the United States, which meets at the Capitol in Washington, D.C."

Last week, I was the only one to physically attend a Transportation Committee hearing on rail workers affected by COVID-19.

I believe the proper way for Congress to represent our constituents is in person in our Nation's Capital. It is imperative we simply get back to work for our constituents.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 35 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1000

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 10 a.m.

PRAYER

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

As the morning temperatures cool here at the Capitol, and schools throughout the country open to various configurations, we know the season is changing, yet the challenges confronting our Nation remain. The weather in the West especially belies the normal and further gives notice that much needs to be done.

Bless the Members of the people's House with wisdom and goodwill, that they might address these many challenges with due care and diligence, and the stress confronting so many of our families and businesses might be eased.

Lord, have mercy.

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

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentlewoman from Kansas (Ms. DAVIDS) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

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

HONORING MAYOR MICHAEL COPELAND

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

Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and service of Mayor Michael Copeland, who passed away on August 19, 2020.

Mayor Copeland was a devoted father and husband. He is survived by his wife, Maria, and three children, Olivia, Abigail, and Joshua.

As Olathe's longest serving mayor, he was elected in 2001 and held the office until his passing.

Mayor Copeland leaves behind a legacy that has touched the lives of many in the Olathe community.

Personally, I will miss Mayor Copeland's counsel. I very much appreciated each one of our many conversations since I took office. He was always generous with his time and knowledge, willing and eager to represent the people of Olathe.

Mr. Speaker, I offer my deepest condolences to Mayor Copeland's family and friends and to all of those who will miss his kindness and leadership. This truly is a loss for Kansas and our community.

RECOGNIZING MARY KAY CSANYI

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

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to rise today and recognize Mary Kay Csanyi from Kernersville, North Carolina.

Since 2004, Mary Kay has served as an administrative assistant with the Kernersville Chamber of Commerce.

The title she holds does not do justice to the impact she has at the chamber or in Kernersville. To me, she was the sunshine in the room, no matter where she is. Her ray of sunshine will be sorely missed.

In her capacity, she has coordinated numerous craft shows, festivals, and events within the Kernersville community. After 15 wonderful years at the Kernersville Chamber, Mary Kay retired on August 26 and celebrated alongside her colleagues and friends with a drive-in celebration.

Mary Kay, as you enter this new stage of your life, I know that you will continue to serve your community, impact the lives of your friends and neighbors, and be a ray of sunshine wherever you are.

May God continue to bless you; Bob, your husband of 40 years; and your family.

RECOGNIZING BUFFALO BLACK ACHIEVERS

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

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the Buffalo Black Achievers, who will soon celebrate virtually its 48th annual Black Achievers Awards ceremony.

I have been honored to speak at several past ceremonies, and I am certain this year's event will be very memorable.

The Buffalo Black Achievers honor the character and accomplishments of outstanding citizens of Buffalo and western New York and the substantial contributions they make every day.

In 2020, 36 Black Achievers Awards will be bestowed upon recipients in a variety of walks of life. A particular emphasis is placed upon community service, a fact underscored by the existence of the Black Achievers Scholarship, which has funded awards to local high school students for more than 15 years.

My congratulations go out to all of those earning the Buffalo Black Achievers Awards for 2020, and I offer my best wishes to my friend, Chief Executive Officer Herb Bellamy, Jr., and in the memory of his great father, Herb Bellamy, Sr., and to the other members of his board of directors for a successful virtual ceremony in 2020.

We look forward to celebrating together once again in 2021.

TRUMP ADMINISTRATION NEGOTIATES PEACE IN MIDDLE EAST

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

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, we are witnessing history at this time: historic peace agreements between Israel and its Arab neighbors, the UAE and Bahrain, both negotiated with the help of the Trump administration.

But judging from the media coverage, you would hardly know it. In fact, I

wouldn't be surprised if we actually saw a banner headline like this: Extra! Trump kills U.S. defense jobs! President brokers Middle East peace deals.

I made this front-page parody, but it is trying to make a point.

When President Jimmy Carter brokered the Camp David Accords between Egypt and Israel, the achievement was celebrated. He was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize. It was a defining moment in history.

There have been just four peace agreements negotiated between Israel and its Arab neighbors. President Trump played an important role in two of these, as well as his administration.

Let's give credit where credit is due, and let's work together for even more peace in the region.

COMMENDING OREGON'S FIRST RESPONDERS ON FRONT LINES OF HISTORIC WILDFIRES

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

Mr. SCHRADER. Mr. Speaker, over the last week, historic wildfires have ravaged my home State of Oregon. I have three major fires in my congressional district alone.

These fires continue to burn at an alarming rate. The extent of loss of life and property is still unknown.

However, without the heroic life-saving work of our firefighters, police, and sheriffs' offices, the sheer magnitude of that loss would have been far greater.

First responders from Lincoln, Marion, Polk, Clackamas, and Tillamook Counties have been working around the clock to evacuate families while the winds have changed most rapidly and dangerously, putting their own lives in peril.

Currently, Oregon experiences the worst air quality in the world and has been enveloped in absolute dense smoke for 1 week.

Many of those battling these fires live in impacted communities and have continued their work as their families evacuate and their homes are lost.

There are not enough words of thanks to give to these heroes, but I know that I speak on behalf of all Oregonians when I say that we are forever grateful to you.

HONORING SERGEANT MAJOR THOMAS PAYNE

(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. Mr. Speaker, all of America was grateful on Friday, the 19th anniversary of the September 11 attacks, to witness President Donald Trump present Sergeant Major Thomas Patrick Payne the military's highest honor for valor, the Medal of Honor.

A native of South Carolina towns Batesburg-Leesville and Lugoff, Payne and Master Sergeant Joshua L. Wheeler with fellow Army Rangers in 2015 helped rescue about 70 hostages set to be executed by the Islamic State terrorists in Iraq. The terrorists had dug mass graves to prepare for mass murder.

Sadly, Sergeant Wheeler lost his life, but Payne, with Kurdish commandos, continued their multiple courageous assaults to cut the locks, free the hostages, and helicopter the hostages to freedom.

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

HONORING LEVESTER THOMPSON

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

Mr. ROSE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in memory of my constituent Levester Thompson, who was taken from us far too soon after battling COVID-19.

Growing up in a small Virginia town of 300, LT aspired to move to the big city, inspired to work as a banker in Manhattan. He commuted 2½ hours every day from Staten Island to pursue that dream.

As he got older, he realized there is so much more to life, so he returned to his true passion, his true passion for sports, working as an equipment manager for NYU's athletics department and spending more time helping his children, Jade and Chase, realize their own passions.

LT was a larger-than-life character, a coach, a mentor, someone with a great sense of humor, and a smile that will be so dearly missed.

LT, you will forever live in our memory.

EXPAND MILK OPTIONS AVAILABLE THROUGH WIC PROGRAM

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to cosponsor the GIVE MILK Act with my Pennsylvania colleague FRED KELLER.

The GIVE MILK Act is an important piece of legislation that gives families who use the WIC program more control over the nutrition of their children.

The bill would make 2 percent and whole milk available through the WIC program to any child over the age of 2, reversing an Obama-era rule limiting WIC participants to low-fat or non-fat milk.

This legislation will give families who depend on WIC more options when considering nutritional options for their children. It will also help increase milk consumption, which is a win for our dairy farmers.

Whole milk has been wrongfully targeted as unhealthy in recent years, but

in reality, it provides a wealth of vital nutrients that are particularly important for growing children.

Including whole milk in the WIC program will provide a healthy option for those families who find themselves depending upon these benefits for essential nutrition.

□ 1015

DEFENDING AMERICAN VALUES

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

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the timeless American principles of freedom, equality, and opportunity. These principles are the foundation on which our Nation was built.

Unlike the nations and the empires that came before, the United States was founded on an idea, an idea that men are created equal and have certain inalienable rights given by our Creator. This idea turned into a dream, a dream that, no matter what circumstances you come from, you can come to America and be free to pursue your dreams and be equal to your peers in the eyes of the law.

There are some among us who think this system of self-government has failed. There are some who believe socialism is a better tool to achieve the American Dream, and they think, by tearing down our institutions, by tossing aside the Constitution, and by giving the government more control that they will somehow achieve utopia. Using history as a guide, we know this to be wrong.

Our Constitution is special because it limits the power of government while safeguarding our freedoms and our civil rights. I will do my best to follow their example and keep our America as the shining city on the hill.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2574, EQUITY AND INCLUSION ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 2019; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2639, STRENGTH IN DIVERSITY ACT OF 2019; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2694, PREGNANT WORKERS FAIRNESS ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. RES. 908, CONDEMNING ALL FORMS OF ANTI-ASIAN SENTIMENT AS RELATED TO COVID-19; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1107 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1107

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 2574) to amend title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to restore the right to individual civil actions in cases involving disparate impact, and for other purposes.

All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Education and Labor, modified by the amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 2639) to establish the Strength in Diversity Program, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Education and Labor now printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116-62 shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor; (2) the further amendments described in section 3 of this resolution; (3) the amendments en bloc described in section 4 of this resolution; and (4) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 3. After debate pursuant to the second section of this resolution, each further amendment printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules not earlier considered as part of amendments en bloc pursuant to section 4 of this resolution 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.

SEC. 4. It shall be in order at any time after debate pursuant to the second section of this resolution for the chair of the Committee on Education and Labor or his designee to offer amendments en bloc consisting of further amendments printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution not earlier disposed of. Amendments en bloc offered pursuant to this section shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor or their respective designees, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

SEC. 5. All points of order against the further amendments printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules or amendments en bloc described in section 4 of this resolution are waived.

SEC. 6. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 2694) to eliminate discrimination

and promote women's health and economic security by ensuring reasonable workplace accommodations for workers whose ability to perform the functions of a job are limited by pregnancy, childbirth, or a related medical condition. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Education and Labor now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 7. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the resolution (H. Res. 908) condemning all forms of anti-Asian sentiment as related to COVID-19. The resolution shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and preamble to adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

SEC. 8. House Resolution 967, agreed to May 15, 2020 (as most recently amended by House Resolution 1053, agreed to July 20, 2020), is amended—

(1) in section 4, by striking “September 21, 2020” and inserting “November 20, 2020”;

(2) in section 11, by striking “calendar day of September 20, 2020” and inserting “legislative day of November 20, 2020”; and

(3) in section 12, by striking “September 21, 2020” and inserting “November 20, 2020”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LEVIN of Michigan). The gentlewoman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 1 hour.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule, House Resolution 1107, providing for consideration of H.R. 2574, the Equity and Inclusion Enforcement Act, and H.R. 2694, the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act, under closed rules.

The rule provides for 1 hour of debate for each of the two bills, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking member of the Committee on Education and Labor. The rule also

self-executes a manager's amendment to H.R. 2574.

Additionally, the rule provides for consideration of H.R. 2639, the Strength in Diversity Act, under a structured rule. The rule provides 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking member of the Committee on Education and Labor and makes in order 12 amendments. The rule provides that the chair of the Committee on Education and Labor may offer amendments en bloc, debatable for 20 minutes.

The rule also provides for consideration of H. Res. 908, Condemning All Forms of Anti-Asian Sentiment As Related to COVID-19, under a closed rule.

Finally, the rule extends recess instructions, suspension and same-day authority through November 20, 2020.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to begin debate on four bills today that will protect workers, encourage diversity and inclusion in the workforce, and demonstrate Congress' support for our Asian-American communities in the face of anti-Asian rhetoric by the administration and right with respect to COVID-19.

COVID-19 has infected over 27 million people worldwide and claimed the lives of over 900,000, including almost 200,000 of our fellow Americans. This pandemic brought the world to a standstill economically and socially. Virtually everything in our daily lives has been affected in some form.

There was no coherent national strategy to deal with this deadly pandemic when it started, and now, 6-plus months in, Americans are still being left behind by an executive branch more focused on downplaying the virus' severity than getting it under control and our economy and way of life back on track.

In Congress, we find ourselves having to deal with a Senate majority that has even less interest in controlling the virus and helping American families than the President. The House has passed numerous pieces of legislation that would directly help American workers, small businesses, families, and children; but, in the midst of a pandemic, Leader MCCONNELL is more interested in packing the judiciary than he is in passing legislation to help the American people. The HEROES Act has sat on Leader MCCONNELL's desk collecting dust for exactly 4 months to the day.

In the absence of leadership by the White House and Senate, our cities and States are desperate for resources to combat the pandemic. The American people are calling out for relief, but Republicans are willfully ignoring them. Instead, they are trying to divert attention from their abject failure to take prompt or effective action earlier this year when tens of thousands of lives could have been saved. Instead, this administration is using the playbook of fear-mongering autocrats through the ages by demonizing a marginalized group.

In recent months, we have seen a marked rise in anti-Asian sentiment and rhetoric. Racist and xenophobic names for COVID-19 have been spouted by elected officials, and these terms have had damaging, far-reaching impact on Asians and Asian Americans.

As we have seen over the past 4 years, the endorsement of racist language by national leaders has led to well-documented increases in racist speech and hate crimes across the country. This harmful rhetoric has resulted in physical attacks, verbal assaults, workplace discrimination, and online harassment against our fellow citizens. These are our friends and neighbors, essential workers, nurses, law enforcement officers, and teachers.

The vitriol against our fellow Americans must be forcefully and overwhelmingly condemned, Mr. Speaker.

In the midst of this pandemic, reaffirming American values is more necessary than ever, whether it is condemning hate speech or making sure that our government is working for all Americans and not just Wall Street tycoons or real estate developers. Therefore, I would recommend to my colleagues that they encourage Senator MCCONNELL to quickly take up the HEROES Act or come to the table with good-faith negotiations to address COVID-19 in a thoughtful and people-focused way.

I thank my colleague, Congresswoman GRACE MENG from New York, for introducing this necessary resolution and the House Judiciary Committee for quickly getting this before the Rules Committee.

Mr. Speaker, it has been more than 65 years since the Supreme Court made racial segregation in public education illegal, but over the past several decades, racial and socioeconomic segregation in our schools has dramatically increased. This didn't happen by accident.

In many counties across the U.S., children are assigned to schools based on where their home is located. If your parents can afford to live in a more affluent area and pay higher property taxes, the school you attend will reflect this.

□ 1030

The opposite, of course, is true for students in poorer areas, and centuries of systemic racism have relegated far too many students of color to poorer neighborhoods and school districts.

School districts that predominantly serve students of color receive \$23 billion less in funding than predominantly White school districts. The result of this undeniable gap in educational funding is that students of color have fewer resources, older equipment, and aging—if not crumbling—facilities that make learning more challenging compared to their peers in higher-income areas.

In a 2001 Supreme Court decision, *Alexander v. Sandoval*, a conservative majority stripped away four decades of

statutory protection against discrimination by disallowing victims of these unjust policies from bringing disparate impact claims under title VI of the Civil Rights Act. Fortunately, the bill we are considering this week will restore the rights of students, parents, and communities to address this systemic harm by allowing those impacted to seek enforcement in our courts.

The Equity and Inclusion Enforcement Act is critical to reforming how education is accessed in the United States. It is long past time for Congress to step in and ensure that the law can address discriminatory policies and practices, and that is exactly what this bill will do.

Similar to the Equity and Inclusion Enforcement Act, the Strength in Diversity Act addresses the importance of increasing diversity in education and eliminating socioeconomic and racial segregation. Once again, educational opportunities for our children largely depend on their home ZIP code.

Unsurprisingly, segregation has a detrimental impact on learning and educational outcomes. Research shows that students educated in integrated schools have higher test scores, are more likely to enroll in college and are less likely to drop out. Moreover, integrated classrooms have been found to encourage critical thinking, problem solving, and creativity.

Consistent with the primacy of local control of education, many school districts around the country have implemented innovative strategies to address school segregation. Strategies to support more diverse and inclusive learning include the development of state-of-the-art magnet schools, open enrollment policies, and changes in feeder patterns to promote diversity. Research suggests that diverse settings reduce stereotypes and promote cross-racial understanding which is especially important as our country moves towards a more ethnically and culturally diverse society.

The Strength in Diversity Act supports communities in developing, implementing, and expanding diversity initiatives to promote higher levels of social cohesion and reduce racial prejudice. There is no one solution to make education more equitable for our students, but different data clearly shows that increased diversity in classrooms is one of the best ways for all students to receive a quality education. This bill will promote those solutions.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, we have the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act.

COVID-19 has exposed and exacerbated the hurdles women continue to face in the workplace, so let's start out by stating one obvious fact: women shouldn't be forced to choose between financial security and a healthy pregnancy.

It has been illegal to discriminate against pregnant women for decades, but we know that this damaging practice remains widespread.

Women make up nearly half of the labor force in this country, yet pregnancy discrimination persists, including losing a job, being denied reasonable accommodation, or not being hired in the first place. In fact, the number of pregnancy discrimination claims filed with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission has been steadily rising for two decades and is hovering near an all-time high. These practices aren't new, and they must end.

This is an issue that spans the political spectrum and affects women in every corner of this country. Estimates indicate that over 20 percent of pregnant workers are employed in jobs that are both low wage and physically demanding. Women of color are heavily overrepresented in these estimates, with nearly one in three employed Black and Latina women working in low-wage jobs.

Though the Pregnancy Discrimination Act has been law since the seventies and despite a 2015 Supreme Court decision allowing for reasonable accommodation claims, an unreasonably high standard of proof is still allowing discrimination against many pregnant workers.

The bipartisan Pregnant Workers Fairness Act helps change this practice by strengthening Federal workplace protections and promoting the health and well-being of pregnant women and their families. This important legislation requires public-sector employers and private-sector employers with more than 15 employees to make reasonable accommodations for pregnant employees and individuals with known limitations related to pregnancy, childbirth, or related medical conditions.

It is 2020. We should not have to have this debate or lay out an entire argument as to why we should protect pregnant workers. But here we are. It is past time that pregnant workers have fair and equal opportunity in employment. It is past time that the protections of the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act become law.

When more women work, the better the economy performs. Women are not asking for special treatment or handouts, just the workplace protections they deserve so that they can do the jobs they need to do.

Mr. Speaker, I thank all of my colleagues who helped craft these superb pieces of legislation. I look forward to supporting this rule, I urge my colleagues to do the same, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I want to thank my colleague from Pennsylvania for yielding me the time.

She and I have the pleasure of serving on the Congressional Modernization Committee together—a bipartisan committee—and it is not infrequent that we will have identified a problem and she will have identified a solution, and I will think: Why haven't we come

up with that before. And we will move forward in partnership together.

I think that is the way the American people expect this House to run, and doggone it, we are close to getting there today, Mr. Speaker.

But I listened to my colleague as she laid the mantle of blame at the feet of our friends in the Senate and our friends in the White House, for why can't they get more things done?

The truth is we have opportunities here to get things done, and I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, the mantle of responsibility sits with us, and we are missing some of those opportunities today to come together and do things in a partnership way.

Over the weekend, Mr. Speaker, I was with our colleague, DENNY HECK from Washington State. We were in a forum on polarization in Congress, and we were talking about what that has meant, how that has come to be, and how legislation is affected by that. Mr. HECK said something that I thought was very profound and not really understood outside of the Halls of Congress. Folks often talk about their partisan achievements, but, he said that—and I will paraphrase him—there is really a special sense of pride that Members take in sorting out those really thorny issues, those issues that you had to come together and work on, those issues where you had to give a little to get a little, and those issues that not just anybody could have solved but that we came together with a unique mix of people at a unique time and that Members take special pride in cracking those hardest of nuts.

I think that is exactly right. The media doesn't cover those successes, I think, with the same glee that partisan bickering is covered, but, absolutely, men and women of conscience in this body take special pride in solving particularly hard problems.

We have an opportunity today, Mr. Speaker, to solve some problems, and I am not sure that we are taking full advantage of that. Principled compromise, Mr. Speaker, does not mean finding the lowest common denominator. It means finding those things that all of our constituents are asking us to do and figuring out how in 435 different districts and different sets of ideas we can meld those things together.

We have in this rule today, Mr. Speaker, a whole host of bills. I miss the days where we did one rule and one bill. I recognize the pandemic has caused some time crunch problems, but I hope that when these masks come off—as I am absolutely certain one day they will—we will return to being a body that can handle one idea at a time and have a full-throated debate on each idea, but this bill makes in order a number of bills.

I will start with H.R. 2639, the Strength in Diversity Act, Mr. Speaker. It must have been said by every Member who spoke yesterday that discrimination is wrong, that it is immoral, that it is unlawful, and that we

have to do absolutely everything we can to ensure that American school children are treated equally in our schools. H.R. 2639 purports to do that.

Again, this is an idea that has great bipartisan support. It has moral right on its side. Separate is not equal, and learning from diversity is part of the strength that our Nation provides. I am glad, even though we offered a motion for an open rule so that all Members could have their voices heard, my friends in the majority on the Rules Committee saw fit to make 12 separate amendments in order, including one from my colleague from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN) that I believe will make this bill better.

The Allen amendment is an opportunity for us to work together and move forward, not just on something that goes to the Senate, Mr. Speaker, but something that goes to the Senate and moves beyond. I have been there, and so I understand the need to say: I have sent my idea to the Senate and the Senate isn't moving it, and shame on the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, if you talk to your friends in this Senate, whether it is a Democratic-led Senate or a Republican-led Senate, they will tell you that if you send them bad ideas they are not going to move them.

We can send good ideas to the United States Senate, Mr. Speaker, good ideas that will move across the floor, ideas that will move to the President's desk and thus ideas that will make a difference. We all grow weary on this floor of talking about things we would like to do, and we often mistake passing something using a very partisan majority in the House as getting something done. It is not. It is absolutely making a statement, but it is getting absolutely nothing done. Only when the Senate acts and only when the President acts are we able to get something done. We have that opportunity with the Allen amendment today, Mr. Speaker, and I hope folks will take advantage of that.

Mr. Speaker, another bill that the rule makes in order is the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act, H.R. 2694.

Again, there is not a single Member in this body who believes that discrimination is appropriate. This is another opportunity that we had to work in a partnership way to move a bill forward. We all believe it is important for employers to provide reasonable accommodations to pregnant workers. We all want what is best for these workers; and, in fact, we heard from the ranking member of the Education and Labor Committee yesterday, Mr. Speaker, that Chairman SCOTT, the chairman of that committee, had worked to try to make this bill better. The bill is different today than it was when it was introduced because of that partnership effort. Again, any good thing that comes out of this institution comes out in a partnership way.

One more step that, of course, the minority was hoping we could make

would be one to protect religious freedoms in this bill, the rights of religious institutions, Mr. Speaker. This is not a radical idea. This is something we have been doing for 50 years when we have talked about nondiscrimination statutes. It is my hope that Chairman SCOTT, having heard the arguments yesterday in the Rules Committee and having heard from our ranking member, the gentlewoman from North Carolina, Dr. FOXX, that he will take yes for an answer. There is still time to come back and improve this bill and get it across the floor in a very bipartisan, again, partnership way that not just makes it to the Senate but makes it through the Senate on to the President's desk to effect the law as we all desire. I think the American people will thank us if we seize this opportunity to find common ground.

Mr. Speaker, we see this, again, in H. Res. 908 that this rule makes in order today. It condemns all forms of anti-Asian sentiment and bias as it relates to COVID-19. Mr. Speaker, I would encourage you to go and read this resolution. As you know from House resolutions, you have a series of "and whereas", and then you have what it is that we want to do.

If you read this series of whereases, you will find it to be as stridently partisan as you often find House resolutions to be, and it is not necessary that it be that way. We all condemn and denounce anti-Asian sentiment, Mr. Speaker, all manifestations of racism, of xenophobia, of scapegoating, and of intolerance. We all condemn those ideas, and we all want Federal law enforcement to play a strong role in ensuring that Asian-American communities across this country are protected and that crimes against them are investigated and properly prosecuted.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, in July of this year I joined, again, in a partnership, bipartisan way Mr. LIEU and Ms. CHU on the Democratic side of the aisle and Mr. OLSON and myself on the Republican side of the aisle. We led a letter to Attorney General Barr that included signatories like my friend from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCANLON) asking that the Justice Department bolster its work in this area and to send an unambiguous message to the American people that anti-Asian bias and discrimination will not be tolerated at any level of our government.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, because I do want to highlight those things that we do together not in a partisan way but in a "let's-get-something-done-together way", I include in the RECORD the letter.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, July 20, 2020.

HON. WILLIAM P. BARR,
Attorney General, Department of Justice,
Washington, DC.

DEAR ATTORNEY GENERAL BARR: Thank you for featuring the quote "Coronavirus is no excuse for hate" on the Department of Justice's hate crimes website. The COVID-19 pandemic affects all Americans and has wrought enormous pain in the United States.

Some Americans are facing increased discrimination as a result of the pandemic. We write to draw particular attention to an increase in verbal and physical attacks as well as discrimination towards Asian Americans who have been wrongly blamed for the virus' spread. We respectfully request that you publicly condemn acts of anti-Asian bias, and provide us with regular status updates regarding the steps the Department of Justice is taking and will take going forward to combat this behavior.

Asian Americans are not responsible for the spread of coronavirus in the United States; yet, since the start of the pandemic they have experienced continued harassment, violence, and discrimination. As of June 3, the Asian Pacific Policy and Planning Council reported 2,066 incidents of coronavirus-related discrimination. These and numerous news reports have documented cases ranging from the denial of services at stores to verbal harassment on the subway to physical assaults.

In one particularly egregious instance, an individual in Texas stabbed three Asian Americans, two of whom were children, because he thought they were infecting others with COVID-19. In March, the Federal Bureau of Investigation's Houston field office acknowledged the likelihood of a surge in hate crime incidents against Asian Americans. And most recently, a new Ipsos survey conducted for the Center for Public Integrity found that more than 30 percent of Americans have witnessed someone blaming Asian people for the coronavirus pandemic.

We appreciate the op-ed the Department placed in the Washington Examiner generally stating that hate crimes will be investigated and prosecuted. However, the dangers faced by the Asian American community today are very real and deserve a strong and specific response by our government. In fact, on May 8, the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights acknowledged its concerns "over the increase in xenophobic animosity toward Asian Americans (and perceived Asian Americans) as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic" and unanimously issued recommendations urging federal agencies reduce this sentiment.

We note that in the early 2000s during the severe acute respiratory syndrome outbreak, the Bush Administration immediately took steps to prevent discrimination against Asian Americans by creating a community outreach team to monitor and document acts of anti-Asian bias and engage with the community.

Two years earlier following the September 11 terrorist attacks, the Administration had similarly sought to prevent attacks against Arab, Muslim, Sikh, and South Asian American communities by engaging with community leaders, conducting coordinated civil rights enforcement, and speaking out forcefully. While these prior responses were not perfect, they represented an important effort to acknowledge and address the specific discrimination.

Despite the fear present within the community, each and every day Asian Americans help to combat COVID-19. While Asian Americans comprise 7 percent of the U.S. population, 17.1 percent of active medical physicians are Asian American. Similarly, Asian Americans are serving our country by working as nurses, health aides, and in many other essential occupations. Asian Americans are just as American as any other group of people in our country.

We respectfully request that you, as head of the Department of Justice, forcefully condemn anti-Asian bias to send an unambiguous message to all Americans that discrimination against this community is un-American and will not be tolerated. Further, we

would ask that you update us regularly as to what steps the Department has taken to address our concerns. Thank you for your attention to this important matter.

Sincerely,

Ted W. Lieu, Member of Congress; Rob Woodall, Member of Congress; Judy Chu, Member of Congress; Pete Olson, Member of Congress.

Jerrold Nadler, Ted S. Yoho, Adam Smith, Derek Kilmer, Frank Pallone, Jr., John Yarmuth, Nydia M. Velázquez, Karen Bass, Adam B. Schiff, Dan Crenshaw, Eddie Bernice Johnson, James P. McGovern, Kathy Castor, Peter A. DeFazio, Joaquin Castro, Brian Fitzpatrick, Carolyn B. Maloney, Eliot L. Engel, Zoe Lofgren, Mark Takano, Ted Deutch.

Abigail D. Spanberger, Alan Lowenthal, Alma S. Adams, Ph.D., Andy Kim, Ann McLane Kuster, Ayanna Pressley, Bill Foster, Bonnie Watson Coleman, Brenda L. Lawrence, Chellie Pingree, Danny K. Davis, Adriano Espaillat, Alcee L. Hastings, Ami Bera, M.D., Andy Levin, Anna G. Eshoo, Barbara Lee, Bill Pascrell, Jr., Brad Sherman, Brendan F. Boyle, Cheri Bustos, Darren Soto, Al Green, Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez, André Carson, Angie Craig, Anthony G. Brown, Betty McCollum, Bobby L. Rush, Bradley S. Schneider, Cedric L. Richmond, Colin Z. Allred, David N. Cicilline.

David Trone, Debbie Wasserman Schultz, Donald M. Payne, Jr., Doris Matsui, Ed Case, Eric Swalwell, Grace F. Napolitano, Gwen Moore, Henry C. "Hank" Johnson, Jr., Jackie Speier, Jan Schakowsky, Dean Phillips, Denny Heck, Donald S. Beyer Jr., Dwight Evans, Eleanor Holmes Norton, Gerald E. Connolly, Grace Meng, Hakeem Jeffries, Ilhan Omar, Jahana Hayes, Jared Huffman, Debbie Mucarsel-Powell, Dina Titus, Donna E. Shalala, Earl Blumenauer, Emanuel Cleaver, II, Gilbert R. Cisneros, Jr., Gregory W. Meeks, Harley Rouda, J. Luis Correa, Jamie Raskin, Jason Crow.

Jennifer Wexton, Jimmy Gomez, John B. Larson, Juan Vargas, Kim Schriener, M.D., Lisa Blunt Rochester, Madeleine Dean, Mark DeSaulnier, Max Rose, Pramila Jayapal, Ro Khanna, Jerry McNerney, Jimmy Panetta, Joseph P. Kennedy, III, Katherine M. Clark, Lauren Underwood, Lucille Roybal-Allard, Marc Veasey, Mark Pocan, Mike Thompson, Raja Krishnamoorthi, Ron Kind, Jesús G. "Chuy" García, Joe Neguse, Josh Gottheimer, Katie Porter, Linda T. Sánchez, Lucy McBath, Marcia L. Fudge, Mary Gay Scanlon, Peter Welch, Rick Larsen, Rosa L. DeLauro.

Ruben Gallego, Scott H. Peters, Seth Moulton, Stephanie Murphy, Susan A. Davis, Suzanne Bonamici, TJ Cox, Veronica Escobar, Yvette D. Clarke, Salud O. Carbajal, Sean Casten, Sharice L. Davids, Steve Cohen, Susie Lee, Sylvia R. Garcia, Tony Cardenas, Vicente Gonzalez, Nanette Diaz Barragan, Sanford D. Bishop, Jr., Sean Patrick Maloney, Sheila Jackson Lee, Steven Horsford, Suzan K. DelBene, Thomas R. Suozzi, Tulsi Gabbard, William R. Keating, Members of Congress.

□ 1045

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, the Attorney General, I have no doubt, feels exactly the same way about this as Ms. SCANLON and I do, as Mr. LIEU and Ms. CHU do. And that is why I am saddened that we have a resolution before us today that includes these "whereases" that make it difficult to take "yes" for an answer.

Mr. Speaker, I want you to remember that we had a very similar conversation with H. Res. 576 last year. That

was the resolution asking that the whistleblower's complaint be provided to Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I went up to the Rules Committee on that afternoon last spring, and the conversation was the Trump administration is derelict, it is full of scoundrels, all of these bad things are going on, and we demand the whistleblower's report.

Mr. Speaker, well, what are we supposed to do with that? As Article I says, we are entitled to the whistleblower's report, and we made a recommendation to the chairman of the Rules Committee at that time and to the House leadership to give us an opportunity to speak with one Article I voice on whether or not the House is entitled to see a whistleblower's report.

We said, "Please, take out these partisan jabs and let's just get to the heart of the matter and get access to those documents that we want. In the chairman's wisdom, and in the Speaker's wisdom, they took that advice. A resolution that had been on its way to being whipped "no" from the Republican side of the aisle, came back and passed with absolutely no dissent when we decided to spend less time poking one another and more time trying to make progress together.

Mr. Speaker, we have that opportunity again today, and I hope we will take "yes" for an answer. This is obviously an election year, an opportunity to get off the rails on partisan rhetoric from time to time, but we all know that we speak with a stronger voice when we speak with one voice here in this institution, and we have that opportunity to find that space in H. Res. 908.

Mr. Speaker, finally, the last bill in this very long rule, is H.R. 2574, a measure that purports to strengthen Federal civil rights laws in educational settings, creating a private right of action on the theory of disparate impact.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I hope it surprises you, as it surprises me, that we are talking about a fundamental change in American civil jurisprudence, and this bill didn't go through the Committee on the Judiciary at all. Now, again, it purports to change the laws it relates to educational settings, but, of course, in fact, changes the law across the entire spectrum of civil litigation and not one opportunity for the Committee on the Judiciary to be heard.

Now, I talked about principle compromise and not seeking the lowest common denominator. I don't want to pretend that it will be an easy thing to find that common ground on disparate impact litigation. Litigation is something that divides this House time and time again, and it takes serious people, which is why serious men and women, like my friend from Pennsylvania, find themselves on the Committee on the Judiciary. It is not an easy path to find. But for not one opportunity—and we asked the Judiciary chairman about that yesterday, Mr. Speaker—and he

said he looked at the Committee on Education's work product and he thought it was appropriate. Well, I am glad that he does not feel undermined by being completely left out of changes in judicial procedure in the United States of America. I would feel that way if I were chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary. But even if he doesn't feel left out, even if he thinks that is good enough, I have got dozens and dozens of Members who are on the Committee on the Judiciary who were placed on that committee because of their expertise in that area, who have been placed on the Committee on the Judiciary because of their thoughtfulness in this area. And I think America would benefit, not be burdened, by having an opportunity for those voices to be heard.

Again, if your position is "let's pass bills in the House and thank ourselves, congratulate ourselves for passing something in the House," we have got exactly the right bill before us today.

If our position is, we want to make a difference for the men and women that we serve—and I say, "if our position is"—Mr. Speaker, I take that back. I shouldn't have even said that, because I am certain, knowing each one of my colleagues as I do, that it is their position that they didn't come here to make a statement, that they did come here to make a difference. I want it to come to fruition that we can make that partnership progress together.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat this rule, we are going to have that opportunity. I am not talking about an opportunity to quash any of these bills. I am talking about an opportunity to perfect these bills in those ways that I have mentioned, not so that they go to the Senate and die, not so that they receive a veto threat from the White House, but so that they go to the Senate and pass, so that they receive the President's signature, and so that they make the difference that each one of the men and women in this Chamber were sent here to do.

Mr. Speaker, we are close to that today, and I believe if we defeat the rule, we can get that.

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

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I thank my learned colleague for his input. It certainly would be refreshing to see anything pass the Senate these days.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished member of the Rules Committee, Ms. SCANLON, for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, there are a lot of good things included in this rule. I want to discuss one in particular today: H. Res. 908—condemning all forms of anti-Asian sentiment as related to COVID-19.

This resolution is about our values; not our Democratic values, not our Republican values, it is about our American values.

Look, I understand that politics can be contentious. The rhetoric can get heated. But what we are talking about here is something else altogether. Anti-Asian rhetoric crosses a line that should never be crossed.

The Asian-American community is an integral part of our society. It is an important part of my community in Massachusetts. These are our neighbors, our friends, and our family. And the hateful rhetoric that we are hearing directed towards them during this pandemic is unacceptable. It has led to an uptick in physical attacks, verbal assaults, and online harassment. Hate crimes against Asian Americans are on the rise.

Mr. Speaker, this is the antithesis of what the United States of America stands for. During difficult times, our Nation comes together. We don't allow offensive rhetoric to tear us apart, no matter who says it. We are nearing 200,000 lives lost in this country because of the coronavirus. Countless more are sick. Businesses have closed, our economy is struggling.

Mr. Speaker, the world has changed. But one thing that is not and will not change is our obligation to be there for each other, to treat others as we would want to be treated. To show those around us the dignity and respect and the basic human decency that we would want them to show us—pandemic or no pandemic.

To pretend that these hateful words about Asian Americans don't matter is to kid yourself. Just ask those who have been on the receiving end. Or ask the groups that monitor hate-inspired discrimination. They tell us that there were more than 2,100 anti-Asian-American hate incidents in this country related to this pandemic between March and June. I shudder to think what the number has grown to today.

No one should be forced to endure such hate and violence. Asian Americans are struggling under the weight of this pandemic, just like everyone else. They are doctors and nurses and first responders—just like everyone else. I know that in politics our values don't always align, but on this, Democrats and Republicans should agree. Some things go beyond partisanship. They speak to who we are as a Nation and what we are willing to tolerate.

Mr. Speaker, I am hoping for a strong bipartisan vote on this resolution because this country should always stand as an inclusive and just society. And as elected officials, that starts with us. We must lead by example.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues on both sides to support this rule and the underlying measures.

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

Mr. Speaker, I don't disagree with a word my friend from Massachusetts had to say, and, in fact, I want to

thank him for joining the letter that we led on this very topic in a bipartisan way earlier this year. And I do not believe I am speaking out of turn. If the gentleman will partner with me for stripping out the political "whereases" in this resolution, I am certain not only will we get a bipartisan vote, we will get a huge bipartisan vote in the same way that we did when you followed that same good advice that I gave about this time last year.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will amend the rule to make in order H.R. 1325, the Protect and Serve Act, and H.R. 8251.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, these measures before us today are critically important.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. RUTHERFORD), a gentleman who can speak to these critically important issues with not just his words, but with a lifetime of service.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend and neighbor from Georgia for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to stand up for the lives of our Nation's law enforcement officers. I spent over 40 years of my life in law enforcement, including 12 as sheriff. I dedicated my life to protecting minorities in Florida communities and doing my absolute best to ensure that all of my officers went home safely to their families.

Sadly, we still lost good men and women in the line of duty. And there is no doubt that law enforcement is a dangerous profession, and every officer that puts on that badge knows the risk that they take. But one thing is certain, these risks are growing significantly—increased, thanks to the growing anti-police rhetoric we are seeing across the country, making their jobs more dangerous now than ever before.

Mr. Speaker, I urge defeat of the previous question so that we can consider H.R. 1325, the Protect and Serve Act. The lead cosponsor of my legislation is Congresswoman VAL DEMINGS, a career police officer and former Orlando police chief. It is not a controversial bill, and it is one that many, many, of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle support. In fact, last Congress, this bill overwhelming passed the House by a vote of 382–35.

Like Congresswoman DEMINGS, I know what officers go through every day when they put on their uniform, say goodbye to their families, and head out to do the important work of protecting our communities.

Recently, we have seen an undeniable increase in violent attacks against po-

lice officers, especially using ambush-style attacks. Just this weekend, we saw two Los Angeles police officers shot in cold blood while simply sitting in their vehicle. But then, when being transported to the hospital for life-saving treatment, the doors to that hospital were blocked—blocked by protesters chanting, "We hope they die. We hope they die."

Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago, in Gilchrist County, Florida, two deputies were assassinated while simply eating lunch. This year, 24 police officers have been ambushed, and 7 of them died because of the attacks.

This is why we must defeat the previous question and consider the Protect and Serve Act. This is bipartisan legislation that will enact the strongest penalties for anyone who decides to target and harm not only Federal officers, but also, in some cases, State and local officers.

Mr. Speaker, many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle have expressed shock over the recent police shootings. I now ask that you translate those statements of shock into action and show America that attacks on law enforcement will not be tolerated.

Please stand with Congresswoman DEMINGS and I in supporting the Protect and Serve Act.

□ 1100

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

Mr. Speaker, we have been talking about shared American values. Certainly, one of our strongest shared American values is that we condemn violence, particularly violence against our law enforcement officers. That is not open to question. What happened in California this past week is horrific, and we all condemn that.

But that is not what we are talking about here. What we are talking about is an attempt to hijack the rule that we are here to debate.

I mean, I have just listened to a very eloquent argument by the gentleman from Georgia about the need for bills to go through regular order and to follow the process. If these are the non-controversial items, as warranted by my colleagues, then they can go through the suspension process.

We just voted on two suspension bills last night. We can do more. We can be here longer than anticipated if the news I am reading is correct. So, let them go through the suspension process. Let them be marked up.

Let's get back to the business of why we are here today and the four bills that are under consideration as part of this rule.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI), another distinguished member of the Rules Committee.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of a rule providing for consideration of several bills that will support pregnant women in the workplace and reaffirm our shared commitment to equity and diversity.

Of these important bills, one stands out as personal to me: the resolution condemning all forms of anti-Asian sentiment related to COVID-19.

For many Asian Americans across this country, the harmful rhetoric from the highest officials of our land is a painful reminder of our yet unrealized potential as a Nation. This pain is informed by our lived experiences.

For me, having been born in a Japanese-American internment camp, I learned from my parents and grandparents the dangers of governing with fear and hatred, not acceptance and unity.

If our country is to successfully contain the spread of this deadly virus, the Federal Government must demonstrate that every single American is valued and that their stories and lives matter. Americans of all backgrounds deserve to know that their government holds a fundamental dedication to their well-being.

However, when our leaders use language that undermines our collective resolve, it diminishes public trust, undercuts public health, and harms families. This rhetoric does not align with the values we work to instill in our children, and it has no place in America today.

This is an important statement for this Chamber to make, and I look forward to a vote on the House floor soon.

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

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the words of my friend from California. What makes this institution strong is so many of those experiences that each one of us brings from our lives.

Again, we have an opportunity to speak with exactly the one voice that my friend asks us to if we can simply remove the partisanship from this resolution and make it the condemning resolution that it should absolutely be.

Along those lines, Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 4 minutes to my friend from Missouri to talk about, again, not hijacking the rule by defeating the previous question, but simply adding to what is already a very long rule, two additional bipartisan measures that won't just be statements, Mr. Speaker. They will be opportunities to move through the Senate and on to the President's desk.

I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER).

Mrs. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend, a ranking member of the Rules Committee, for his support and his friendship for so very many years and for his fight for this cause in this Chamber and for his constituents in Georgia.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call on my colleagues to defeat the previous question and bring up my legislation, H.R. 8251, which would ensure that all Americans can access hospitals and urgent medical care without fear of life-threatening delays due to violence and extremism.

My legislation would prohibit intentionally blocking hospital entries or

exits by force, threat of force, or physical obstruction in order to injure, intimidate, or interfere with any person who is trying to obtain and provide lifesaving medical procedures or treatment.

Mr. Speaker, I am outraged that the irrational and unconscionable hatred directed at the brave men and women of our Nation's law enforcement resulted in the attempted assassination of two innocent deputies and the reckless endangerment of those in need of urgent medical care.

On September 12, a gunman attempted to execute two Los Angeles Sheriff's deputies, Claudia Apolinar, a 31-year-old single mother, and her 24-year-old partner, simply because they wore the uniform, simply because they were called to serve and to protect American neighborhoods.

This was a chilling and senseless act of brutality that we are seeing all over our country. Instead of turning to healing, protestors chose to endanger the lives of those in need of immediate medical care by actually blocking the entrance to the hospital where the deputies were receiving critical care and chanting, "We hope they die," and, "Death to police."

"We hope they die," and, "Death to police."

The courageous men and women of our law enforcement are selfless public servants, Mr. Speaker. Every day, they choose to risk their lives to protect us. It is unconscionable that their sacrifices are being repaid with targeted violence and hatred. It is equally unconscionable that protestors would prevent innocent Americans from receiving lifesaving care by blocking hospital entrances.

I call on my colleagues—I implore my colleagues—for us to come together to defeat the previous question. Stand with our men and women in blue. Stand for what is right and just in our country. Stand for humanity and support my legislation.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, we are prepared to close if the gentleman from Georgia has no further speakers.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, we have no further speakers. I am prepared to close.

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

I can't say it any better than my friends from Missouri and Florida have just said it.

My colleague from Pennsylvania is absolutely right, Mr. Speaker. We have a regular order process. Here we are, halfway through September. We are back for our first day of session this month. I wish we were here more. I wish there was more work going on. I wish there was less campaigning and more working together, but there simply isn't.

The previous question is an opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to add things to the rule. You can use it to hijack the rule. You can use it to take down the rule. That is not what we are doing

today. What we are asking, Mr. Speaker, is to add two commonsense, bipartisan bills.

Mr. Speaker, you heard the arguments from the gentleman from Florida and the gentlewoman from Missouri. Did you object to a single word that they had to say? Did you find one bit of partisanship or disagreement in their words? You did not.

The question isn't are we going to get some Democratic votes to defeat the previous question and add these two bills. We are. We absolutely are because these are bipartisan ideas. The question isn't if we are going to get them. The question is: Are we going to get enough?

The truth is, Mr. Speaker, the question isn't if their words ring true with you. The question is, knowing that their words rang true with you, will you add your vote to theirs? I am asking you to do that. I am asking my friend from Pennsylvania to do that. I am asking my friends from Massachusetts and California to do that.

I opened the debate today, Mr. Speaker, telling you we were so close to what I believe every man and woman in this Chamber come here to do, and that is work together, not to pick a fight, not to make an argument, but to make a difference. With some minor, minor tweaks, we can do that with every single piece of legislation that my friends in the majority want to bring forward today.

With just one vote to defeat the previous question, Mr. Speaker, and no tweaks at all, we can do that with the two measures that the gentlewoman from Missouri and the gentleman from Florida have put before us here today.

Mr. Speaker, vote with me. Defeat the previous question. Let's move forward to speak with one voice, not just to condemn anti-American sentiment, not just to protect pregnant women in the workplace, but to stand behind the public safety officers, the men and women in this country who show up every day of the week for us.

I ask my colleagues to defeat the previous question. In the absence of that, let's defeat the rule and follow exactly the advice my friend from Pennsylvania suggested, take all of these bills back to committee and bring them back out one more time. It doesn't have to be that way. We can move forward today.

Mr. Speaker, I do encourage my colleagues to defeat the previous question, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

We are in the midst of some of our country's most challenging times. Millions of Americans are facing eviction. They are food insecure. They don't know where their next paycheck is going to come from. 200,000 Americans have died, and that number is likely to double by the end of this year. We have a President wholly indifferent to the pandemic, other than its impact on his

political future, and Senate leaders aiding him every step of the way.

Months ago, the House passed the HEROES Act, which would be a lifeline to the people we serve. However, that bill remains untouched on Senator MCCONNELL's desk, with hundreds of others.

Included in that bill are lifelines for small business and working Americans, critical aid to State and local governments just trying to keep the lights on and to defend our citizens against the pandemic when national leadership is so lacking, and much-needed money that would go a long way to developing a vaccine for COVID-19.

The HEROES Act is money for our healthcare providers, our schools, our caretakers, and essential workers. It is a dereliction of duty for the Senate to refuse to engage in good faith on this critical legislation, and the American people will remember.

But while this bill remains in Senator MCCONNELL's legislative graveyard, we will continue to push for the protections that Americans need, deserve, and are calling out for. Each of the four pieces of legislation in our rule today will help our country and Americans all over.

From the beginning of the 116th Congress, this House has shown that it is up to the task of legislating for the people while exercising oversight and other critical constitutional duties.

While we have passed critical COVID-19-related legislation, we will not stop passing the legislation necessary to make this country a more equitable place for all Americans. We won't stop working for the American people, despite attacks by those who would prefer to posture.

There is no place for violence against law enforcement. There is no place for violence against our fellow citizens, whether that violence comes from the left or the right. There is no place for discrimination. Most of all, there is no place for stoking division between Americans, and we will beat that back at every opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "yes" vote on the rule and the previous question.

The material previously referred to by Mr. WOODALL is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 1107

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 9. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall resolve into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1325) to amend title 18, United States Code, to punish criminal offenses targeting law enforcement officers, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. When the committee rises and reports the bill back to the House

with a recommendation that the bill do pass, the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 10. Immediately after disposition of H.R. 1325, the House shall resolve into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 8251) to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit preventing access to life-saving medical procedures and treatments, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. When the committee rises and reports the bill back to the House with a recommendation that the bill do pass, the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 11. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 1325 and H.R. 8251.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

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

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 219, nays 170, not voting 41, as follows:

[Roll No. 185]

YEAS—219

Adams	Bustos	Connolly
Aguilar	Butterfield	Cooper
Allred	Carbajal	Correa
Axne	Cárdenas	Costa
Barragán	Carson (IN)	Courtney
Bass	Cartwright	Cox (CA)
Beatty	Case	Craig
Bera	Casten (IL)	Crist
Beyer	Castor (FL)	Crow
Bishop (GA)	Chu, Judy	Cuellar
Blumenauer	Ciциlline	Cunningham
Blunt Rochester	Cisneros	Dauids (KS)
Bonamici	Clark (MA)	Davis (CA)
Boyle, Brendan F.	Clarke (NY)	Davis, Danny K.
Brindisi	Clay	Dean
Brown (MD)	Cleaver	DeGette
Brownley (CA)	Clyburn	DeLauro
	Cohen	DelBene

Delgado	Lawrence	Richmond
Demings	Lawson (FL)	Rose (NY)
DeSaulnier	Lee (CA)	Rouda
Dingell	Lee (NV)	Roybal-Allard
Doggett	Levin (CA)	Ruiz
Doyle, Michael F.	Levin (MD)	Ruppersberger
Escobar	Lieu, Ted	Rush
Eshoo	Lipinski	Ryan
Espallat	Loeb sack	Sánchez
Evans	Lofgren	Sarbanes
Finkenauer	Lowenthal	Scanlon
Fletcher	Lowe y	Schakowsky
Foster	Luján	Schiff
Frankel	Luria	Schrader
Fudge	Lynch	Schrier
Gabbard	Malinowski	Scott (VA)
Gallego	Maloney,	Scott, David
Garamendi	Carolyn B.	Serrano
Garcia (IL)	Maloney, Sean	Sewell (AL)
Garcia (TX)	Matsui	Shalala
Gomez	McAdams	Sherman
Gottheimer	McBath	Sherrill
Green, Al (TX)	McCollum	Sires
Grijalva	McEachin	Slotkin
Haaland	McGovern	Smith (WA)
Harder (CA)	McNerney	Spanberger
Hastings	Meeks	Speier
Hayes	Meng	Stanton
Heck	Mfume	Stevens
Higgins (NY)	Moore	Suo zvi
Himes	Morelle	Swalwell (CA)
Horn, Kendra S.	Moulton	Takano
Horsford	Mucarsel-Powell	Thompson (CA)
Houlahan	Nadler	Thompson (MS)
Hoyer	Napolitano	Titus
Huffman	Neal	Tlaib
Jackson Lee	Neguse	Tonko
Jayapal	Norcross	Torres (CA)
Jeffries	O'Halleran	Torres Small
Johnson (GA)	Ocasio-Cortez	(NM)
Johnson (TX)	Omar	Trahan
Keating	Pallone	Underwood
Kelly (IL)	Panetta	Vargas
Kennedy	Pappas	Veasey
Khanna	Pascrell	Vela
Kildee	Payne	Velázquez
Kilmer	Perlmutter	Visclosky
Kim	Peters	Wasserman
Kind	Peterson	Schultz
Kirkpatrick	Phillips	Waters
Krishnamoorthi	Pingree	Watson Coleman
Kuster (NH)	Pocan	Welch
Lamb	Porter	Wexton
Langevin	Pressley	Wild
Larsen (WA)	Price (NC)	Wilson (FL)
Larson (CT)	Raskin	Yarmuth
	Rice (NY)	

NAYS—170

Allen	Diaz-Balart	Johnson (LA)
Amash	Duncan	Johnson (OH)
Amodei	Dunn	Johnson (SD)
Armstrong	Emmer	Jordan
Arrington	Estes	Joyce (OH)
Babin	Ferguson	Joyce (PA)
Bacon	Fitzpatrick	Katko
Baird	Fleischmann	Keller
Balderson	Flores	Kelly (PA)
Barr	Fortenberry	King (IA)
Biggs	Foxx (NC)	King (NY)
Bilirakis	Fulcher	Kinzing er
Bishop (NC)	Gallagher	LaHood
Bishop (UT)	Garcia (CA)	LaMalfa
Bost	Gianforte	Latta
Brady	Gibbs	Lesko
Brooks (AL)	Gohmert	Long
Brooks (IN)	Golden	Loudermilk
Buchanan	Gonzalez (OH)	Lucas
Buck	Gooden	Luetkemeyer
Bucshon	Gosar	Marchant
Budd	Graves (LA)	Marshall
Burgess	Graves (MO)	Massie
Calvert	Griffith	Mast
Carter (GA)	Grothman	McCarthy
Carter (TX)	Guthrie	McCaul
Chabot	Hagedorn	McKinley
Cheney	Harris	Meuser
Cline	Hartzler	Miller
Cloud	Hern, Kevin	Mitchell
Cole	Herrera Beutler	Moolenaar
Collins (GA)	Hice (GA)	Mooney (WV)
Comer	Higgins (LA)	Mullin
Conaway	Hill (AR)	Murphy (NC)
Crawford	Holding	Newhouse
Crenshaw	Hollingsworth	Norman
Curtis	Hudson	Olson
Davidson (OH)	Huizenga	Palmer
Davis, Rodney	Hurd (TX)	Perry
DesJarlais	Jacobs	Posey

Reed	Smith (NE)	Wagner
Reschenthaler	Smucker	Walberg
Rice (SC)	Spano	Walden
Roby	Staubert	Walker
Rodgers (WA)	Stefanik	Walorski
Roe, David P.	Steil	Waltz
Rogers (AL)	Steube	Watkins
Rogers (KY)	Stewart	Weber (TX)
Rooney (FL)	Stivers	Webster (FL)
Rose, John W.	Taylor	Westerman
Rouzer	Thompson (PA)	Williams
Roy	Thornberry	Wittman
Rutherford	Tiffany	Womack
Scalise	Tipton	Woodall
Schweikert	Turner	Young
Shimkus	Upton	Zeldin
Smith (MO)	Van Drew	

□ 1221

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SUOZZI) at 12 o'clock and 21 minutes p.m.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2574, EQUITY AND INCLUSION ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 2019; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2639, STRENGTH IN DIVERSITY ACT OF 2019; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2694, PREGNANT WORKERS FAIRNESS ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. RES. 908, CONDEMNING ALL FORMS OF ANTI-ASIAN SENTIMENT AS RELATED TO COVID-19; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on adoption of the resolution (H. Res. 1107) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2574) to amend title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to restore the right to individual civil actions in cases involving disparate impact, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2639) to establish the Strength in Diversity Program, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2694) to eliminate discrimination and promote women's health and economic security by ensuring reasonable workplace accommodations for workers whose ability to perform the functions of a job are limited by pregnancy, childbirth, or a related medical condition; providing for consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 908) condemning all forms of anti-Asian sentiment as related to COVID-19; and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 216, nays 157, not voting 57, as follows:

[Roll No. 186]

YEAS—216

NOT VOTING—41

Abraham	Graves (GA)	Riggleman
Aderholt	Green (TN)	Schneider
Banks	Guest	Scott, Austin
Bergman	Kaptur	Sensenbrenner
Burchett	Kelly (MS)	Simpson
Byrne	Kustoff (TN)	Smith (NJ)
Castro (TX)	Lamborn	Soto
Cook	McClintock	Timmons
DeFazio	McHenry	Trone
Deutch	Murphy (FL)	Wenstrup
Engel	Nunes	Wilson (SC)
Gaetz	Palazzo	Wright
Gonzalez (TX)	Pence	Yoho
Granger	Quigley	

□ 1210

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

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 965, 116TH CONGRESS

Barragán (Beyer)	Kirkpatrick (Gallego)	Pingree (Clark (MA))
Blumenauer (Beyer)	Langevin (Lynch)	Pocan (Raskin)
Butterfield (Kildee)	Lawrence (Kildee)	Porter (Wexton)
Chu, Judy (Takano)	Lawson (FL)	Rooney (FL)
Clay (Davids (KS))	(Evans)	(Beyer)
	Lieu, Ted (Beyer)	Roybal-Allard (Aguilar)
Cohen (Beyer)	Lipinski (Cooper)	Rush (Underwood)
Davis, Danny K. (Underwood)	Lofgren (Jeffries)	Serrano (Jeffries)
DeSaulnier (Beyer)	Lowenthal (Beyer)	Sewell (AL) (Del Bene)
Frankel (Clark (MA))	Meng (Clark (MA))	Thompson (MS) (Fudge)
García (IL)	Moore (Beyer)	Trahan (McGovern)
(Raskin)	Napolitano (Correa)	Watson Coleman (Pallone)
Grijalva (Raskin)	Pascarell (Pallone)	Welch (McGovern)
Hastings (Wasserman Schultz)	Payne (Wasserman)	Wilson (FL) (Hayes)
Jayapal (Raskin)	Schultz)	
Khanna (Gomez)		

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

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

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

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

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess for a period of less than 15 minutes.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 13 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

Adams	Case	Davids (KS)
Aguilar	Casten (IL)	Davis (CA)
Allred	Castor (FL)	Davis, Danny K.
Axne	Chu, Judy	Dean
Barragán	Cicilline	DeGette
Bass	Cisneros	DeLauro
Beatty	Clark (MA)	DelBene
Bera	Clarke (NY)	Delgado
Beyer	Clay	Demings
Bishop (GA)	Cleaver	DeSaulnier
Blumenauer	Clyburn	Dingell
Blunt Rochester	Cohen	Doggett
Bonamici	Connolly	Doyle, Michael F.
Boyle, Brendan F.	Cooper	Escobar
Brown (MD)	Correa	Eshoo
Brownley (CA)	Costa	Espallat
Bustos	Courtney	Evans
Butterfield	Cox (CA)	Finkenauer
Carbajal	Craig	Fletcher
Cárdenas	Crist	Foster
Carson (IN)	Crow	Frankel
Cartwright	Cuellar	Fudge
	Cunningham	

Gabbard	Lofgren	Ruppersberger
Gallego	Lowenthal	Rush
Garamendi	Lowey	Ryan
García (IL)	Lujan	Sánchez
García (TX)	Lynch	Sarbanes
Golden	Malinowski	Scanlon
Gomez	Maloney,	Schakowsky
Green, Al (TX)	Carolyn B.	Schiff
Grijalva	Maloney, Sean	Schrader
Haaland	Matsui	Schrier
Harder (CA)	McAdams	Scott (VA)
Hastings	McBath	Scott, David
Hayes	McCollum	Serrano
Heck	McEachin	Sewell (AL)
Higgins (NY)	McGovern	Shalala
Himes	McNerney	Sherman
Horn, Kendra S.	Meeks	Sherrill
Horsford	Meng	Sires
Houlihan	Mfume	Slotkin
Hoyer	Moore	Smith (WA)
Huffman	Morelle	Spanberger
Jackson Lee	Moulton	Speier
Jayapal	Mucarsel-Powell	Stanton
Jeffries	Nadler	Stevens
Johnson (GA)	Napolitano	Suozy
Johnson (TX)	Neal	Swalwell (CA)
Kaptur	Neguse	Takano
Keating	O'Halleran	Thompson (CA)
Kelly (IL)	Ocasio-Cortez	Thompson (MS)
Kennedy	Omar	Titus
Khanna	Pallone	Tlaib
Kildee	Panetta	Tonko
Kilmer	Pappas	Torres (CA)
Kim	Pascarell	Trahan
Kind	Payne	Underwood
Kirkpatrick	Perlmutter	Vargas
Krishnamoorthi	Peters	Veasey
Kuster (NH)	Peterson	Vela
Lamb	Phillips	Velázquez
Langevin	Pingree	Visclosky
Larsen (WA)	Pocan	Wasserman Schultz
Larson (CT)	Porter	Waters
Lawrence	Pressley	Watson Coleman
Lawson (FL)	Price (NC)	Welch
Lee (CA)	Raskin	Wexton
Lee (NV)	Rice (NY)	Wild
Levin (CA)	Richmond	Wilson (FL)
Levin (MI)	Rose (NY)	Yarmuth
Lieu, Ted	Rouda	
Lipinski	Roybal-Allard	
Loebsack	Ruiz	

NAYS—157

Allen	Fortenberry	Lucas
Amash	Fox (NC)	Luetkemeyer
Amodel	Fulcher	Marchant
Armstrong	Gallagher	Marshall
Arrington	García (CA)	Masie
Babin	Gianforte	Mast
Bacon	Gibbs	McKinley
Baird	Gohmert	Meuser
Balderson	Gonzalez (OH)	Miller
Barr	Gooden	Mitchell
Biggs	Gosar	Moolenaar
Bilirakis	Graves (LA)	Mooney (WV)
Bishop (NC)	Griffith	Mullin
Bishop (UT)	Grothman	Murphy (NC)
Bost	Guthrie	Newhouse
Brady	Hagedorn	Norman
Brooks (AL)	Harris	Olson
Brooks (IN)	Hartzler	Palmer
Buchanan	Hern, Kevin	Posey
Buck	Herrera Beutler	Reed
Bucshon	Hice (GA)	Reschenthaler
Budd	Higgins (LA)	Rice (SC)
Burgess	Holding	Roby
Calvert	Hollingsworth	Rodgers (WA)
Carter (GA)	Hudson	Roe, David P.
Carter (TX)	Huizenga	Rogers (AL)
Chabot	Hurd (TX)	Rogers (KY)
Cline	Jacobs	Rooney (FL)
Cloud	Johnson (LA)	Rose, John W.
Cole	Johnson (OH)	Rouzer
Collins (GA)	Johnson (SD)	Roy
Comer	Jordan	Rutherford
Conaway	Joyce (OH)	Schweikert
Crawford	Joyce (PA)	Shimkus
Crenshaw	Katko	Smith (MO)
Davidson (OH)	Keller	Smith (NE)
Davis, Rodney	Kelly (PA)	Smucker
Diaz-Balart	King (IA)	Spano
Duncan	King (NY)	Staubert
Dunn	Kinzinger	Stefanik
Emmer	LaHood	Steil
Estes	LaMalfa	Steube
Ferguson	Latta	Stivers
Fitzpatrick	Lesko	Taylor
Fleischmann	Long	Thompson (PA)
Flores	Loudermilk	Thornberry

Tiffany	Walden	Williams
Tipton	Walker	Wittman
Turner	Walorski	Womack
Upton	Watkins	Woodall
Van Drew	Weber (TX)	Young
Wagner	Webster (FL)	
Walberg	Westerman	

NOT VOTING—57

Abraham	Graves (MO)	Scalise
Aderholt	Green (TN)	Schneider
Banks	Guest	Scott, Austin
Bergman	Hill (AR)	Sensenbrenner
Brindisi	Kelly (MS)	Simpson
Burchett	Kustoff (TN)	Smith (NJ)
Byrne	Lamborn	Soto
Castro (TX)	Luria	Stewart
Cheney	McCarthy	Timmons
Cook	McCaul	Torres Small
Curtis	McClintock	(NM)
DeFazio	McHenry	Trone
DesJarlais	Murphy (FL)	Murphy (FL)
Deutch	Norcross	Waltz
Engel	Nunes	Wenstrup
Gaetz	Palazzo	Wilson (SC)
Gonzalez (TX)	Pence	Wright
Gottheimer	Perry	Yoho
Granger	Quigley	Zeldin
Graves (GA)	Riggleman	

□ 1310

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, on September 15, 2020, I missed the second vote on H. Res. 1107. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 186.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, September 15, 2020, I was honored to attend the Abraham Accords Signing Ceremony at the White House. This historic peace deal between the United Arab Emirates and Israel demonstrates President Trump's commitment to bring stability to the region. For the above reason, I was not recorded for roll call vote 185 and 186. Had I been present, I would have voted Nay on the Previous Question on H. Res. 1107 and Adoption of H. Res. 1107.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BERGMAN. Mr. Speaker, please accept this personal explanation as I was unavoidably detained due to my presence as the White House for the historic signing of the Abraham Accords between the United States, Israel, the United Arab Emirates, and Bahrain. Had I been present, I would have voted: "nay" on rollcall No. 185 and "nay" on rollcall No. 186.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, please accept this personal explanation as I was unavoidably detained due to my presence at the White House for the historic signing of the Abraham Accords between the United States, Israel, the United Arab Emirates, and Bahrain. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 185 and "nay" on rollcall No. 186.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 965, 116TH CONGRESS

Barragan (Beyer)	Davis, Danny K.	Hastings
Blumenauer	(Underwood)	(Wasserman
(Beyer)	DeSaulnier	Schultz)
Butterfield	(Matsui)	Jayapal (Raskin)
(Kildee)	Frankel (Clark	Khanna (Gomez)
Chu, Judy	(MA))	Kirkpatrick
(Takano)	Garcia (IL)	(Gallego)
Clay (Davids	(Raskin)	Langevin
(KS))	Grijalva (Raskin)	(Lynch)
Cohen (Beyer)		Lawrence
		(Kildee)

Lawson (FL)	Payne	Sewell (AL)
(Evans)	(Wasserman	(DelBene)
Lieu, Ted (Beyer)	Schultz)	Thompson (MS)
Lipinski (Cooper)	Pingree (Clark	(Fudge)
Lofgren (Jeffries)	(MA))	Trahan
Lowenthal	Pocan (Raskin)	(McGovern)
(Beyer)	Porter (Wexton)	Watson Coleman
Lowey (Tonko)	Rooney (FL)	(Pallone)
Meng (Clark	(Beyer)	Welch
(MA))	Roybal-Allard	(McGovern)
Moore (Beyer)	(Aguilar)	Wilson (FL)
Napolitano	Rush	(Hayes)
(Correa)	(Underwood)	
Pascarell	Serrano	
(Pallone)	(Jeffries)	

STRENGTH IN DIVERSITY ACT OF 2019

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on H.R. 2639, the Strength in Diversity Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ESPAILLAT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1107, I call up the bill (H.R. 2639) to establish the Strength in Diversity Program, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1107, in lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Education and Labor printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116-62, is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 2639

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 "Strength in Diversity Act of 2020".

SEC. 2. PURPOSE.

The purpose of this Act is to support the development, implementation, and evaluation of comprehensive strategies to address the effects of racial isolation or concentrated poverty by increasing diversity, including racial diversity and socioeconomic diversity, in covered schools.

SEC. 3. RESERVATION FOR NATIONAL ACTIVITIES.

The Secretary may reserve not more than 5 percent of the amounts made available under section 10 for a fiscal year to carry out activities of national significance relating to this Act, which may include—

(1) research, development, data collection, monitoring, technical assistance, evaluation, or dissemination activities; and

(2) the development and maintenance of best practices for recipients of grants under section 4 and other experts in the field of school diversity.

SEC. 4. GRANT PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.

(a) AUTHORIZATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—From the amounts made available under section 10 and not reserved under section 3 for a fiscal year, the Secretary shall award grants in accordance with subsection (b) to eligible entities to develop or implement plans to improve diversity and reduce

or eliminate racial or socioeconomic isolation in covered schools.

(2) TYPES OF GRANTS.—The Secretary may, in any fiscal year, award—

(A) planning grants to carry out the activities described in section 6(a);

(B) implementation grants to carry out the activities described in section 6(b); or

(C) both such planning grants and implementation grants.

(b) AWARD BASIS.—

(1) CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING APPLICATIONS.—The Secretary shall award grants under this section on a competitive basis, based on—

(A) the quality of the application submitted by an eligible entity under section 5; and

(B) the likelihood, as determined by the Secretary, that the eligible entity will use the grant to improve student outcomes or outcomes on other performance measures described in section 7.

(2) PRIORITY.—In awarding grants under this section, the Secretary shall give priority to the following eligible entities:

(A) First, to an eligible entity that proposes, in an application submitted under section 5, to use the grant to support a program that addresses racial isolation.

(B) Second, to an eligible entity that proposes, in an application submitted under section 5, to use the grant to support a program that extends beyond one local educational agency, such as an inter-district or regional program.

(c) DURATION OF GRANTS.—

(1) PLANNING GRANT.—A planning grant awarded under this section shall be for a period of not more than 1 year.

(2) IMPLEMENTATION GRANT.—An implementation grant awarded under this section shall be for a period of not more than 3 years, except that the Secretary may extend an implementation grant for an additional 2-year period if the eligible entity receiving the grant demonstrates to the Secretary that the eligible entity is making significant progress, as determined by the Secretary, on the program performance measures described in section 7.

SEC. 5. APPLICATIONS.

In order to receive a grant under section 4, an eligible entity shall submit an application to the Secretary at such time and in such manner as the Secretary may require. Such application shall include—

(1) a description of the program for which the eligible entity is seeking a grant, including—

(A) how the eligible entity proposes to use the grant to improve the academic and life outcomes of students in racial or socioeconomic isolation in covered schools by supporting interventions that increase diversity in such covered schools;

(B) in the case of an implementation grant, the implementation grant plan described in section 6(b)(1); and

(C) evidence, or if such evidence is not available, a rationale based on current research, regarding how the program will increase diversity;

(2) in the case of an eligible entity proposing to use any of the grant to benefit covered schools that are racially isolated, a description of how the eligible entity will identify and define racial isolation;

(3) in the case of an eligible entity proposing to use any portion of the grant to benefit high-poverty covered schools, a description of how the eligible entity will identify and define income level and socioeconomic status;

(4) a description of the plan of the eligible entity for continuing the program after the grant period ends;

(5) a description of how the eligible entity will assess, monitor, and evaluate the impact of the activities funded under the grant on student achievement and student enrollment diversity;

(6) an assurance that the eligible entity has conducted, or will conduct, robust parent and community engagement, while planning for and implementing the program, such as through—

(A) consultation with appropriate officials from Indian Tribes or Tribal organizations approved by the Tribes located in the area served by the eligible entity;

(B) consultation with other community entities, including local housing or transportation authorities;

(C) public hearings or other open forums to inform the development of any formal strategy to increase diversity; and

(D) outreach to parents and students, in a language that parents and students can understand, and consultation with students and families in the targeted district or region that is designed to ensure participation in the planning and development of any formal strategy to increase diversity;

(7) an estimate of the number of students that the eligible entity plans to serve under the program and the number of students to be served through additional expansion of the program after the grant period ends;

(8) an assurance that the eligible entity will—

(A) cooperate with the Secretary in evaluating the program, including any evaluation that might require data and information from multiple recipients of grants under section 4; and

(B) engage in the best practices developed under section 3(2);

(9) an assurance that, to the extent possible, the eligible entity has considered the potential implications of the grant activities on the demographics and student enrollment of nearby covered schools not included in the activities of the grant; and

(10) in the case of an eligible entity applying for an implementation grant, a description of how the eligible entity will—

(A) implement, replicate, or expand a strategy based on a strong or moderate level of evidence (as described in subclause (I) or (II) of section 8101(21)(A)(i) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801(21)(A)(i))); or

(B) test a promising strategy to increase diversity in covered schools.

SEC. 6. USES OF FUNDS.

(a) **PLANNING GRANTS.**—Each eligible entity that receives a planning grant under section 4 shall use the grant to support students in covered schools through the following activities:

(1) Completing a comprehensive assessment of, with respect to the geographic area served by such eligible entity—

(A) the educational outcomes and racial and socioeconomic stratification of children attending covered schools; and

(B) an analysis of the location and capacity of program and school facilities and the adequacy of local or regional transportation infrastructure.

(2) Developing and implementing a robust family, student, and community engagement plan, including, where feasible, public hearings or other open forums that would precede and inform the development of a formal strategy to improve diversity in covered schools.

(3) Developing options, including timelines and cost estimates, for improving diversity in covered schools, such as weighted lotteries, revised feeder patterns, school boundary redesign, or regional coordination.

(4) Developing an implementation plan based on community preferences among the options developed under paragraph (3).

(5) Building the capacity to collect and analyze data that provide information for transparency, continuous improvement, and evaluation.

(6) Developing an implementation plan to comply with a court-ordered school desegregation plan.

(7) Engaging in best practices developed under section 3(2).

(b) **IMPLEMENTATION GRANTS.**—

(1) **IMPLEMENTATION GRANT PLAN.**—Each eligible entity that receives an implementation grant

under section 4 shall implement a high-quality plan to support students in covered schools that includes—

(A) a comprehensive set of strategies designed to improve academic outcomes for all students, particularly students of color and low-income students, by increasing diversity in covered schools;

(B) evidence of strong family and community support for such strategies, including evidence that the eligible entity has engaged in meaningful family and community outreach activities;

(C) goals to increase diversity in covered schools over the course of the grant period;

(D) collection and analysis of data to provide transparency and support continuous improvement throughout the grant period; and

(E) a rigorous method of evaluation of the effectiveness of the program.

(2) **IMPLEMENTATION GRANT ACTIVITIES.**—Each eligible entity that receives an implementation grant under section 4 may use the grant to carry out one or more of the following activities:

(A) Recruiting, hiring, or training additional teachers, administrators, and other instructional and support staff in new, expanded, or restructured covered schools, or other professional development activities for staff and administrators.

(B) Investing in specialized academic programs or facilities designed to encourage inter-district school attendance patterns.

(C) Developing or initiating a transportation plan for bringing students to and from covered schools, if such transportation is sustainable beyond the grant period and does not represent a significant portion of the grant received by an eligible entity under section 4.

(D) Developing innovative and equitable school assignment plans.

(E) Carrying out innovative activities designed to increase racial and socioeconomic school diversity and engagement between children from different racial, economic, and cultural backgrounds.

SEC. 7. PERFORMANCE MEASURES.

The Secretary shall establish performance measures for the programs and activities carried out through a grant under section 4. These measures, at a minimum, shall track the progress of each eligible entity in—

(1) improving academic and other developmental or noncognitive outcomes for each subgroup described in section 1111(b)(2)(B)(xi) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6311(b)(2)(B)(xi)) that is served by the eligible entity on measures, including, as applicable, by—

(A) increasing school readiness;

(B) increasing student achievement and decreasing achievement gaps;

(C) increasing high school graduation rates;

(D) increasing readiness for postsecondary education and careers;

(E) reducing school discipline rates; and

(F) any other indicator the Secretary or eligible entity may identify; and

(2) increasing diversity and decreasing racial or socioeconomic isolation in covered schools.

SEC. 8. ANNUAL REPORTS.

An eligible entity that receives a grant under section 4 shall submit to the Secretary, at such time and in such manner as the Secretary may require, an annual report that includes—

(1) a description of the efforts of the eligible entity to increase inclusivity;

(2) information on the progress of the eligible entity with respect to the performance measures described in section 7; and

(3) the data supporting such progress.

SEC. 9. APPLICABILITY.

Section 426 of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. 1228) shall not apply with respect to activities carried out under a grant under this Act.

SEC. 10. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act such sums as may be nec-

essary for fiscal year 2020 and each of the 5 succeeding fiscal years.

SEC. 11. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) **COVERED SCHOOL.**—The term “covered school” means—

(A) a publicly-funded early childhood education program;

(B) a public elementary school; or

(C) a public secondary school.

(2) **ELIGIBLE ENTITY.**—The term “eligible entity” means a local educational agency, a consortium of such agencies, an educational service agency, or regional educational agency that at the time of the application of such eligible entity has significant achievement gaps and socioeconomic or racial segregation within or between the school districts served by such entity.

(3) **ESEA TERMS.**—The terms “educational service agency”, “elementary school”, “local educational agency”, “secondary school”, and “Secretary” have the meanings given such terms in section 8101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801).

(4) **PUBLICLY-FUNDED EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION PROGRAM.**—The term “publicly-funded early childhood education program” means an early childhood education program (as defined in section 103(8) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1003(8)) that receives State or Federal funds.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill, as amended, is debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor.

The gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. FUDGE) and the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Ohio.

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

Mr. Speaker, racial segregation in public education has been illegal for more than 66 years in the United States. Still, American public schools are more segregated today than at any time since the 1960s. The average African-American or Latino student attends schools with a majority of children of their own race.

Most of these schools serve a high number of low-income students forced to learn in old, broken-down buildings with fewer resources and disproportionately high rates of discipline.

Segregated schools are inherently unequal, creating barriers for the students who reside in underserved communities. It has been 66 years since the landmark decision in *Brown v. Board of Education*, and the promise of equal access to education has yet to be realized.

Today, public schools are not segregated because the law requires it, they are segregated by their ZIP Codes.

Segregation exists due to the erosion of a middle-class tax base. An erosion that has caused communities of color to become systemically poor. Essential services and public education are continuously underfunded.

These communities have been denied access to the intergenerational wealth that comes from homeownership due to discriminatory housing patterns and mortgage lending policies. This is particularly true for Black communities.

When districts split schools between affluent and poor neighborhoods, it draws a bright line between the haves and the have-nots. This type of separation inflicts the same harm on students today as legalized segregation did prior to 1954.

That is why I introduced H.R. 2639, the Strength in Diversity Act. It directly addresses inequities in public education by authorizing funding to support local education leaders in their efforts to lessen racial and socioeconomic isolation in public schools.

The Strength in Diversity Act will ensure every student has equitable access to a quality education. This is one step toward remedying the issue of segregated schools.

The bill provides support for school districts that are developing, expanding, or implementing school diversity initiatives.

Eligible school districts can devote funding to study the adverse effects of segregation, provide equitable access to transportation, create programs to attract children from neighboring communities, and recruit new specialized teachers.

Studies show school integration benefits students of all races. Even the conservative think tank, the Hoover Institution, agrees that diverse learning environments help close the achievement gap and lead to numerous academic, social and cognitive benefits. Research tells us school integration results in cross-racial friendships and a decline in stereotyping, allowing students to better navigate an increasingly diverse society and preparing them for real world experiences.

Mr. Speaker, the Strength in Diversity Act is not new policy. It is practically the same policy the Obama administration sought to pursue in its 2016 Opening Doors, Expanding Opportunities program, which provided \$12 million to help school districts increase diversity.

Nearly 30 school districts from 22 States and the District of Columbia applied for the Obama-era integration grant, but the program was eliminated by the current administration in 2017 without explanation. That decision came at a time when research clearly showed a resurgence in segregated schools.

Totally ignoring this increase in separate educational facilities, Education Secretary Betsy DeVos moved to rescind Federal guidance to assist school districts in pursuit of racial diversity. When my Education and Labor Committee colleague Representative TRONE asked the Secretary about this rescission, she said she was “unfamiliar with the guidance.” That was 2 years ago. Since then, things have gotten worse, not better.

Mr. Speaker, we are experiencing a racial reckoning in this country. Despite efforts from 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue to sow racial division, I remain hopeful.

Now is the time to enact the Strength in Diversity Act and provide

school districts with the support they need to tackle the task of true integration.

This is hard work, but necessary work, and it is past time the Federal Government support local leaders to fulfill the promise of Brown.

Today, I urge my colleagues to make a commitment to put an end to racial and socioeconomic isolation and segregation in our Nation’s public schools by voting in favor of the Strength in Diversity Act.

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

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in opposition to H.R. 2639, the Strength in Diversity Act.

Republicans and Democrats agree that discrimination and State-sanctioned segregation are repugnant, illegal, and blatantly immoral. Studies have shown that integrated schools promote greater understanding, tolerance, and improved educational outcomes.

I don’t disagree with the intentions behind this bill but have major reservations about its efficacy. Will this bill stand the test of time? Will these ideas have helped the ongoing effort to achieve greater equality for children? Sadly, the answer is no.

The Education and Labor Committee has a long history of reaching across the aisle and finding common ground to effect meaningful reform for our Nation’s schools and students.

The legislation before us today was another opportunity for committee Republicans and Democrats to find bipartisan compromise. Unfortunately, committee Democrats ignored common-sense approaches to this problem to impose a top-down, Big Government mandate that would have the Federal Government decide how best to address the issues of racial and socioeconomic isolation in America’s schools.

As we have seen many times before, additional government mandates and burdensome red tape are not the answer. Congress has already set up the Student Support and Academic Enrichment Grants, a block grant created to give school districts flexibility to pursue local solutions to their communities’ educational challenges. Local and State leaders and those with their feet on the ground know how best to combat these challenges, not the Federal Government.

That is why Representative ALLEN will offer a Republican alternative later today that will provide this House a bipartisan solution that could easily garner an overwhelming majority of support in this Chamber if every Member chose to focus on the importance of actually addressing racial and socioeconomic isolation in schools. His amendment would ensure that nearly every school district in the country would have the flexibility with Federal funds they may need to tackle this problem. This is how legislating for so-

lutions, rather than legislating for headlines can work.

Republicans want nothing more than to see all American children prosper. That means expanding opportunities for marginalized students to gain access to an education that prepares them for lifelong success. It also means school districts taking action to reduce racial and socioeconomic isolation in schools.

A bipartisan path forward to make that possible is achievable, but Democrats would rather score political points than work with Republicans on solutions that will make a significant difference in the lives of our Nation’s children.

Instead of building upon a program that has bipartisan, bicameral support, Democrats’ H.R. 2639 sets up a new grant program within the Department of Education that will inevitably be underfunded, if it is funded at all.

Creating more government programs that have to scramble for funding in order to operate successfully is the last thing we need to foster the best environment for all students to learn.

H.R. 2639 also ignores the biggest problem facing low-income students and students of color—a lack of high-quality educational options. Committee Republicans stand ready to work with our colleagues in the majority to expand educational opportunities to all families. But rather than bring a bill to the floor that would expand the availability of charter schools or offer marginalized families the kind of educational freedom that the wealthy exercise for themselves, Democrats decided teachers unions are more important to them than real families who are desperate for access to a better education for their children.

My Republican colleagues and I believe that expanding opportunities for students should be a priority. We know school choice gives families the opportunity to break the cycle of poverty and enroll their children in challenging environments that better develop their skills and intellect, encouraging them to reach higher. In fact, studies show that when students are given the freedom to attend school in a learning environment best suited to their abilities, they pursue and complete postsecondary opportunities at higher rates.

Access to opportunities, freedom to climb, these are aspects of a student’s education that must be equal for all children nationwide. No one-size-fits-all structure can deliver on those essentials. Separate was never equal, but equality cannot simply mean uniformity if that uniformity doesn’t prepare students for lifelong success. Equality is affirming that all children are fundamentally the same in dignity, importance, and worth but also understanding that not all children’s needs are the same.

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

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I think that we all want commonsense solutions, but as proven by Secretary

DeVos, common sense is not always common, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4½ minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), the chair of the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Strength in Diversity Act.

It has been 66 years since the Supreme Court unanimously struck down public school segregation in the landmark case of *Brown v. Board of Education*. In that case, the Court declared that public education where the State has undertaken to provide it, is a right which must be made available to all on equal terms.

The Court went on to say that, “in the field of public education, the doctrine of ‘separate but equal’ has no place. Separate educational facilities are inherently unequal.”

More than six decades later, we have failed to fulfill that promise. According to the Government Accountability Office, our public schools are more segregated today by race and class than at any time since the 1960s, and segregation is actually getting worse according to the Government Accountability Office.

□ 1330

School segregation has profound consequences for students. Today, low-income students of color are more likely to attend schools with fewer experienced teachers and resources. In fact, schools serving predominantly students of color face a \$23 billion funding gap compared to schools serving predominantly White students.

Now, we know that integration works. Black students who attend integrated schools have higher test scores and are more likely to graduate from high school, complete college, and even earn higher wages throughout their lives.

Communities across the country have recognized the importance of school diversity for student success and have developed integrative strategies to promote diversity in education.

In 2016, dozens of school districts applied for funding under the Opening Doors, Expanding Opportunities grant program, which was designed to help schools to pursue voluntary, community-driven school integration strategies. Regrettably, one of Secretary Betsy DeVos’ first actions in office was to terminate that program before any money was disbursed.

The Strength in Diversity Act corrects this action by providing Federal support to help school districts develop, implement, or expand efforts to integrate their local schools.

The legislation will also shield these resources from the whims of changing administrations and allow communities to compile best practices for tackling segregation.

This expertise is critical because of a series of Supreme Court rulings that have been hostile to integration. Most

recently, in the Parents Involved case, the Court struck down two voluntary integration plans, one in Louisville, Kentucky, and the other in Seattle, Washington. The Court held that using race in desegregation plans is constitutional, but only if the plan is narrowly tailored to address the compelling interest of integrating the public schools. Unfortunately, they ruled in those cases that the plans were not narrowly tailored.

The Strength in Diversity Act will provide resources so that the localities will be able to design plans that will be not only effective, but also be able to withstand constitutional challenge.

Addressing America’s legacy of racial discrimination is often uncomfortable and complicated. However, we must confront, not ignore, inequities in education if we are to reckon with this legacy and overcome a global pandemic that threatens to worsen the achievement gaps.

Our former colleague, Congressman John Lewis, once stated: “When you see something that is not right, not fair, not just, you have to speak up. You have to say something. You have to do something.”

Let’s follow his guidance and vote for the first time in more than three decades to provide new resources that will help integrate our public schools and fulfill the promise of equity in education.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to support the Strength in Diversity Act. I thank the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. FUDGE) for her distinguished leadership in this legislation.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), my good friend.

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, first, let me just thank the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. FUDGE) for yielding and for her tremendous leadership on behalf of our children, but also for demonstrating what strength in diversity means throughout her life’s work. I thank her for bringing this Strength in Diversity bill to the floor, H.R. 2639.

Let me just say a couple of things. First of all, this bill takes action where Secretary DeVos and the administration have failed to act to make sure that all of our children, no matter what color they are, get the same opportunities to get an education and pursue their dreams. We have had this discussion over and over and over again in the Appropriations Committee with the Secretary.

Sixty years ago, Ruby Bridges was the first African-American student to attend an integrated school in the South. Yes, as has been said by our chair and also the gentlewoman authoring this bill, this is 66 years after *Brown v. Board of Education*.

We still have segregation in our school districts, and it is leading to

measurably unjust outcomes for Black and Brown students, robbing them of their future.

Now, when I started school, mind you, schools were segregated. My family in El Paso, Texas, fought to desegregate schools, especially my beloved mother, Mildred Parish Massey, who was one of the first students to integrate the University of Texas at El Paso.

In addition to the GAO report, a 2019 report out of Stanford University also reviewed hundreds of millions of test scores from students across the Nation. Their findings show that racial segregation leaves Black and Brown students concentrated in high-poverty schools, leading to a huge opportunity deficit even for high-performing students.

In fact, they found large achievement gaps in every single school district with just moderately high segregation. This fact remains. This data is the same. Also, these schools have fewer resources, and the students experience more disciplinary actions than in more diverse schools.

The Strength in Diversity Act would help reverse this segregation by promoting diversity, increasing student achievement and readiness, and investing in our children.

The bill would authorize Federal funding to provide grants to support new and existing local efforts to increase racial and socioeconomic diversity in our schools.

It would further document segregation in our public schools, implement programs to recruit and hire diverse teachers, and work to ensure our students have equitable access to resources.

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

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman.

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congresswoman FUDGE for yielding the additional time.

Let me conclude by saying, in doing this, Congresswoman FUDGE and Chairman SCOTT have documented this, that by having equitable access to resources, we actually found that racial prejudice is reduced by making sure that our children are in diverse schools and classrooms.

All of our students should receive the best education regardless of their race and ethnicity. That is what this bill is about.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Congresswoman FUDGE, the gentlewoman from Ohio, for putting forth this bill, because she more than most knows the importance of diversity.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN).

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman, Ms. FUDGE,

for allowing me the time. I acknowledge Mr. SCOTT for the outstanding work that he has done on this legislation, among many other pieces of legislation.

I have an amendment that speaks for itself. This amendment deals with the entry exams that fail the diversity test at many elite schools—elite schools, by the way, that are funded with tax dollars that come from poor communities, elite schools that can accept tax dollars but cannot accept the students who are from communities that are affording the schools the tax dollars.

The amendment reads: If applicable—meaning if you haven't done it already—develop an implementation plan to replace entrance exams or other competitive application procedures with methods of student assignments to promote racial and socioeconomic diversity.

This amendment does deal with minorities, but it also deals with other persons who happen to be disadvantaged. Mr. Speaker, that is another way of saying poor White people. They, too, suffer from disadvantages associated with the elite tests that can fail even some of the best that come from schools that have little resources.

I believe that if this amendment is passed, this amendment is going to encourage schools to do what John Lewis would call the right thing, the just thing, the fair thing.

Mr. Speaker, I support the amendment and beg that my colleagues would support it as well.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congresswoman FOXX for yielding. I appreciate the opportunity to address this issue today.

I rise in opposition to H.R. 2639, and I oppose it because I believe every child should have access to a good education. I have long advocated for the need to expand choice to each student so that they have the opportunity to live out the American Dream regardless of their ZIP Code or family resources. In fact, we talked about this very thing on the steps of the Capitol this morning.

H.R. 2639 is a partisan proposal that would impose a top-down, Big Government solution—that is the problem—allowing the Federal Government to decide how best to address the issues of racial and socioeconomic isolation in America's schools.

Unfortunately, this debate is not about equality for all children. If it were, we would have ensured no State had the ability to trap students in low-performing schools.

Rather than bring a bill to the House floor that would expand the availability of charter schools or offer families educational freedom, Democrats have decided the teachers unions are more important to them than real families who are desperate for access to a better education for their children.

Additionally, this partisan proposal would create another Federal program while ignoring existing priorities.

During committee markup, I offered a substitute amendment to the bill that would have expanded the Student Support and Academic Enrichment Grants, or SSAEG, in the Every Student Succeeds Act to allow school districts to use funds to reduce or eliminate racial or socioeconomic isolation in schools.

The SSAEG were authorized on a bipartisan basis to give school districts flexible funding to address local needs and receive \$1.21 billion in fiscal year 2020 appropriated funds.

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

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, committee Democrats rejected my amendment and chose to push forward a partisan bill that would only result in another broken promise from the Federal Government.

Instead of working in a bipartisan, bicameral fashion to implement a commonsense solution, Democrats are once again choosing partisan political messaging over sound policy.

It has been a tough year, especially on families who have had to adapt to learning in the age of coronavirus. So, let's have a real conversation on how we can best serve our students and families by working to expand choice.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this partisan bill before it is too late.

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I have no idea what bill my colleagues are reading. There is nothing in this bill about teachers unions or anything else that they are talking about.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. ADAMS), my colleague, who is also a member of the Education and Labor Committee.

Ms. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. FUDGE) for yielding and for her incredible leadership on this issue.

It has been 66 years since the Brown v. Board of Education decision when this country took a step toward making amends for its legacy of oppression and discrimination against African Americans. But policymakers haven't always done the work necessary to make the promises of Brown a reality.

After years of gains, the last three decades have been marked by increased racial isolation for Black and Brown students.

Since 1988, the percentage of schools where less than 10 percent of the student body is White has increased from 6 to 18 percent. More than half of our Nation's schoolchildren are in districts where over 75 percent of students look just like them.

So, I am happy that today, after 30 years of backsliding, the House will take a vote to live up to the legacy of Brown.

The Strength in Diversity Act is as good as its name. It will restore the government's commitment to school desegregation and to ensuring that every child receives equal opportunity because as Brown told us, separate is inherently unequal.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to help this Nation live up to those ideals by voting in support of the Strength in Diversity Act. I thank my colleague from Ohio for bringing this bill forward.

□ 1345

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2639, the Strength in Diversity Act. I thank this bill's sponsor, Congresswoman FUDGE, and Chairman SCOTT for shepherding this bill through the Education and Labor Committee.

Nearly 20 years after Brown v. Board of Education, lesser-known Supreme Court cases like Milliken v. Bradley determined that segregation was allowed, if not considered an explicit policy, of each school district.

This meant schools and communities were not held responsible for desegregation. Busing policies meant to integrate city and suburban schools were abandoned and the inequality created by racist redlining and exclusionary housing policies continued, keeping Black Americans out of the suburbs and trapped in underfunded schools to this day. Today, the school system at the center of Milliken v. Bradley, Detroit's, is more segregated than it was in 1974.

This bill will provide grants to improve racial and socioeconomic diversity in public schools, an essential step toward fulfilling the promise of Brown v. Board, ending the segregation that continues to plague school districts across this country, including in my own district, Michigan's Ninth.

Thurgood Marshall, the Supreme Court's first Black Justice, warned in his dissent in Milliken v. Bradley, "unless our children begin to learn together, there is little hope that our people will ever learn to live together and understand each other."

As we reckon with our Nation's past and work to dismantle racist institutions that have stood for far too long, let us not forget our children.

I urge my colleagues to vote for this bill.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, Democrats' approach in H.R. 2639 is wrong for our Nation's schools and students if we hope to achieve greater equality for children nationwide. Not only does this bill push another Democrat-led, top-down, Big Government mandate, but it has

also been crafted to mirror a failed Obama administration program.

At the Rules Committee yesterday, and also referenced today, Chairman SCOTT touted the fact that 30 school districts applied under the Opening Doors, Expanding Opportunities program created during the Obama administration. For the sake of debate, let's say that half of those school districts had been awarded funding. That is only 15 school districts nationwide that would have received Federal funding under President Obama's program that this bill is modeled after.

In contrast to this failed approach, Representative ALLEN will offer an amendment that would allow school districts to use funds from an existing Federal grant program to accomplish the same goals as the Democrats' bill.

About 12,000 school districts receive ESEA block grant funding every year. By supporting Representative ALLEN's amendment, we can ensure that nearly every school district in the country has the flexibility to tackle this problem using taxpayer funds at the Federal level. This is how legislating for solutions, rather than legislating for headlines, can work.

A high-quality education is an indispensable tool, and America's children deserve nothing less than an education that empowers them to reach their greatest potential. This bill doesn't move us in that direction.

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

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. SHALALA).

Ms. SHALALA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2639 and congratulate my fellow Clevelander, Representative FUDGE, and Chairman SCOTT for their leadership, and all the members of the committee on Education and Labor who have worked tirelessly to get us here today.

We know that modern school segregation is largely related to housing and income segregation, with the worst cases concentrated in urban and suburban areas.

Research shows that schools with a large proportion of middle-class White students tend to have access to more resources. They benefit from challenging, college-level courses, teachers and guidance counselors who can help plan for college, and from wide-ranging extracurricular activities in sports, the arts, and music, all of which greatly contribute to a student's academic achievement.

The impact, however, goes well beyond academic opportunities. Children who aren't regularly exposed to people from other backgrounds are less likely to see racial and economic disparities as a problem.

Diversity, almost everyone agrees, is good; inclusion is good; exposure to different cultures and ideas is good.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to represent Miami, a city that values diversity and multiculturalism as the backbone of our society.

Miami is the second largest minority-majority school district in the Nation, where more than 92 percent of the students are Black or Hispanic, students whose families often escaped political persecution and extreme poverty. Yet the typical Black or Hispanic student attends an underresourced school where more than 60 percent of other students come from low-income families.

Similarly, schools with large Black enrollment don't excel in State ratings, and Black students are woefully underrepresented in the district's stellar magnet program.

The grants in H.R. 2639 would fund efforts to explore different approaches to integration, recruit or train staff to better serve minority students, and engage local communities on specialized academic programs.

If we as policymakers say we have an interest in increasing the academic success rate for Black and Hispanic youth, then we support H.R. 2639.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2639, the Strength in Diversity Act.

I thank Congresswoman MARCIA FUDGE and Chairman BOBBY SCOTT for their leadership and for affording me the opportunity to speak today, and I am proud to support this important step toward addressing the legacy of segregation in America's schools.

"Segregation distorts the soul," Martin Luther King, Jr. wrote in 1936 from a Birmingham jail. Yet 66 years after the Supreme Court unanimously held in *Brown v. Board of Education* that racial segregation of children in public schools is unconstitutional, segregation remains a reality for many of America's children. It is a persistent stain on the soul of our country.

The Strength in Diversity Act incentivizes inclusive educational environments and promotes racial and socioeconomic diversity in schools as instrumental to the education and development of every single child. This act encourages school districts to study the effects of segregation, evaluate their current policies, and implement evidence-based solutions to deepen diversity in their schools through inclusive policies.

We all wish that racism was a thing of the past. It is not. We must actively confront our Nation's sins, past and present. We must confront the fear and the hatred embedded in our institutions, embracing, once and for all, the strength of our diversity.

America can do better for our children, and we must. And it is important to remember, discrimination robs the victim of the ability to become all that they can, of their full potential. But it also robs the entire community of what that person could contribute and do,

free of the pernicious discrimination that is at the heart of this legislation.

So I urge all of my colleagues to vote in support of H.R. 2639.

I thank Congresswoman FUDGE and Chairman SCOTT for their extraordinary leadership.

I am really proud that this bill is on the floor today, and I hope my Republican colleagues will embrace their responsibility to help end racism in this country and in our schools and be sure that every child in America has the same opportunity to realize their full potential.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. BEATTY), my good friend.

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend, Congresswoman MARCIA FUDGE, for bringing this bill to this Chamber.

I stand here as the chair of the Subcommittee on Diversity and Inclusion. I have probably spent more hours and time looking into the difference diversity makes, whether it is a small business, whether it is an educational system, whether it is a child.

I remind us to history. In 1960, a little Black girl by the name of Ruby Bridges was denied the right to enter a school—against the Supreme Court of this land—by a Governor.

I stand here on this floor and hear indictments about President Obama. Mr. Speaker, let me say to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, anything that his educational Secretaries did was better than what we have now with Secretary Betsy DeVos.

Let me just say that it is so important when we think about diversity and inclusion and we think about those little children, Black children, marginalized White children.

When I look at the votes for what my colleagues on the other side have said about us—and they don't vote for budgets; they don't vote for funding that can save lives—their arguments are weak. Their arguments are unfounded.

This bill is about equal opportunity. This bill is about removing systemic racism.

We already know that racism is a national crisis. So when I think of housing, when I think about feeding a child, what kind of Member of Congress would stand here against Congresswoman FUDGE, Congressman BOBBY SCOTT, who is the chair of this committee and has done more in his lifetime on education than anyone who has been to this microphone on the other side?

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, we all want to create the maximum amount of opportunity for our children, regardless of their background. That is why it is unfortunate

that this legislation fails to fix the most tragic inequity in our education system: the absence of choice.

The right to a high-quality education is fundamental to the promise of America, and no child should be denied that right because of income or background. Thankfully, President Trump and Republicans in Congress are working to provide that opportunity to all families.

I am proud to have introduced the CHOICE Act, which creates opportunity grants that families can use for private school tuition, microschoools, learning pods, and homeschooling costs.

My bill ensures that all families—not just those with the means or those lucky enough to live in a wealthy school district—have access to the best possible education for their child. Giving families this choice is the only way to furnish equal access to the American Dream. Republicans are ready to take this step. If Democrats join us, we can make it a reality.

□ 1400

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time remains.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Ohio has 6¼ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from North Carolina has 17½ minutes remaining.

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. MFUME).

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Speaker, this legislation, this bill, this movement, and this purpose that we are debating today really found its genesis long ago with a Supreme Court decision in *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, Kansas*, when, on May 17, 1954, nine men robed in black assembled not far from here to announce on the steps their unanimous decision to end segregation in public education. On that day, among the Nation's Black citizens, there was, indeed, a celebration, and it was a celebration, indeed, by many of its Whites.

Many of us thought that this decision was the launching of the threshold of a new era in life when education all across this Nation would be treated the way it should be for all of its citizens. Many people felt in the bowels of their being and in their very existence that this Nation again at long last would find a way to launch itself into a new era.

So this is the manifestation of that new era. This legislation extends the guarantees, the protections, and the expectations of that decision; and it is the expectations that we are talking about today: to be able to provide the kind of education and the kind of treatment of education that would extend to all people, to increase diversity, and to do away with those things that have held us back for so many, many years.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the sponsor of this bill. I urge my colleagues to

understand her intent and the expectations that it brings with it so that we might do the right thing and pass it. I urge an "aye" vote, Mr. Speaker.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Mr. Speaker, Republicans and Democrats agree that discrimination and State-sanctioned segregation are repugnant, illegal, and blatantly immoral. Action must be taken to achieve greater equality for our Nation's students and in our schools.

We continue to strive toward a future where all students, regardless of race or color, have the chance to succeed. Education and hard work are the paths out of poverty for millions, and education provides students with the tools and skills they need to build a successful life.

It is disappointing that a bipartisan path forward to address these issues was possible but not attained because of political posturing from Democrats. Apparently, political wins are more important than building upon bipartisan, bicameral legislative solutions that will help our Nation's children prosper.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on H.R. 2639 so that we can have the opportunity to work on a bipartisan solution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, we started this out with the ranking member saying we just wanted headlines. I absolutely want headlines to bring to the attention of this country the poverty in our schools. I want headlines about the crumbling schools my children go to school in. I do want headlines about the disinvestment in public education that my colleagues continue to do.

I want the headlines. So I admit it.

We also talked this afternoon about how equality cannot mean uniformity, but it can also not mean doing nothing but giving lip service to a problem, which is what my colleagues do. They talk and do nothing. Not one solution comes from the other side of the aisle—not one. I didn't hear one today.

Then we talk about this amendment that is coming to use another fund to help us do some of these things. They don't tell you, Mr. Speaker, that that fund is a fund that is used for mental health for children. So they want us to choose between integrating schools and the mental health of our children.

I think if that is the best they have got then I am so very, very disappointed, Mr. Speaker, because at some point we have to reckon with what is going on in this country today and deal with the racial segregation of my children—and they are all my children.

Mr. Speaker, if we fail to begin to address this issue—and this is only a beginning—then we can no longer say we agree that every child should have access to a quality education, that every

child should go to a school that has the kind of equipment that they should have, that every child has internet and broadband access, and that every child has an opportunity to succeed. If we don't do this, we don't mean it.

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

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2639, the Strength in Diversity Act. This landmark legislation would allow our students to learn in an environment that is representative of America, rather than being in a bubble with other students who look like them or share the same backgrounds and experiences.

66 years ago, the Supreme Court opened the door to school integration with their ruling in *Brown vs. Board of Education*. Soon after, schools in my home state of Texas and other states across the south started the process of integrating Black and White students so that one day there would be a level playing field for students in the classroom.

However, since that period, we have slowly seen a creeping effect where students have been divided into bubbles based strictly on the neighborhoods where they live. Opposition to bussing, white flight to the suburbs, and lingering systematic racism have all contributed to the alarming situation we find ourselves in today as a country.

A GAO report published in 2016 found that 61 percent of all high-poverty schools served majority Black and Hispanic students. This separation by racial and socioeconomic lines prevents students in our poorest neighborhoods from getting the same educational outcomes as those in wealthier ones. Studies have shown that more diverse schools lead to better grades and test results, higher rates of college attendance, and lower dropout rates for students.

This bill helps to stem the tide and reverse the wrongs of the past few decades by authorizing federal funding to provide grants to school districts across the country to promote racial and socioeconomic diversity. Specifically, this additional funding could be used by school districts to study the impact of segregation in their schools, create innovative programs like magnet schools to attract students from outside the local community, and to train, hire, and retain high quality teachers to support these diversified schools.

Mr. Speaker, North Texas is blessed to have such a diversified community; however, I have seen how some neighborhoods in my district have had better educational outcomes for students than others. It's time that we level the playing field and give every student an opportunity at success. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2639, the "Strength in Diversity Act." H.R. 2639, directs the Department of Education (ED) to award grants to specified educational agencies, that may include local educational agencies, to develop or implement plans to improve diversity and reduce or eliminate racial or socioeconomic isolation in publicly funded early childhood education programs, public elementary schools, or public secondary schools. Specifically, ED may award planning and implementation grants to specified educational agencies.

A recipient of a planning grant must use the grant to support students through certain activities, such as developing options to improve

diversity in schools that might include weighted lotteries or school boundary redesign. In addition, a recipient of an implementation grant must implement a high-quality plan to support students. This plan must, among other things, include a comprehensive set of strategies that are designed to improve academic outcomes for all students, particularly students of color and low-income students. A grant recipient may also use the grant for certain activities such as recruiting additional teachers and staff, investing in specialized academic programs, and developing innovative and equitable school assignment plans.

This legislation will also allow ED to carry out national activities under the grant program, such as developing best practices for grant recipients and other experts in school diversity. The bill also requires ED to establish performance measures for the program and its related activities.

H.R. 2639 is needed because for far too often, for reasons of legacy or policy, students of color or in low-income communities are shut out of the opportunity to get a good education. Just as intolerance and discrimination are learned behaviors, so are tolerance and inclusion learned behaviors. As years of research have shown us, school integration benefits students and communities. Research shows that racial and socioeconomic diversity in the classroom can provide students with a range of cognitive and social benefits. And school policies around the country are beginning to catch up.

Today, over 4 million students in America are enrolled in school districts or charter schools with socioeconomic integration policies—a number that has more than doubled since 2007. Students in integrated schools have higher average test scores. On the 2011 National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) given to fourth graders in math, for example, low-income students attending more affluent schools scored roughly two years of learning ahead of low-income students in high-poverty schools.

Students in integrated schools are more likely to enroll in college, when comparing students with similar socioeconomic backgrounds, those students at more affluent schools are 68 percent more likely to enroll at a four-year college than their peers at high-poverty schools. Students in integrated schools are less likely to dropout, with dropout rates that are significantly higher for students in segregated, high-poverty schools than for students in integrated schools. Education policy is contributing to systemic racism that exists in how education is provided in the United States, which resists efforts to remove barriers that would allow all children to succeed.

It has been well documented that integrated schools help to reduce racial achievement gaps. In fact, the racial achievement gap in K through 12 education closed more rapidly during the peak years of school desegregation in the 1970s and 1980s than it has overall in the decades that followed—when many desegregation policies were dismantled through federal court decisions allowing discriminatory segregated education to continue. Benefits are not limited to minority students, but also extend to white students.

Integrated classrooms encourage critical thinking, problem solving, and creativity. We know that diverse classrooms, in which students learn cooperatively alongside those

whose perspectives and backgrounds are different from their own, are beneficial to all students—including middle-class white students—because these environments promote creativity, motivation, deeper learning, critical thinking, and problem-solving skills.

This bill will help in this effort by providing grants to school districts that want to increase diversity in schools. As many of you know the school-age population in the United States is becoming more racially and ethnically diverse. A National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) report released in February 2019, on “Status and Trends in the Education of Racial and Ethnic Groups 2018,” examined how education experiences and outcomes vary among racial/ethnic groups. The report contains 36 indicators that cover preprimary to postsecondary education, as well as family background characteristics and labor force outcomes.

Prior research shows that living in poverty during early childhood is associated with lower-than-average academic performance that begins in kindergarten and extends through high school, leading to lower-than-average rates of school completion. In 2016, the percentages of children living in poverty were highest for Black and American Indian/ Alaska Native children and lowest for White and Asian children.

One of the casualties of COVID-19 are the millions of children and young people who have lost out on opportunities to learn and grow in diverse school settings during the spring and fall of this year. Between 2000 and 2017, the percentage of 5- to 17-year-olds who were White decreased from 62 to 51 percent, while the percentage who were Hispanic increased from 16 to 25 percent. The challenge of diversity in education is not just limited to racial diversity in schools. Questions of socioeconomic diversity combined with those of racial diversity are important to consider in determining how far we have come in school equality. This bill builds on the work already underway by schools and school districts who are pursuing diversity to have additional resources.

In 2019, approximately 56.6 million students attended elementary and secondary school in the United States: 50.8 million students were in public schools; 5.8 million students were in private schools. Among the 50.8 million students enrolled in elementary and secondary public schools: 1.4 million were in prekindergarten; 3.7 million were in kindergarten; 35.5 million attended elementary through middle school (K–8th grade); 15.3 million attended high school (9–12th grade). Through 2028, enrollment is projected to increase to 51.4 million.

In 2018, 3.3 million students graduated from high school, marking nearly a 1 percent increase from 2017: 3.7 million were expected to graduate in 2020; 3.3 million from public high schools; 0.4 million from private schools. The average per-student expenditure in public schools is \$13,440.

In 2019, there are approximately 16,800 school districts in the United States. Thirteen percent of all public school students were served by the Individuals with Disabilities Act for the 2015–2016 school year.

Between 2000 and 2016, total public school enrollment increased for 32 states. The following saw increases of 15 percent or more: Florida, Delaware, North Carolina, Idaho,

Georgia, Colorado, Arizona, Texas, Utah, and Nevada. The following states saw decreases of 10 percent or more: Michigan, Maine, New Hampshire, and Vermont. In 2018, 7 million or 13.7 percent of public school students received special education services. In 2017, 9.6 percent of public school students were learning English as a second language.

I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 2639, Strength in Diversity Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CUELLAR). All time for debate has expired.

Each further amendment printed in part B of House Report 116-502 not earlier considered as part of amendments en bloc pursuant to section 4 of House Resolution 1107, 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.

It shall be in order at any time for the chair of the Committee on Education and Labor or his designee to offer amendments en bloc consisting of further amendments printed in part B of House Report 116-502, not earlier disposed of. Amendments en bloc shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor or their respective designees, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MRS. TORRES OF CALIFORNIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part B of House Report 116-502.

Mrs. TORRES of California. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment at the desk.

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

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 3, line 2, strike “and” at the end.

Page 3, line 7, strike the period at the end and insert “; and”.

Page 3, after line 7, insert the following:

(C) the likelihood that the grant will lead to a meaningful reduction in racial and economic isolation for children in covered schools.

Page 3, after line 19, insert the following:

(C) Third, to an eligible entity that demonstrates meaningful coordination with local housing agencies to increase access to schools that have a disproportionately low number of low-income students.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1107, the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TORRES) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Mrs. TORRES of California. Mr. Speaker, in 1954, *Brown v. Board of Education* unequivocally asserted that segregated schools are inherently unequal. When Thurgood Marshall argued this landmark case before the Supreme Court, he thought it would take just 5 years to integrate schools nationwide. Sadly, 60 years later, schools are more segregated now than any time since the early 1970s, and school segregation is occurring at alarming rates nationwide.

In order to address increased school segregation, we must address one of the root causes of the problem: residential segregation. Housing segregation leads to school segregation. That is why I am taking an initial step to address the link between housing and school segregation by offering an amendment to the Strength in Diversity Act to prioritize grant recipients that coordinate with local housing agencies to integrate schools.

My amendment will make sure that all grants have a meaningful reduction in racial and economic isolation for children in schools. Segregation in schools is propagated by housing segregation, and my amendment will work to address this underlying issue.

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

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment, although I am not opposed to the amendment and have great affection for the introducer.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentlewoman from North Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, this amendment does nothing to correct the flaws of the underlying bill, but it doesn't make the bill any worse either. The amendment includes language that would ensure applicants are judged on their ability to meet the fundamental purposes of the bill, which should be done with all grant applications and by anyone receiving taxpayer funding, and that makes sense.

However, the amendment doesn't change the fundamentally flawed approach this bill takes to tackle a problem we all agree that school districts should address. But nothing in the amendment itself is objectionable—in fact, it may be helpful—so I will support the amendment.

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

Mrs. TORRES of California. Mr. Speaker, no child should receive a lesser education because of the color of their skin or the neighborhood where they live, and I am proud that my amendment will address school segregation holistically by supporting coordination between schools and housing agencies.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this amendment and pass this legislation to fight discrimination and secure the future for

all American children, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1107, the previous question is ordered on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TORRES).

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. ALLEN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part B of House Report 116-502.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment at the desk.

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

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike section 1 and all that follows through the end of the bill and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Strength in Diversity Act of 2020”.

SEC. 2. PURPOSE.

The purpose of this Act is to support the development, implementation, and evaluation of comprehensive strategies to address the effects of racial isolation or concentrated poverty by increasing diversity, including racial diversity and socioeconomic diversity, in covered schools.

SEC. 3. ACTIVITIES TO IMPROVE DIVERSITY AND REDUCE OR ELIMINATE RACIAL OR SOCIOECONOMIC ISOLATION.

(a) **LOCAL USES OF FUNDS.**—A local educational agency, or consortium of such agencies, that receives an allocation under section 4105(a) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7115(a)) for a fiscal year may use such funds to develop or implement comprehensive strategies to improve diversity and reduce or eliminate racial or socioeconomic isolation in covered schools.

(b) **LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCY APPLICATIONS.**—A local educational agency, or consortium of such agencies, that intends to use an allocation under section 4105(a) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7115(a)) for the purposes described in subsection (a) shall include in the application such local educational agency or consortium submits under section 4106 of such Act (20 U.S.C. 7116) a description of—

(1) the comprehensive strategies to be carried out under subsection (a);

(2) the robust parent, student, teacher, school leader, and community engagement that has been conducted, or will be conducted, in the planning and implementation of such comprehensive strategies, such as through—

(A) consultation with appropriate officials of Indian Tribes or Tribal organizations approved by the Tribes located in the area served by such agency or consortium;

(B) consultation with other community entities, which may include local housing or transportation authorities;

(C) public hearings or other open forums to inform the development of such comprehensive strategies; and

(D) outreach to parents and students, in a language that parents and students can understand, and consultation with students and families within such agency or consortium that is designed to ensure participation in the planning and development of such comprehensive strategies; and

(3) how such projects or activities will comply with Federal law.

(c) **SPECIAL RULES.**—

(1) **ASSURANCES.**—A local educational agency, or consortium of such agencies, that intends to use an allocation under section 4105(a) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7115(a)) for the purposes described in subsection (a) shall be required to provide only one of the assurances described in subparagraphs (C), (D), and (E) of section 4106(e)(2) of such Act (20 U.S.C. 7116(e)(2)).

(2) **TRANSPORTATION.**—Notwithstanding section 426 of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. 1228), activities carried out to meet the purposes of subsection (a) may include transportation if such transportation—

(A) is sustainable after the allocation received under section 4105(a) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7115(a)) expires; and

(B) does not represent a significant portion of such allocation.

(d) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this Act:

(1) **COVERED SCHOOL.**—The term “covered school” means—

(A) a publicly-funded early childhood education program;

(B) a public elementary school; or

(C) a public secondary school.

(2) **ESEA TERMS.**—The terms “elementary school”, “local educational agency”, “school leader”, and “secondary school” have the meanings given those terms in section 8101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801).

(3) **PUBLICLY-FUNDED EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION PROGRAM.**—The term “publicly-funded early childhood education program” means an early childhood education program (as defined in section 103(8) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1003(8)) that receives State or Federal funds.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1107, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I have got to be frank for a minute. I find it a shame that this amendment is even necessary.

When we replaced the No Child Left Behind Act with the Every Student Succeeds Act, we created the Student Support and Academic Enrichment Grants program on a bipartisan, bicameral basis. We did this to provide school districts the flexibility they need to use Federal funds as they see fit to meet local needs.

It is disappointing that my Democratic colleagues didn't invite Republicans to the table to negotiate in good faith to build on that consensus. Instead, Democrats once again ignored commonsense approaches and impose a top-down, Big Government solution that will have the Federal Government decide how best to address the issues of racial and socioeconomic isolation in American schools.

□ 1415

You know, we have heard story after story of the history of our schools and how we got to this point. The question is, will we continue with this top-down government approach or allow the

schools the flexibility to fix this problem.

My amendment, on the other hand, offers a commonsense solution that could easily garner an overwhelming majority of votes in this body if every Member chose to focus on the importance of actually addressing racial and socioeconomic isolation in schools and not on scoring political points.

This amendment would explicitly allow school districts to use funds they receive from the Student Support and Academic Enrichment Grants program under the Every Student Succeeds Act to develop or implement comprehensive strategies to improve diversity and reduce or eliminate racial or socioeconomic isolation in public early childhood programs and public schools.

This is a real solution. The SSAEG block grant is currently receiving just over \$1 billion. The proposal before us today would have to fight for funding with the multitude of other Federal programs that currently exist.

This amendment also ensures that school districts are engaging with their communities to design programs that comply with Federal law and have the support of parents and other constituents. It also alters requirements to distribute funds across multiple spending categories so that districts will have sufficient funding to design effective integration programs.

The amendment uses the same language as the Magnet Schools Assistance Program under the Every School Succeeds Act to ensure that school districts choosing to use funds for improving diversity can fund transportation activities, if they see fit.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I claim the time in opposition.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), the chairman.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

While I appreciate that the gentleman from Georgia acknowledges the importance of providing resources to support school diversity, encouraging the use of IV-A funds for this purpose is not a reasonable solution.

Schools already rely on a very limited amount of IV-A funding for a wide range of activities and programs, including mental health resources, educational technology, STEM education, extracurricular activities, and other critical needs.

This amendment would effectively force schools to choose between addressing school segregation and providing mental health services. Developing, implementing, and expanding school diversity initiatives is costly and should not come at the expense of important programs already being sup-

ported by title IV. We will not improve services for students, parents, and communities by cutting the same size pie into even smaller slices.

The purpose of the Strength in Diversity Act is to provide direct and additional investments in education that helps communities integrate their schools without undermining existing school programs and services.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this amendment.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX).

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the gentleman's amendment and urge my colleagues to support it.

I applaud the gentleman from Georgia for offering such an alternative. As has been said, it builds on bipartisan, bicameral agreements to ensure nearly every school district in the country has Federal funds to pursue the goals of the underlying bill rather than affording this opportunity to a select few school districts.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

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

Mr. Speaker, it is a shame that we even have to offer this amendment. We have got a problem, but I can tell you, my community solved this problem, which is the reason I ran for Congress.

The faith-based community created a school for kids who are branded as losers in the public education system, and these moms don't have but one choice, and that is to send these children to this school. And it is amazing how kids who are branded as losers have become the most outstanding students in Richmond County.

We keep talking about fixing these things and, like I said earlier, we continue to offer solutions, but we continue with the same problem. There is a way to fix this. This is a start. Rather than create a new program we know will be underfunded that will benefit, at best, a small handful of school districts, my amendment would ensure that nearly every school district in this country would have Federal funds available to improve diversity and reduce or eliminate racial or socioeconomic isolation in schools.

I urge the majority to put the students and families and educators my amendment would benefit before their political interest and take "yes" for an answer.

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

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I just have to say that, once again, my colleagues have put forth an amendment that does nothing to stop or to help with integrating schools. Absolutely nothing. They have had time after time after time to address this issue, even as recently as 2017 when Betsy DeVos decided to eliminate the program, as well

as to start to roll back the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Education.

So it is not like this just came up. I think part of the problem is when you have never experienced this kind of racism, it is hard to deal with it, but I am giving you an opportunity now to deal with it.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1107, the previous question is ordered on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN).

The question is on the amendment.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC OFFERED BY MS. FUDGE OF OHIO

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Chair, pursuant to House Resolution 1107, I offer amendments en bloc.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendments en bloc.

Amendments en bloc consisting of amendment Nos. 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10, 11, and 12, printed in part B of House Report 116-502, offered by Ms. FUDGE of Ohio:

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. BROWN OF MARYLAND

Page 10, line 11, insert "school counselors," after "administrators."

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. BROWN OF MARYLAND

Page 12, line 17, strike "and" at the end.
Page 12, line 18, strike the period at the end and insert "; and".

Page 12, after line 18, insert the following:
(4) a description of how the eligible entity will continue to make improvements toward increasing diversity and decreasing racial or socioeconomic isolation in covered schools and sustaining inclusion.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. COOPER OF TENNESSEE

Page 3, line 11, strike "(A) First" and insert "(B) Second".

Page 3, after line 10, insert the following:

(A) First, to an eligible entity that submitted an application for a grant under the Opening Doors, Expanding Opportunities program described in the notice published by the Department of Education in the Federal Register on December 14, 2016 (81 Fed. Reg. 90343 et seq.).

Page 3, line 15, strike "(B) Second" and insert "(C) Third".

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MS. ESCOBAR OF TEXAS

Page 4, line 19, after "diversity" insert "for students".

Page 7, line 9, strike "and" at the end.

Page 7, line 20, strike the period at the end and insert "; and".

Page 7, after line 20, insert the following:

(1) in the case of an application by a consortium of local educational agencies, a specification of which agency is the lead applicant, and how the grant funds will be divided among the school districts served by such consortium.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. GREEN OF TEXAS

Page 9, after line 7, insert the following:

(8) If applicable, developing an implementation plan to replace entrance exams or other competitive application procedures with methods of student assignment to promote racial and socioeconomic diversity.

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MR. MOULTON OF MASSACHUSETTS

Page 12, line 3, strike “(E)” and insert “(F)”.

Page 12, after line 2, insert the following:

(E) improving access to mental health and social-emotional learning;

Page 12, line 4, strike “(F)” and insert “(G)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MS. MUCARSEL-POWELL OF FLORIDA

Page 8, line 6, strike “and” at the end.

Page 8, line 10, strike the period at the end and insert “; and”.

Page 8, after line 10, insert the following:

(C) teacher diversity in covered schools, and plans for expanding teacher diversity.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MS. TLAIB OF MICHIGAN

Page 12, line 17, strike “and”.

Page 12, line 18, strike the period at the end and insert “; and”.

Page 12, after line 18, insert the following:

(4) information on the progress of regional programs on reducing racial and socioeconomic isolation in covered schools, if applicable.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1107, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. FUDGE) and the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BROWN).

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I first want to recognize not just the hard work of my colleague from Ohio, Representative MARCIA FUDGE, but really a lifelong commitment to improving the quality of education for all of our children across this country, regardless of your background and experience, regardless of your ZIP Code, and that is what the Strength in Diversity Act does.

I thank Representative FUDGE for her leadership and for giving me an opportunity to present a portion of this en bloc amendment, the two amendments that I sponsored and that are part of the en bloc.

Mr. Speaker, I rise, of course, in support of the Strength in Diversity Act and my amendments to this legislation, which will ensure that our reforms continue to have an impact well into the future. We still have work to do to address persistent racial and socioeconomic disparities that exist in our schools.

According to the 2016 GAO report, 61 percent of all high-poverty schools were serving majority Black and Hispanic student populations. The COVID-19 pandemic has further exasperated the racial and socioeconomic isolation throughout our country and our school systems.

Without proper support, the learning loss will be greatest among low-income Black and Hispanic students during the period of remote learning. The Strength in Diversity Act will help create a level playing field by authorizing grants to localities that have significant achievement gaps and segregation in their schools.

These grants will allow school districts to recruit, hire, and train additional teachers, administrators, and other instructional and support staff, knowing that our educators are essential to creating the world-class education that our children deserve.

My first amendment would allow education systems to use grant funds to also recruit, hire, and train school counselors. School counselors serve a vital role in maximizing students' success, working with students individually and collectively to create an exclusive school climate.

Numerous studies have shown the value of school counseling for students in academic and social-emotional development, as well as college and career readiness. Having the additional support of a school counselor helps develop well-rounded and prepared students.

But hiring our best talent cannot be the end of our efforts. We need accountability now and into the future.

The underlying bill requires grantees to submit an annual report to the Department of Education on their efforts to increase diversity and meet certain performance measures.

My second amendment requires the annual report to include a description of how grantees will continue this important work following the grant period to ensure schools are thinking ahead to the future and creating sustainable strategies and programs to continue fostering diversity, inclusion, and achievement.

We cannot task our schools to only address diversity and inclusion for the duration of a grant. Longstanding issues require long-term, community-driven solutions. School systems must readjust their frameworks so that increasing diversity and inclusion is always part of the conversation and curriculum.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly encourage my colleagues to support the en bloc amendment and the underlying bill.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the majority of the amendments are unobjectionable, though none of them address the underlying problems with the bill.

However, I highlight two problematic amendments:

The amendment offered by Representative COOPER would give school districts priority in this program if those districts had previously submitted an application under an Obama-era predecessor to the program in the underlying bill. This amendment is flawed for two reasons:

An application filed 4 years ago, may or may not still be adequate. Auto-

matically giving those districts priority would disadvantage school districts who might have new and better ideas to propose.

Submitting an application 4 years ago is not the same as being funded 4 years ago. Applicants that never demonstrated their merit then should start on equal footing with new applicants now.

Another amendment concealed within the en bloc is offered by Representative GREEN of Texas, which forces grantees' hands on a dilemma many are still considering for themselves. The amendment requires that participating school districts that utilize entrance exams and competitive application procedures must replace these processes with other methods.

Republicans recognize that many school districts, as well as colleges and universities, are wrestling with the role entrance exams and other competitive application procedures have played in the admissions decisions and should play in the future. Democrats would, apparently, like to short-circuit that debate and make those determinations for school districts themselves.

Ironically, entrance exams began as an earnest effort to combat discrimination and prejudice by creating objective criteria that weren't as easily manipulated by admissions personnel who were biased against certain populations. Objective enrollment criteria can decrease the potential for schools—especially highly competitive schools—to be able to justify discrimination against students based on their backgrounds or racial identities.

Today, there are legitimate arguments to be made on both sides of the debate for keeping or eliminating this practice. But this amendment would proclaim that the House of Representatives has decided against the use of entrance exams, a conversation this body has never had.

These two amendments—one undermining the quality of the application process, and the other unfairly deciding an outcome of an ongoing debate—cause me great concern and I oppose them.

Ultimately, though, on balance, this en bloc consideration is worthy of support, even if it doesn't ultimately redeem the underlying bill.

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

□ 1430

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COOPER).

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her terrific leadership in the Strength in Diversity Act.

I am afraid the gentlewoman from North Carolina completely misunderstood my amendment. My amendment would allow the 30 school districts that were prevented from applying for the Opening Doors, Expanding Opportunities grant—it would just give them the

first shot at reapplying. It does not guarantee acceptance for these 30 school districts but, rather, gives them a first shot at correcting the racial injustices in their districts.

It is very sad that Secretary DeVos' first action in office was to cut this critical program, so this offers an opportunity to right that wrong.

I want to commend, again, the gentlewoman from Ohio for her terrific leadership on this bill. I would like to thank Chairman SCOTT, BOBBY SCOTT, the head of the whole committee. I would also like to thank BARBARA LEE for her critical support of this amendment.

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL).

Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of my amendment to the Strength in Diversity Act, and I am very grateful to Representative FUDGE for allowing me to introduce this amendment, a critical piece of legislation to begin reversing decades of resegregation in our schools.

In Florida, nearly 63 percent of students are from minority communities, compared to only 30 percent of teachers. This disparity is exacerbating racial and socioeconomic achievement gaps.

A teacher in my district, Sharon Rivers, emphasized the importance of diversity in the classroom, saying: "Culture diversity in the classroom is essential in helping us recognize, respect, and welcome the many differences across the district. It is imperative that we allow our understanding of our differences to build a bridge of respect for one another."

I couldn't agree more, and my amendment would build upon that effort by increasing the diversity of our teaching workforce. Teachers of color can provide more culturally relevant education and better understand the situations their students of color are facing, helping develop stronger student-teacher relationships.

Our teachers should reflect our communities and our schools. Recent studies show that increased teacher diversity results in better achievement scores, lower levels of disciplinary action, and reduced dropout rates. In fact, a Florida study showed that Black students had higher reading and math scores when taught by Black teachers.

Unfortunately, in most States, as the proportion of students of color grows, the number of minority teachers is not keeping pace. We must do more to ensure that all students, regardless of their race or background, are set up for success.

I urge everyone to vote to pass my amendment.

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. TLAIB).

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of my amendment to the Strength in Diversity Act, which re-

quires grantees to report on their progress in reducing racial and socioeconomic segregation in our schools.

In the year 2020, our schools are still separate and unequal. My home district has some of the most racially segregated schools in the country, and this is no coincidence. This was by design.

Forty-five years ago, rich White suburbs around my district decided they didn't want to bus their children to desegregate schools, and the highest court in our land agreed with them. The Supreme Court case of *Milliken v. Bradley* made racial integration of schools nearly impossible, and we are still seeing the negative impact of that decision today.

We see it in our Detroit Public Schools, where students had to sue the State of Michigan for the right to literacy. We see it in the lead that poisons our school drinking fountains throughout my district. We see it in having just \$7,000 per pupil while the neighboring the Grosse Pointe community, a largely White, affluent suburb, has nearly \$14,000 per pupil.

I want to thank Representative FUDGE for her tireless efforts in leading this legislation, which is a critically important step toward racial desegregation of our schools.

I also want to thank Chairman SCOTT and his incredible staff for working with me on this amendment and for their leadership.

I urge strong support for this amendment and for this bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1107, the previous question is ordered on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. FUDGE).

The question is on the amendments en bloc.

The en bloc amendments were agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MS. DEAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in part B of House Report 116-502.

Ms. DEAN. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment at the desk.

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

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 1, line 10, insert "AND STATE" after "national".

Page 1, line 11, strike "The Secretary" and insert the following:

(a) NATIONAL ACTIVITIES.—The Secretary

Page 2, after line 3, insert the following:

(b) STATE ACTIVITIES.—The Secretary may reserve not more than 10 percent of the amounts made available under section 10 for a fiscal year for planning grants and implementation grants made to State educational agencies under section 4.

Page 7, line 9, strike "and" at the end.

Page 7, line 20, strike the period at the end and insert "; and".

Page 7, after line 20, insert the following:

(1) in the case of an application by a State education agency, a demonstration that the agency has procedures in place—

(A) to assess and prevent the redrawing of school district lines in a manner that increases racial or socioeconomic isolation;

(B) to assess the segregation impacts of new school construction proposals and to prioritize school construction funding that will foreseeably increase racial and economic integration; and

(C) to include progress toward reduction of racial and economic isolation as a factor in its State plan under section 1111 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6311).

Page 13, line 14, insert "a State educational agency," after "means".

Page 13, beginning on line 23, strike "and 'Secretary'" and insert "'Secretary', and 'State educational agency'".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1107, the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. DEAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania.

Ms. DEAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of my amendment No. 6 to H.R. 2639, the Strength in Diversity Act. This amendment would allow State education agencies to apply for the grants provided under this bill and would require these agencies to have procedures in place to assess and to prevent the redrawing of school district lines in a manner that increases racial or socioeconomic isolation.

Specifically, agencies applying for grants will have to demonstrate procedures to, number one, assess and prevent redrawing of school district lines that increase isolation; number two, assess segregation impacts of new school construction proposals and prioritize construction funding that will increase integration; and, number three, identify progress toward reduction of racial and economic isolation in their State plans.

Mr. Speaker, diversity is our strength, and ensuring equity in our education systems will benefit all students and school districts across this Nation.

I am a parent, a grandparent, and a former teacher. I know that access to a good education is the key to determining one's future, and each child deserves equal opportunity to that promise. Yet, we are reminded every day that we have a racial and economic divide in this country that leaves too many children behind.

This amendment is about good government and about equitable education, giving all children the opportunities they deserve while also ensuring the prevention of school secessions, which usually create wealthy White enclaves separated from more diverse communities.

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

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I claim the time in opposition to the gentlewoman's amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from North Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, while I support the goals of this amendment, I must reluctantly urge my colleagues to oppose it.

Hidden within this amendment is potentially a sweeping change to how States evaluate their schools under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The amendment requires States to include progress on reducing racial and economic isolation in evaluating schools as a factor under State's title I State plans.

I say this is a potentially sweeping change because the language is unclear. However, I read it as intending to require States to consider racial and economic isolation as a factor in the State-driven accountability systems required under title I.

Mr. Speaker, I am not sure if such a change to how States evaluate schools is a good or bad idea. But I am sure that such a significant change should be debated as part of a proper reevaluation of title I, not in the context of a standalone competitive grant program.

If this is not the gentlewoman's intent with this amendment, then this just highlights the flaws in legislating without bipartisan discussions. Perhaps there are steps we could agree States should take in the context of title I to reduce racial and economic isolation, but let's debate those changes in the proper context.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. DEAN. Mr. Speaker, I am a little puzzled by those remarks. After all, the Allen amendment sought some rather drastic changes to ESEA, but that didn't seem to generate that same comment.

We all know that equal educational opportunities enrich us all, and they are the right of all and lead to better financial outcomes later in life.

Though we need to collectively do better across this Nation in increasing diversity in our educational systems, my home State of Pennsylvania, in particular, demonstrates the need for greater action.

According to a 2015 report by the UCLA Civil Rights Project, the amount of majority-minority and intensely segregated schools statewide more than doubled, 21 percent and 11 percent, respectively, over two decades.

In fact, 17 percent of Philadelphia schools have a student body that is 99 percent to 100 percent minority students. Also, in the Philadelphia metro area, a typical Black and Latino student attended a school with, respectively, 71 percent or 68 percent low-income students, while a typical White student attended a school with only 21 percent low-income students.

This is a problem. These inequities isolate and segregate students, which in turn separate our communities, limit student growth, and hurt the educational resources in highly segregated schools.

Our schools are meant to serve all students equally, no matter their race,

ethnicity, or socioeconomic status. Without adequate educational resources, students do not have the necessary tools to perform to the best of their abilities and to further their education. This not only hurts students who are racially or socioeconomically isolated; it hurts us all because America works best when we all succeed.

Despite Pennsylvania's need for further action to combat these problems, there is promise and hope in the fact that my State has shown real change can happen. From the early sixties to the late nineties, there were intentional desegregation efforts that resulted in evidence-based decreases in segregation. New, competitive grants to State agencies would direct resources to States looking to advance and support these efforts moving forward.

Mr. Speaker, I want to close by saying that I thank Chairman SCOTT and Representative FUDGE for their leadership.

I urge Members to support this amendment.

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

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I want to repeat something I said earlier. Republicans and Democrats agree that discrimination and State-sanctioned segregation are repugnant, illegal, and blatantly immoral. Action should be taken to achieve greater equality for our Nation's students and in our schools.

We believe we should strive toward a future where all students, regardless of race or color, have the chance to succeed. Education and hard work are the paths out of poverty for millions, and education provides students with the tools and skills they need to build a successful life.

My colleague mentioned that she didn't see the difference between her amendment and Representative ALLEN's amendment. Well, Representative ALLEN's amendment provides a way for all schools to achieve worthy goals through grant programs. This goes to the fundamental way schools are evaluated and would be a major change in policy.

I, again, urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this amendment. We should be debating this issue when we are debating the issues related to title I.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1107, the previous question is ordered on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Ms. DEAN).

The question is on the amendment. The amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1445

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. MOULTON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 9 printed in part B of House Report 116-502.

Mr. MOULTON. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment at the desk.

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

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 11, after line 7, insert the following:

(F) Creating or improving systems and partnerships to create a one-stop enrollment process for students with multiple public school options, including making school information and data more accessible and easy to understand, in order to ensure access to low poverty or high-performing schools for low-income children and to promote racial and socioeconomic diversity.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1107, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOULTON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MOULTON. Mr. Speaker, school segregation is inseparable from housing and the persistence of segregated communities, communities segregated by race largely due to decades of purposeful law and policy that supported White homeownership while denying people of color the same subsidies, things like the ways that Black World War II veterans were denied the use of GI Bill-guaranteed mortgages in suburban neighborhoods; purposeful policies and restrictive covenants allowing open and rampant discrimination in lending and homeownership; and policies like redlining that robbed Black and Brown Americans of access to public resources to grow wealth and opportunity—all of these things embodied, I think most clearly, by the underfunding of neighborhood schools serving communities of color that were on the wrong side of the red line. These purposeful policies, housing policies, created tremendous inequities in education.

Now, some of my colleagues across the aisle claim that the underlying bill ignores the opportunity, the issue, of school choice. Well, my amendment brings these two things together. This amendment makes it clear that, where school choice supports diversity, it should be encouraged. And, indeed, there are great examples of this across the country.

Public school choice is the most effective means of achieving racial and socioeconomic integration in K-12 education in diverse schools across the country today, supporting parents to enroll their children beyond their neighborhood schools.

Public school choice did not exist in 1954. It did not exist in 1968. It did not exist at scale in the 1990s, but it does today. The problem is just that, all too often, school choice policies ignore the pressing issue of segregation by housing.

When school choice is not intentional, it can serve to exacerbate inequity instead of remedying it. This has been confirmed by decades of research here in the U.S. and across the world.

Many school choice systems are overly complex, parents aren't supported, and, too often, only the wealthy and well-connected take advantage of open enrollment policies.

My amendment would support school districts in using public school choice to improve school diversity and, in turn, equity of opportunity. This commonsense amendment would ensure that districts receiving grants can use the funds to design or improve public school choice systems, while prioritizing diversity in school assignment, and make them easier for parents to navigate. These all should be bipartisan priorities.

We have more public school choice now than we ever had before, yet our schools are more segregated by race and class than at any time since the 1960s. But it doesn't have to be this way.

My amendment, a relatively small change, would make a big difference because it would say that the use of public school choice policies, like open enrollment across and between districts, that match parent choice with purposeful diversity planning can be used successfully to accomplish all of these goals.

It is time we support school districts in using responsible public school choice as a tool to achieve equity of opportunity, a fundamental right in our Constitution.

When public school choice controls for diversity in school assignment, we see not only improved diversity of the student body, but also resource equity among schools, higher parent and teacher satisfaction, and increased achievement for all students.

I urge my colleagues to stand with me in supporting the use of public school choice to decrease racial and socioeconomic school segregation, and I urge a bipartisan "yes" vote on my amendment.

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

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, although I am not opposed to the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentlewoman from North Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I mentioned in my opening remarks that the underlying bill fails, in part, because it doesn't address the biggest challenge facing low-income families and families of color, namely, the lack of access to high-quality education options that will prepare their children for lifelong success. Unfortunately, this amendment doesn't directly address that problem either, but at least it takes a small step in that direction.

As more and more communities embrace charter schools and other public school options, one-stop enrollment processes are one way some communities have made it easier for parents

to understand and navigate their options.

As charter school enrollment grew in Washington, D.C., to include nearly half of the city's students, the city implemented an open lottery system to provide parents a one-stop portal to apply to multiple schools.

The system isn't perfect, but that is mostly because the open lottery system doesn't address the fact that there are an insufficient number of seats in high-performing schools to meet demand. I wish we were here debating solutions to that problem today, Mr. Speaker.

But in the absence of a real effort to increase the availability of the high-quality education options, I will settle for an effort to facilitate easier selections of these options where they exist.

I applaud the gentleman for bucking the trend in his party of opposing educational freedom for low-income families and families of color, and I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

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

Mr. MOULTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina for her support and for understanding that, yes, this is not perhaps the sweeping change that we would all like to see to fix these truly historic inequities in our education system, but it is an important step in the right direction.

And there are great examples across the country of school systems that have been able to use public school choice in positive ways to improve educational opportunities for all. It is simple common sense that access to these programs should be simple, it should be easy to navigate, and these programs should not effectively discriminate against certain families that do not have access to all the information or wealth or other opportunities to navigate them successfully.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my Republican colleagues for their support on this amendment, and I particularly want to thank the leaders of this committee, Chairman SCOTT and Representative FUDGE, for continuing to push to recognize the fundamental values of our country and our education system. That opportunity should be equal for all, that education should be the great equalizer because, if we can do that, we will live up to our Founders' ideals.

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

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my colleague's comments, and, as I said, this is a very small step in the right direction. I wish that there were more people in the gentleman's party who wanted to see this. We have tremendous evidence that school choice is the tide that lifts all boats in education. It does everywhere.

It breaks my heart when I see places like New York City where people there—particularly, the mayor there, has done everything he can to snuff out

choice and to snuff out the opportunities that exist there, such as Success Academy, which not only has provided extraordinarily high-quality education to the students, but has really helped raise the level in a very minor way in the other public schools there.

We have way too many situations in this country where the teachers unions want to stop all opportunities for choice. And I will take a tiny, tiny step as a good faith movement in the direction of providing all students, particularly low-income students, with the opportunity for choice, because we know where there is choice, the quality increases.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1107, the previous question is ordered on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOULTON).

The question is on the amendment.

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

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. ALLEN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on amendment No. 2, printed in part B of House Report 116-502, on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the yeas and nays were ordered. The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN).

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 171, nays 243, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 187]

YEAS—171

Aderholt	Byrne	Fortenberry
Allen	Carter (GA)	Foxx (NC)
Amash	Carter (TX)	Fulcher
Amodei	Chabot	Gaetz
Armstrong	Cheney	Gallagher
Arrington	Cline	Garcia (CA)
Babin	Cole	Gianforte
Bacon	Collins (GA)	Gibbs
Baird	Comer	Gohmert
Balderson	Conaway	Gonzalez (OH)
Banks	Cook	Gooden
Barr	Crawford	Granger
Bergman	Crenshaw	Graves (LA)
Bilirakis	Curtis	Graves (MO)
Bishop (NC)	Davis, Rodney	Green (TN)
Bishop (UT)	DesJarlais	Griffith
Bost	Diaz-Balart	Grothman
Brady	Duncan	Guest
Brooks (AL)	Dunn	Guthrie
Brooks (IN)	Emmer	Hagedorn
Buchanan	Estes	Hartzler
Bucshon	Ferguson	Hern, Kevin
Burchett	Fleischmann	Herrera Beutler
Burgess	Flores	Higgins (LA)

Hill (AR) McClintock
Holding McKinley
Hollingsworth Meuser
Hudson Miller
Huizenga Mitchell
Jacobs Moolenaar
Johnson (LA) Mooney (WV)
Johnson (OH) Mullin
Johnson (SD) Murphy (NC)
Jordan Newhouse
Joyce (OH) Norman
Joyce (PA) Nunes
Keller Olson
Kelly (MS) Palmer
Kelly (PA) Pence
King (IA) Perry
King (NY) Posey
Kinzinger Reed
Kustoff (TN) Reschenthaler
LaHood Rice (SC)
LaMalfa Roby
Lamborn Rodgers (WA)
Latta Roe, David P.
Lesko Rogers (AL)
Long Rogers (KY)
Loudermilk Rose, John W.
Lucas Rouzer
Luetkemeyer Scalise
Marchant Schweikert
Marshall Scott, Austin
Mast Sensenbrenner
McCarthy Shimkus
McCaul Smith (MO)

NAYS—243

Adams Doggett
Aguilar Doyle, Michael
Allred F.
Axne Engel
Barragán Escobar
Bass Eshoo
Beatty Espaillat
Bera Evans
Beyer Finkenauer
Biggs Fitzpatrick
Bishop (GA) Fletcher
Blumenauer Foster
Blunt Rochester Frankel
Bonamici Fudge
Boyle, Brendan Gabbard
F. Gallego
Brindisi Garamendi
Brown (MD) Garcia (IL)
Brownley (CA) Garcia (TX)
Buck Golden
Budd Gomez
Bustos Gonzalez (TX)
Butterfield Gosar
Carbajal Gottheimer
Cárdenas Green, Al (TX)
Carson (IN) Grijalva
Cartwright Haaland
Case Harder (CA)
Casten (IL) Harris
Castor (FL) Hastings
Chu, Judy Hayes
Cicilline Heck
Cisneros Hice (GA)
Clark (MA) Higgins (NY)
Clarke (NY) Himes
Clay Horn, Kendra S.
Cleaver Horsford
Cloud Houlahan
Clyburn Hoyer
Cohen Huffman
Connolly Hurd (TX)
Cooper Jackson Lee
Correa Jayapal
Costa Jeffries
Courtney Johnson (GA)
Cox (CA) Johnson (TX)
Craig Kaptur
Crist Katko
Crow Keating
Cuellar Kelly (IL)
Cunningham Kennedy
Davids (KS) Khanna
Davidson (OH) Kildee
Davis (CA) Kilmer
Davis, Danny K. Kim
Dean Kind
DeGette Kirkpatrick
DeLauro Krishnamoorthi
DelBene Kuster (NH)
Delgado Lamb
Demings Langevin
DeSaulnier Larsen (WA)
Deutch Larson (CT)
Dingell Lawrence

Smith (NE) Ruppersberger
Smucker Rush
Spano Rutherford
Stauber Ryan
Stefanik Sánchez
Steil Sarbanes
Steube Scanlon
Stewart Schakowsky
Stivers Schiff
Taylor Schneider
Thompson (PA) Schrader
Thornberry Schrier
Tiffany Scott (VA)
Tipton Scott, David
Turner Serrano
Upton Sewell (AL)
Van Drew Shalala
Wagner Sherman
Walberg Sherrill

Sires Trahan
Slotkin Trone
Smith (NJ) Underwood
Smith (WA) Vargas
Spitzer Veasey
Speier Vela
Stanton Velázquez
Stevens Visclosky
Suozi Wasserman
Swalwell (CA) Schultz
Takano Waters
Thompson (CA) Watson Coleman
Thompson (MS) Welch
Titus Wexton
Tlaib Wild
Tonko Wilson (FL)
Torres (CA) Yarmuth
Torres Small Yoho

NOT VOTING—10

Abraham Palazzo
Calvert Quigley
Castro (TX) Riggleman
DeFazio Rooney (FL)
Graves (GA) Simpson
McHenry Soto

□ 1550

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mses. CASTOR of Florida, JOHNSON of Texas, GABBARD, Messrs. ESPAILLAT, COHEN, MCEACHIN, RUTHERFORD, GOSAR, and HARRIS changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. BARR, SCHWEIKERT, GAETZ, and NUNES changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 965, 116TH CONGRESS

Barragán (Beyer)	Khanna (Gomez)	Pingree (Clark (MA))
Blumenauer (Beyer)	Kirkpatrick (Gallego)	Pocan (Raskin)
Butterfield (Kildee)	Langevin (Lynch)	Porter (Wexton)
Chu, Judy (Takano)	Lawrence (Kildee)	Roybal-Allard (Aguilar)
Clay (Davids (KS))	Lawson (FL) (Evans)	Rush (Underwood)
Cohen (Beyer)	Lieu, Ted (Beyer)	Serrano (Jeffries)
Davis, Danny K. (Underwood)	Lipinski (Cooper)	Sewell (AL) (DelBene)
DeSaulnier (Matsui)	Lofgren (Jeffries)	Thompson (MS) (Fudge)
Frankel (Clark (MA))	Lowey (Tonko)	Trahan (McGovern)
Garcia (IL) (Raskin)	Meng (Clark (MA))	Watson Coleman (Pallone)
Grijalva (Raskin)	Moore (Beyer)	Welch (McGovern)
Hastings (Wasserman)	Napolitano (Correa)	Wilson (FL) (Hayes)
Jayapal (Raskin)	Payne (Wasserman)	
	Schultz	
	Schultz	

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of H.R. 2639 is postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess for a period of less than 15 minutes.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 53 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1601

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. DEGETTE) at 4 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.

STRENGTH IN DIVERSITY ACT OF 2019

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2639) to establish the Strength in Diversity Program, and for other purposes, will now resume.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. MOULTON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on amendment No. 9, printed in part B of House Report 116-502, on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOULTON).

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 379, nays 34, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 188]

YEAS—379

Adams	Clyburn	Garcia (TX)
Aderholt	Cohen	Gianforte
Aguilar	Cole	Golden
Allred	Collins (GA)	Gomez
Amodei	Comer	Gonzalez (OH)
Armstrong	Connolly	Gonzalez (TX)
Arrington	Cook	Gottheimer
Axne	Cooper	Granger
Bacon	Correa	Graves (LA)
Baird	Costa	Green, Al (TX)
Balderson	Courtney	Grijalva
Banks	Cox (CA)	Grothman
Barr	Craig	Guest
Barragán	Crenshaw	Guthrie
Bass	Crist	Haaland
Beatty	Crow	Hagedorn
Bera	Cuellar	Harder (CA)
Bergman	Cunningham	Harris
Beyer	Curtis	Hartzler
Bilirakis	Davids (KS)	Hastings
Bishop (GA)	Davis (CA)	Hayes
Bishop (NC)	Davis, Danny K.	Heck
Bishop (UT)	Davis, Rodney	Hern, Kevin
Blumenauer	Dean	Herrera Beutler
Blunt Rochester	DeGette	Higgins (NY)
Bonamici	DeLauro	Hill (AR)
Bost	DelBene	Himes
Boyle, Brendan F.	Delgado	Holding
	Demings	Hollingsworth
Brady	DeSaulnier	Horn, Kendra S.
Brindisi	DesJarlais	Horsford
Brooks (IN)	Deutch	Houlahan
Brown (MD)	Diaz-Balart	Hoyer
Brownley (CA)	Dingell	Hudson
Buchanan	Doggett	Huffman
Bucshon	Dunn	Huizenga
Budd	Emmer	Hurd (TX)
Burchett	Engel	Jackson Lee
Burgess	Escobar	Jacobs
Bustos	Eshoo	Jayapal
Butterfield	Espaillat	Jeffries
Byrne	Estes	Johnson (GA)
Calvert	Evans	Johnson (LA)
Carbajal	Finkenauer	Johnson (OH)
Cárdenas	Fitzpatrick	Johnson (SD)
Carson (IN)	Fleischmann	Johnson (TX)
Cartwright	Fletcher	Joyce (OH)
Case	Flores	Joyce (PA)
Casten (IL)	Fortenberry	Kaptur
Castor (FL)	Foster	Katko
Chabot	Fox (NC)	Keating
Chu, Judy	Frankel	Keller
Cicilline	Fudge	Kelly (IL)
Cisneros	Gabbard	Kelly (MS)
Clark (MA)	Gallagher	Kelly (PA)
Clarke (NY)	Gallego	Kennedy
Clay	Garamendi	Khanna
Cleaver	Garcia (CA)	Kildee
Cloud	Garcia (IL)	Kilmer

Kim Napolitano Slotkin
 Kind Neal Smith (MO)
 King (IA) Neguse Smith (NE)
 King (NY) Newhouse Smith (NJ)
 Kinzinger Norcross Smith (WA)
 Kirkpatrick Nunes Smucker
 Krishnamoorthi O'Halleran Spanberger
 Kuster (NH) Olson Spano
 Kustoff (TN) Omar Speier
 LaHood Pallone Stanton
 LaMalfa Palmer Stauber
 Lamb Panetta Stefanik
 Lamborn Pappas Steil
 Langevin Pascrell Stevens
 Larsen (WA) Payne Stewart
 Larson (CT) Pence Stivers
 Latta Perlmutter Suozzi
 Lawrence Perry Swalwell (CA)
 Lawson (FL) Peters Takano
 Lee (CA) Peterson Thompson (CA)
 Lee (NV) Phillips Thompson (MS)
 Lesko Pingree Thompson (PA)
 Levin (CA) Pocan Thornberry
 Levin (MI) Porter Tipton
 Lieu, Ted Posey Tipton
 Lipinski Pressley Titus
 Loebsock Price (NC) Tlaib
 Lofgren Raskin Tonko
 Long Reed Torres (CA)
 Lowenthal Reschenthaler Torres Small
 Lowey Rice (NY) (NM)
 Lucas Rice (SC) Trahan
 Luetkemeyer Richmond Trone
 Lujan Roby Turner
 Luria Rodgers (WA) Underwood
 Lynch Roe, David P. Upton
 Malinowski Rogers (AL) Van Drew
 Maloney, Carolyn B. Rogers (KY) Vargas
 Rose (NY) Veasey
 Maloney, Sean Rose, John W. Rouda
 Marchant Rouda
 Marshall Rouzer Roybal-Allard
 Mast Roybal-Allard Ruiz
 Matsui Ruppertsberger
 McAdams Rush
 McBath Rutherford
 McCarthy Ryan
 McCaul Sanchez
 McClintock Schultz
 McCollum Sarbanes
 McEachin Scalise
 McGovern Scanlon
 McKinley Schakowsky
 McNerney Schiff
 Meeks Schneider
 Meng Schrader
 Meuser Schriener
 Mfume Schweikert
 Miller Scott (VA) Wild
 Mitchell Scott, Austin Williams
 Moolenaar Scott, David Wilson (FL)
 Mooney (WV) Sensenbrenner Wilson (SC)
 Moore Serrano Wittman
 Morelle Sewell (AL) Womack
 Moulton Shalala Woodall
 Mucarsel-Powell Sherman Yarmuth
 Murphy (FL) Sherrill Young
 Murphy (NC) Shimkus Zeldin
 Nadler Sires

NAYS—34

Allen Duncan Higgins (LA)
 Amash Ferguson Jordan
 Babin Fulcher Loudermilk
 Biggs Gaetz Massie
 Brooks (AL) Gibbs Mullin
 Buck Gohmert Norman
 Carter (GA) Gooden Roy
 Carter (TX) Gosar Steube
 Cheney Graves (MO) Tiffany
 Cline Green (TN) Yoho
 Crawford Griffith
 Davidson (OH) Hice (GA)

NOT VOTING—17

Abraham Graves (GA) Rooney (FL)
 Castro (TX) McHenry Simpson
 Conaway Ocasio-Cortez Soto
 DeFazio Palazzo Timmons
 Doyle, Michael Quigley Walker
 F. Riggelman Wright

□ 1648

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

Messrs. PASCARELL, BURCHETT, PETERSON, Ms. SLOTKIN, and Messrs. FLORES and LAMALFA

changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. QUIGLEY. Madam Speaker, I was unable to attend the full schedule of votes on September 15, 2020, due to a medical procedure a family member underwent in Chicago. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 185, "yea" on rollcall No. 186, "nay" on rollcall No. 187, and "yea" on rollcall No. 188.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 695, 116TH CONGRESS

Barragan (Beyer)	Khanna (Gomez)	Pingree (Clark)
Blumenauer	Kirkpatrick	(MA)
(Beyer)	(Gallego)	Pocan (Raskin)
Butterfield	Langevin	Porter (Wexton)
(Kildee)	(Lynch)	Roybal-Allard
Chu, Judy	Lawrence	(Aguilar)
(Takano)	(Kildee)	Rush
Clay (Davids	Lawson (FL)	(Underwood)
(KS))	(Evans)	Serrano
Cohen (Beyer)	Lieu, Ted (Beyer)	(Jeffries)
Davis, Danny K.	Lipinski (Cooper)	Sewell (AL)
(Underwood)	Lofgren (Jeffries)	(DelBene)
DeSaulnier	Lowenthal	Thompson (MS)
(Matsui)	(Beyer)	(Fudge)
Frankel (Clark	Lowey (Tonko)	Trahan
MA)	Meng (Clark	(McGovern)
Garcia (IL)	(MA))	Watson Coleman
(Raskin)	Moore (Beyer)	(Pallone)
Grijalva (Raskin)	Napolitano	Welch
Hastings	(Correa)	(McGovern)
(Wasserman	Payne	Wilson (FL)
Schultz)	(Wasserman	(Hayes)
Jayapal (Raskin)	Schultz)	

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 248, nays 167, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 189]

YEAS—248

Adams	Butterfield	Costa
Aguilar	Carbajal	Courtney
Ailred	Cardenas	Cox (CA)
Axne	Carson (IN)	Craig
Bacon	Cartwright	Crist
Balderson	Case	Crow
Barragan	Casten (IL)	Cuellar
Beatty	Castor (FL)	Cunningham
Bera	Chu, Judy	Davids (KS)
Beyer	Cicilline	Davis (CA)
Bishop (GA)	Cisneros	Davis, Danny K.
Blumenauer	Clark (MA)	Davis, Rodney
Blunt Rochester	Clarke (NY)	Dean
Bonamici	Clay	DeGette
Boyle, Brendan	Cleaver	DeLauro
F.	Clyburn	DelBene
Brindisi	Cohen	Delgado
Brown (MD)	Connolly	Demings
Brownley (CA)	Cooper	DeSaulnier
Bustos	Correa	Deutch

Dingell	Larsen (WA)	Rose (NY)
Doggett	Larson (CT)	Rouda
Doyle, Michael	Lawrence	Roybal-Allard
F.	Lawson (FL)	Ruiz
Engel	Lee (CA)	Ruppertsberger
Escobar	Lee (NV)	Rush
Eshoo	Levin (CA)	Levin (MI)
Espallat	Lieu, Ted	Sanchez
Evans	Lipinski	Sarbanes
Finkenauer	Loebsock	Scanlon
Fitzpatrick	Lofgren	Schakowsky
Fletcher	Lowenthal	Schiff
Foster	Lowey	Schneider
Frankel	Lujan	Schrader
Fudge	Luria	Schrier
Gabbard	Lynch	Scott (VA)
Gallego	Malinowski	Scott, David
Garamendi	Garcia (IL)	Serrano
Garcia (TX)	Maloney,	Sewell (AL)
Garcia (TX)	Carolyn B.	Shalala
Golden	Maloney, Sean	Sherman
Gomez	Marchant	Sherrill
Gonzalez (OH)	Matsui	Sires
Gonzalez (TX)	McAdams	Slotkin
Gottheimer	McBath	Smith (NJ)
Green, Al (TX)	McCollum	Smith (WA)
Grijalva	McEachin	Spanberger
Haaland	McGovern	Speier
Harder (CA)	McNerney	Stanton
Hastings	Meeks	Stevens
Hayes	Meng	Stivers
Heck	Mfume	Suozi
Herrera Beutler	Moore	Swalwell (CA)
Higgins (NY)	Morelle	Takano
Hill (AR)	Moulton	Thompson (CA)
Himes	Mucarsel-Powell	Thompson (MS)
Hollingsworth	Murphy (FL)	Titus
Horn, Kendra S.	Nadler	Tlaib
Horsford	Napolitano	Tonko
Houlahan	Neal	Torres (CA)
Hoyer	Neguse	Torres Small
Huffman	Norcross	(NM)
Hurd (TX)	O'Halleran	Trahan
Jackson Lee	Ocasio-Cortez	Trone
Jacobs	Omar	Underwood
Jayapal	Pallone	Upton
Jeffries	Panetta	Van Drew
Johnson (GA)	Pappas	Vargas
Johnson (TX)	Pascrell	Veasey
Joyce (OH)	Payne	Perlmutter
Kaptur	Perlmutter	Vela
Katko	Peters	Velazquez
Keating	Peterson	Visclosky
Kelly (IL)	Phillips	Wagner
Kennedy	Pingree	Walden
Khanna	Pocan	Wasserman
Kildee	Porter	Schultz
Kilmer	Pressley	Waters
Kim	Price (NC)	Watson Coleman
Kind	Quigley	Welch
Kirkpatrick	Raskin	Wexton
Krishnamoorthi	Reed	Wild
Kuster (NH)	Rice (NY)	Wilson (FL)
Lamb	Rice (SC)	Yarmuth
Langevin	Richmond	

NAYS—167

Aderholt	Cole	Griffith
Allen	Collins (GA)	Grothman
Amash	Comer	Guest
Amodei	Conaway	Guthrie
Armstrong	Cook	Hagedorn
Arrington	Crawford	Harris
Baird	Crenshaw	Hartzler
Banks	Curtis	Hern, Kevin
Barr	Davidson (OH)	Hice (GA)
Bergman	DesJarlais	Higgins (LA)
Biggs	Diaz-Balart	Holding
Bilirakis	Duncan	Hudson
Bishop (NC)	Dunn	Huizenga
Bishop (UT)	Emmer	Johnson (LA)
Bost	Estes	Johnson (OH)
Brady	Ferguson	Johnson (SD)
Brooks (AL)	Fleischmann	Jordan
Brooks (IN)	Flores	Joyce (PA)
Buchanan	Fortenberry	Keller
Buck	Fox (NC)	Kelly (MS)
Bucshon	Fulcher	Kelly (PA)
Budd	Gaetz	King (IA)
Burchett	Gallagher	King (NY)
Burgess	Garcia (CA)	Kinzinger
Byrne	Gianforte	Kustoff (TN)
Calvert	Gibbs	LaHood
Carter (GA)	Gooden	LaMalfa
Carter (TX)	Gosar	Lamborn
Chabot	Granger	Latta
Cheney	Graves (LA)	Lesko
Cline	Graves (MO)	Long
Cloud	Green (TN)	Loudermilk

Lucas	Reschenthaler	Stewart
Luetkemeyer	Roby	Taylor
Marshall	Rodgers (WA)	Thompson (PA)
Massie	Roe, David P.	Thornberry
Mast	Rogers (AL)	Tiffany
McCarthy	Rogers (KY)	Tipton
McCaul	Rooney (FL)	Turner
McClintock	Rose, John W.	Walberg
McKinley	Rouzer	Walorski
Meuser	Roy	Waltz
Miller	Rutherford	Watkins
Mitchell	Scalise	Weber (TX)
Moolenaar	Schweikert	Webster (FL)
Mooney (WV)	Scott, Austin	Wenstrup
Mullin	Sensenbrenner	Westerman
Murphy (NC)	Shimkus	Williams
Newhouse	Smith (MO)	Wilson (SC)
Norman	Smith (NE)	Wittman
Nunes	Smucker	Womack
Olson	Spano	Woodall
Palmer	Stauber	Yoho
Pence	Stefanik	Young
Perry	Steil	Zeldin
Posey	Steube	

NOT VOTING—15

Abraham	Gohmert	Simpson
Babin	Graves (GA)	Soto
Bass	McHenry	Timmons
Castro (TX)	Palazzo	Walker
DeFazio	Riggleman	Wright

□ 1728

Mr. ROSE of New York changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 965, 116TH CONGRESS

Barragán (Beyer)	Kirkpatrick	Pocan (Raskin)
Blumenauer	(Gallego)	Porter (Wexton)
(Beyer)	Langevin	Rooney (FL)
Butterfield	(Lynch)	(Beyer)
(Kildee)	Lawrence	Roybal-Allard
Chu, Judy	(Kildee)	(Aguilar)
(Takano)	Lawson (FL)	Rush
Clay (Davids	(Evans)	(Underwood)
(KS)	Lieu, Ted (Beyer)	Serrano
Cohen (Beyer)	Lipinski (Cooper)	(Jeffries)
Davis, Danny K.	Loftgren (Jeffries)	Sewell (AL)
(Underwood)	Lowenthal	(DelBene)
DeSaulnier	(Beyer)	Thompson (MS)
(Matsui)	Lowey (Tonko)	(Fudge)
Frankel (Clark	Meng (Clark	Trahan
(MA)	(MA))	(McGovern)
García (IL)	Moore (Beyer)	Watson Coleman
(Raskin)	Napolitano	(Pallone)
Grijalva (Raskin)	(Correa)	Welch
Hastings	Payne	(McGovern)
(Wasserman	(Wasserman	Wilson (FL)
Schultz)	Schultz)	(Hayes)
Jayapal (Raskin)	Pingree (Clark	
Khanna (Gomez)	(MA))	

BACK TO SCHOOL

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, this is a back-to-school September like we have never seen before. Over the last few weeks, students, parents, teachers, and administrators have faced great uncertainty as students return to the classroom.

In many parts of our country, schools are struggling to reopen safely because of the Trump administration's failed response to the ongoing pandemic. Our States are in dire need of more Federal funding for education, and Republicans must come to the table to help provide the support and protection our students and workers need to learn and teach safely.

Secretary DeVos and the Trump administration must embrace virtual learning opportunities, including remote learning, and encourage limited in-person options rather than threatening students' safety and school funding, especially in the areas of science and public health guidance.

It is self-evident that COVID-19 is still a serious health and safety concern for our Nation and neither children nor teachers are immune from this deadly disease.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the public to double down on precautions to prevent infection, and I urge Congress to strike a bipartisan agreement on a COVID-19 relief package that ensures all schools have the resources they need to carry out their duties and to protect the lives of teachers and students as well.

RESTORE, REBUILD, AND RENEW THE AMERICAN DREAM

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

Mr. MEUSER. Mr. Speaker, the Commitment to America introduced by House Republicans is a plan which can be accomplished in the next Congress with the right leadership in place. It is our commitment to the American public that we have clear objectives and we will deliver results for the people.

The plan calls for us to restore our way of life, rebuild our economy, and renew the American Dream.

As we restore our way of life, we will defeat the coronavirus by expanding rapid testing capabilities and developing a vaccine that is safe and effective sooner rather than later.

We will rebuild our economy with unprecedented growth, including, once again, regaining historically low unemployment for all, including women, African Americans, and Hispanic Americans.

We will rebuild by continuing to support employees and employers, upgrading and modernizing our infrastructure, and implementing free and reciprocal trade agreements that give made-in-USA products and farmers a competitive edge on the world stage.

We will renew the American Dream by providing every child the opportunity to attend an excellent school, every veteran a choice in healthcare and job opportunities, every citizen a pathway to pursue a meaningful career, and every senior an assurance that Social Security and Medicare will be protected.

This Republican Commitment to America plan is the framework to complete a great American comeback and ensure a great future for our country.

HONORING EDWARD CARVELL, WORLD WAR II HERO

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

Mr. SMUCKER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a World War II veteran and hero from my district, Mr. Edward Carvell.

Born in November 1926 in Caernarvon Township in eastern Lancaster County as the 10th of 16 children, Mr. Carvell served as a sergeant in the United States Army, serving in the 24th Division in both the Philippines and Japan. He was the second member of his family drafted into service. He followed the path of an older brother.

I learned of Mr. Carvell's exemplary service when my office assisted with submitting his story to the Library of Congress Veterans History Project. I am so thankful that we could be involved in making sure his experience serving in the United States Armed Forces and the stories of many other brave servicemen and -women are preserved.

As we mark the 75th anniversary of the end of World War II this year, I am deeply appreciative of Mr. Carvell's sharing his story, and I am thankful for the service of so many uniformed men and women from Lancaster and Southern York Counties.

I would encourage all of my colleagues to participate in the Veterans History Project so our brave veterans' experiences can be preserved and honored in the Library of Congress.

EXPANDING RURAL BROADBAND

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

Mr. BUDD. Mr. Speaker, during the pandemic, much of our lives has been forced online. Our children are learning remotely. Our businesses are conducted through webcams. Even Sunday church services are now live-streamed on Facebook.

For the estimated 500,000 North Carolinians who lack dependable internet access, these temporary changes have been debilitating.

Making sure rural families have quality internet access is a top priority for me, Mr. Speaker. That is why I sponsored the RURAL Act, which is now the law of the land. It helps ensure that rural telephone and electric co-ops have more dollars for broadband investment.

No one in our district should have their level of internet access determined by their ZIP Code, and I am going to keep fighting for broadband access across all of our rural communities.

RECOGNIZING SISKIYOU COUNTY SHERIFF JON LOPEY

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Sheriff Jon Lopey, who has served as Siskiyou County sheriff for many years.

He served the people there well. He has been a friend in his 10 years of service as sheriff-coroner of Siskiyou County. He will be, indeed, retiring later this week.

He has been an excellent leader in the north State, leading the other sheriffs; keeping the peace in the area; eradicating illegal marijuana growth on public lands, something that is a widespread problem up that way; and staying tough on crime.

Most recently, Sheriff Lopey has been tasked with evacuating Happy Camp, California, with the tragic fire that has occurred there very recently. It just partly destroyed the whole town by what is known as the Slater fire currently burning in Siskiyou County.

Although never an easy task, I sincerely appreciate his dedication to providing the very best safety and service to his citizens. As a constitutional sheriff, he is always looking out for all of our rights.

Mr. Speaker, I wish Sheriff Lopey and his wife, Maxine, the best during his retirement and happy trails.

MIDDLE EAST PEACE

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

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, in this time of great chaos, uncertainty, and fear, today's Abraham Accords provide us with a clear path to the normalization of relations between the State of Israel and her regional neighbors, Bahrain and the UAE.

Not only was this peace achieved without abandoning or weakening our Israeli ally, but it is a peace that recognizes the ever-present and growing threat posed by militant extremists, including the Islamic Republic of Iran, to all regional neighbors. No longer will Iran take advantage of a region divided against itself. Instead, an increasing number of Arab nations are choosing to join a united front against terror led by the United States and Israel.

I was honored to be present for this historic signing ceremony at the White House, and I pray that we can use this unifying moment to recognize that no matter the danger before us, peace will prevail. It is a good illustration of why President Trump is being recognized and considered for the Nobel Peace Prize.

TRAGEDY IN COFFEE COUNTY, TENNESSEE

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

Mr. JOHN W. ROSE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight deeply saddened by the tragedy that took place this past weekend in Coffee County, Tennessee, where two innocent lives were taken and others injured in a heinous kidnapping and carjacking.

Our prayers are with the victims and their families, including Tennessean Philip Jordan Stevens, who are now reeling from this tragedy.

As Tennesseans, we have not and will not accept this kind of disgusting violence in our communities.

I would like to thank our State and local law enforcement for swiftly and dutifully responding to this appalling attack. At a time when police forces around the Nation are themselves under attack, I want our law enforcement officers to know that I will continue to support the thin blue line.

As our community pushes forward, I believe now more than ever that we must stand together as Americans unified in prayer for our State and Nation.

RECOGNIZING CALEB SCHUMACHER

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

Mr. VAN DREW. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize Caleb Schumacher on the enormous feat of making Eagle Scout. I was proud to join Caleb and his family this past weekend in Ocean City.

Caleb's Eagle Scout project was a flag drop box so that flags can be disposed of properly. Caleb's grandfather, who served as a sergeant in the Army in the Korean war, was the inspiration for this project. Caleb plans to become a computer engineer, and I know his intelligence and his drive will push him to accomplish anything he puts to his mind.

Mr. Speaker, I am so very proud of Caleb. I know his mom, dad, and sisters are proud of him as well. His leadership skills and work ethic will serve him well, and I know he is destined for great things in life.

Some folks look to movie stars or, heaven forbid, politicians as their idols. I always look to people like Caleb. He inspires me.

Caleb, God bless you and your family, and God bless America.

CONGRATULATING DOTSON LEWIS OF CORPUS CHRISTI, TEXAS

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

Mr. CLOUD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Mr. Dotson Lewis of Corpus Christi, Texas, on being given the Sam Brown Award by the Texas Association of Sports Officials. This is the most prestigious award from the TASO Football Division, and Mr. Lewis is only the third recipient.

The award honors him for his many years of service, and I can think of no one more deserving than Mr. Lewis.

Before retiring 2 years ago, Dotson Lewis served our community as a referee in both football and basketball for

71 years. In 1977, he was the first executive director of the newly created Southwest Officials Association, now known as the TASO. He has also facilitated numerous exchanges between officials in Texas and in Japan, earning him the title Ambassador of American Football Officiating to Japan.

Even after retirement, he continues to devote himself to service by teaching a class on sports officiating, but his heart of service extends beyond the athletic arena.

For 21 years, he served with our U.S. Army. Following his service, he dedicated himself to serving our veterans. He started and facilitates a weekly coffee group for veterans to connect with each other and share their experiences and also to connect them with vital resources in the area.

His guidance and leadership have benefited many in Texas, the United States, and others around the world. It is my privilege to recognize him and his outstanding achievements today.

□ 1745

PROTECTING ACCESS TO COVID-19 HEALTHCARE TELEMEDICINE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CASE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to do something this evening in light of the angst which is election time. You hear somewhat sort of the hyperbolic language. I am actually hearing many of our friends on the left almost sound like it was 5 years ago, talking about preexisting conditions, ObamaCare. We have all come to a consensus, I believe, as a political body and as a Nation, we are covering preexisting conditions.

So one of the things I want to share and I am going to tie this in to what we are going through in the pandemic and an opportunity to go beyond what is the debate of the Republican alternative from a couple years ago on healthcare or the ACA and how I believe we have changed it.

Remember, the ACA was a financing mechanism. It functionally said who got subsidized, who had to pay. Our Republican alternative, functionally, was a financing mechanism. It was who had to pay and who got subsidized.

What I am begging us all around here to think about is what we pay. Why isn't this body coming together and moving creative, technology-driven ideas to change the price of healthcare? Because when we are doing the financing mechanisms, we are not saving our country.

Remember, the single greatest driver of U.S. debt over the next 30 years—and it is really difficult politically to talk about—is Medicare.

Well, if you are like I am, where you believe we have a moral obligation to

protect Medicare and Social Security, we have a moral, ethical obligation, we also need to be honest about the debt. And I have spent the previous couple of years coming here and showing the charts of what was going on. And it was like silence from my brothers and sisters here because it is so uncomfortable to talk about.

So what I am coming to the floor tonight to do is, I just want to start the inking of there are solutions. They are not perfect. They are going to have glitches, but they start to head us in a direction where we can change the price of healthcare and by doing that, you save Medicare. But you also save the country from the crushing debt that is coming. So this is a moment of optimism.

I am going to grab this board, and this is just part of the thought experiment I want to engage with. This one we picked up today. This is brand new.

We understand the next generation of Apple Watch is coming with an oxygen sensor.

Why is that part of the disruption that helps save the country? I need you to think creatively with me.

It turns out that there is a study going on that basically looks at the concept of if we can know your oxygen, your blood oxygen calculations, we can see your heart rhythm, and those things. But also, your body temperature, we can calculate if you have a virus, if you are getting sick.

Now, obviously, the statisticians—the experts—need to build the model and prove it, but what would happen if the thing you have on your wrist is functionally a traveling medical lab with you, monitoring your health all the time, producing the data, using the algorithm and telling you, Hey, guess what? We believe you have this because we are monitoring these things.

Is that hopeful?

Is that futuristic?

Is it here?

Because this watch, I guess, is out in the next few months.

But it turns out that type of data coming off the technology we are able to have on our bodies, this body has not stepped up and gotten laws, the rules, the regulations, the reimbursements to the point where technology can help us change the price of healthcare.

So can we stop having just the darn stupid debates around here where we debate for hours on who is going to get subsidized and who has to pay? Can we start having honest conversations of what to pay? What can we as a body do to promote the technology, to promote optionality, to promote convenience?

So part of my argument here is, we are actually living part of the disruption right now. A handful of Democrats, and a number of us on the Republican side, I have had—we have had—some telemedicine bills around here for years. And no one would hear them. We would do lip service. We would talk about, well, we are going to

allow some telemedicine, maybe with the VA, but the concept that we were going to have CMS for Medicare/Medicaid patients—particularly Medicare—allowed the use of telemedicine. We know we have an army of lobbyists around here that were very uncomfortable.

If I had one more staffer, lobbyist, even brothers and sisters who are Members of Congress look at me and say, “David, we need to do this slowly. We need to do it incrementally.” Well, what happened a few months ago? The pandemic.

And we grabbed some of the language that we have had now for years and put it into one of the first coronavirus packages. And now telemedicine is reimbursable to our seniors.

And what’s happened?

We have had—and this one goes back to April—it’s my understanding the numbers have gotten dramatically more, but we haven’t been able to vet it—the use of telemedicine with seniors has skyrocketed. Satisfaction is off the charts. They are happy. The doctors we have been meeting with and talking to are actually happy and actually will tell you they are spending more time with their patients, being able to have a conversation, that patients are willing to share more. We have the living example of the disruption happening right now. And all those who kept saying, “David, let’s go slow, let’s do it incrementally,” it didn’t happen that way.

We dove in, and it is working. We need to make it better. We need to make it permanent. Because a lot of folks don’t understand, when the pandemic is declared over, so does this telemedicine. It’s over. The reimbursements, the access, the availability we have given to our seniors—who we are telling to stay home, to stay healthy—to rural America, so you don’t have to drive, it goes away. We need to make it permanent.

But I am asking us to now think even broader. Instead of just doing what I am hoping—we have legislation to do this—to extend telemedicine, as we have made it available during this time of the pandemic. Why don’t we do that? Let’s extend it but let’s actually think broader. What can we do to make healthcare more accessible?

I mean, how many speeches have happened on this floor talking about accessibility for healthcare, for our poor, for those trapped in certain urban islands, those trapped in rural America, those trapped at home.

I want us to get comfortable with the fact that the disruption is here, the technology is here. There are items like this where it is functionally a doctor’s visit in your medicine cabinet. And it has the potential for changing the cost of healthcare.

Mr. Speaker, let’s go through some of these. We want to protect the access to telemedicine, so our first piece of legislation is—I am asking every Member of Congress to think this through. Talk to

your constituents, talk to your medical experts. What has their experience been like? And are you prepared to take this away from every senior and American who has had this optionality? Are you ready to take this away the day the pandemic is declared over?

And then when you have the discussion, the debate with people like me that actually believe in that technology, we can actually expand the definition of telemedicine. So it is more than just talking to a doctor on your phone or doing FaceTime with that medical professional, but it is also the sensors and the data.

You saw the very first board where we talked about a future watch that is actually coming in a few months that will be an oxygen sensor, a pulse rate sensor, a temperature sensor that you will have on your wrist that can actually do linear conversions because it will have multiple samples from you. And the algorithm can help tell you if something is happening to your body.

But also, we need to move pieces of legislation so we can keep this, keep the reimbursement, keep it legal, keep it with us.

Let’s actually take this to what we are experiencing right now.

How many Americans are seniors? We have asked them to stay home. We have asked them to limit their contacts. We have asked them to be careful. We have given them telemedicine, but we need to take it to the next level.

There are now products that are on the market, that are out there today—we need to start reimbursing them and taking care of them—where you can actually do your COVID test at home. You can get on that telemedicine, that phone call, talk to the medical professional, do the COVID test right there with him on the phone—there are multiple providers of this—and get your results in a couple of days. This is instead of asking my father, who is in his mid-eighties, to get in the car and go wait in line at one of the drive-through testing sites, or someone else to go wait at a doctor’s office or an urgent care office, or wherever they’re doing this; this exists today.

Why aren’t we reimbursing them?

Why aren’t we making this available today?

If we say we love and care for our most vulnerable populations, why aren’t we thinking of the future?

Why aren’t we thinking of the convenience?

Why aren’t we thinking of the technology?

We need to do things like this and not be afraid of it.

Yes, it is a disruption for a lot of business models out there that wants the person coming in to test, to come into their center. But this is the future. And if we do this right, we can expand access. We can expand availability, and we can actually change the price curve.

We can make access to healthcare less expensive. And is this a Republican goal or Democrat goal? I think it just needs to be an American goal.

So as we move forward, the impact—and there is a lot of—it is hard to read this slide, but I guess what I am trying to say here is: As you look at this, we went from basically only about—oh, excuse me. I had it wrong.

In 2019, only about 11 percent used any type of telemedicine option. You called the medical professional, you told them your symptoms, you got some sort of diagnosis. We have had an explosion since then.

In 2020, now, our numbers, we think, are already old because we wrote this slide about a month-and-a-half ago on the data we had then. It went from 11 percent to 46 percent. We are hearing stories that it is substantially higher than that today.

For those that were arguing for the incremental adoption of the technology, we hit a pandemic, we got to bathe in the fire, and it worked. Yeah, there are glitches, but it has worked. Asking people not to get in their car, not to actually go wait in the waiting room, not sit—it is here.

How do we expand it?

How do we make it even more accessible?

And how do we broaden the definition of what is telemedicine?

And my argument in many ways here is more than just the simple adoption of technology. Moving away from the skepticism that, Oh, seniors aren't going to know how to use it or like to use it. We have already removed that. We have demonstrated seniors figured it out very quickly. That sort of cynicism that was out there.

But can we, as a Congress—when we get beyond this election cycle, where we are busy knifing each other for things that we know are just rhetorically stale—start giving a damn about the future of this country, about the availability of healthcare and what we are going to do to actually do something elegant, where we change the cost curve and we raise the accessibility? I would think this would make both sides giddy. We just have to make it legal.

And why I explained that is, a few months ago I was on the floor—and I have done this multiple times—we were showing some of the technology that is coming. And one was something that looked like a big kazoo. You blow into it and it would almost instantly tell you you had the flu. And the professor who had been working on this, in some of her writings, she talked about it saying, Then the algorithm could bang off your medical records, right off your phone, encrypted so it is nice and safe, and order your antivirals.

Would that make society healthier?

Would it increase accessibility?

Would it lower the price of healthcare?

Of course, it would.

□ 1800

Anyone else know the problem with this technology? It is functionally illegal today.

The way we reimburse, the way we allow prescriptions to be written, it is a tough discussion because there are lots of special interest groups that we need to work with and respect their talents.

But if we know the greatest fragility of future debt in our society is actually healthcare costs, why wouldn't we embrace something that at least we haven't completely made partisan yet? That is healthcare technology and the access and availability it brings to us.

So, my discussion tonight is a very simple one. We have just lived the experience of COVID, of having so much of our population trapped at home, fearful to go out. As part of our legislation, we allowed access and reimbursement to telemedicine. It has been adopted broadly.

Is this one of those moments we are going to take the success we have had and keep it permanent by not forcing it to expire when the pandemic is declared over? Are we going to actually be a little bit of futurists in saying we saw this experiment work for our society—for our country, for our communities, for our seniors? Could we take the positive part of this experience and go further?

That going further, what would happen if we do it the right way where it actually starts to help lower the cost of healthcare and increase accessibility? It is before us.

So many of us have been heartbroken with what we have gone through the last few months. We have ached when we have seen people lose their jobs, hearing of family members who have lost their lives. Are we going to find some things positive that we have learned over these last few very difficult months and carry those things forward?

I am going to beg of the body to think this through, that is, the adoption of technology as part of individual access to healthcare. Maybe we have to change the name because when we say telemedicine, we instantly think of looking at my phone and doing FaceTime and not realizing it also can be the data coming off your watch, the oxygen patch. Well, now we are about to have an oxygen sensor in the phone.

But how do we make it that telemedicine is the use of technology to keep us healthy and also to find a financial benefit of lowering the cost and increasing the accessibility?

This is going to be one of my passions over the next few months and, if I am blessed to be reelected, over the coming couple of years. We need to make it permanent. We need to open up the definition.

Things like the home testing, I really am begging the body to think about that if we do move another COVID bill, that we turn this into being reimbursable because this is a combination of

home COVID tests that you tie into your telemedicine appointment, and you can get a result in, I think, one of them, within 48 hours.

This is good stuff. They are out there today. There is a debate about whether they can be reimbursed. We need to fix this because we all get behind these microphones, and we wax eloquently of what we think, but it turns out there are actual solutions around us.

So, that is my pitch. It is not a particularly complicated one. But with a couple of pieces of legislation that I am blessed to be sponsoring, and with some of our friends here—and I have some Democrats who are sponsoring with us, too—I think we are seeing a vision. We can actually deliver solutions instead of just political rhetoric.

Mr. Speaker, I think I was supposed to have a friend from Louisiana coming in. We were going to talk a little bit about the environment of what was about to just happen in Louisiana. Until he gets here, I did want to do one story, and let's see if I can tell this without setting too many people on fire.

I am blessed to be the dad of a little girl that is not even 5 years old yet. She will be in a couple of weeks. She started kindergarten, but the starting of her kindergarten was sitting behind a Chromebook laptop completely isolated, whether it be at home for the first week or two, and then the second week or two sitting in an empty gym separated from anyone.

I mean, the picture will rip your heart out. She is sitting behind a laptop with cardboard walls on the side of her. She would come home and say: Daddy, please don't make me go. Daddy, I don't like this. Daddy, please let me go with you.

It was ripping my little girl apart.

Then, this last week, my school district allowed children to be in the classroom with their teacher. They have taken lots of safety precautions. I am blessed that, in my area, the statistics have all fallen within the protocols, the numbers, that it was safe. We only want schools to open if it is safe.

Overnight, it was as if I have a different little girl. She was happy. She was joyful. "Daddy, I have friends." The second day, I am a little disturbed. "Daddy, I have a boyfriend." As the father of a soon-to-be 5-year-old, that was stressing.

I am wondering how many other Americans have seen this with their kids, their grandkids? How many young people have we done such violence to not only their education but their emotional well-being, their ability to get services?

I desperately ask everyone—because I know in so many school districts and the country, and even in my community, the issue of opening schools has become political. It is not science. It is political.

We see some of the protests from our teachers unions in some spots. Now, we have protests from our parents.

We all said we were going to try to address this using math, using science. But beyond that math and science—that is your benchmark—please, we need part of the consideration to be the emotional well-being of our kids. It also needs to be the well-being of their scholastics.

Another project we are doing in the Joint Economic Committee—and I am going to geek out for a second—we are starting to do some math that says we may be damaging millions of Americans in their future earning power. We are setting them back. We may be damaging millions of Americans in their retirement.

Because if you come to the tables, these actuarial tables that we have, and say: What happens if I lost earning power or I lost growth in my Social Security, in my pension, and even my career path for several months, for a year? Have we taken a step backward and understood what other things are happening in our communities?

It turns out one of the linchpins for the next part of the spiking of employment coming back, people getting back into society and our communities, is a barrier called daycare and schools. How many parents are doing their darndest to work from home, but the difficulty is doing it when your child is in the next room sitting behind a laptop completely depressed, trying to do tele-school.

We really need to have a tough conversation and be honest with the numbers and strip the crazy partisan debate over: Is opening schools partisan?

It is insanity. We have loved and cared for our kids. Let's love on them. Let's do the right thing.

I am sorry to personalize the story, but I saw it through the lens of a 5-year-old. I can only imagine what so many others have gone through with their children.

I mean, I am hearing stories of adolescents—we had another one in my community just last week—who have taken their lives. Now, I don't know if that is tied to not being able to socialize or not being able to get counseling services or just the human relations of being at school. I don't know. But you do have to take a step backward and think about it.

Are we willing to engage in this type of cruelty to our children, to those who are trying to build their careers so they can have a healthy retirement, take care of their family for future investments, for just the ability to be part of the American Dream? Because we have some well-organized groups out there that see a political advantage. That is the definition of cruelty.

Let's take a step backward, go back to our earlier promises that we were going to do this through science. It is as much as the COVID statistics in your community and your school district as the human element of let's take care of our kids, let's actually also take care of those parents. Let's do the right thing here.

I am so disappointed in so many of my brothers and sisters who are in the world of politics who are just blinded with a level of rage, that the need to win the election—well, I have sort of said it.

Let's move away from this sort of cruelty and move back to solutions. Whether it be my hope that we found a way to make healthcare more accessible and more affordable to what we are going to do for our families to allow them to safely go back to school.

My friend from Louisiana is here. I want to share my time with him, but I also want to understand what is about to happen with the hurricane.

Didn't you get blasted just a couple of weeks ago with very, very heavy rains?

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Incredibly powerful winds, good sir. Yes, sir.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Look, I have a soft spot. My mother was from Baton Rouge. It is one of the reasons I love the food. And every time I hear your accent, I think of my extended family.

But I wanted to give you some time. Tell us what is happening in your community, and let us know, beyond thoughts and prayers, what is needed.

I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. HIGGINS).

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. I thank my friend, the gentleman, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today simply to remind America of southwest Louisiana's plight in the wake of Hurricane Laura. While the national media and much of America has moved on, I will not allow the people of Louisiana to be forgotten here in Congress.

Just 2 weeks ago, my district witnessed the most powerful hurricane in our State's modern history, sustained winds above 150-miles-per-hour, a storm surge over 10 feet, a catastrophic loss across much of the State.

Thousands of families have been displaced. Many are still without power, without water, without access to the internet, without sanitation. Virtually all infrastructure, public and private, was heavily damaged.

Behind me are images from my district. These are not isolated examples. This is every street, every neighborhood, and every business across two entire parishes of southwest Louisiana and beyond.

I am grateful to President Trump for his quick response. He was on the ground just as soon as we could safely land Air Force One. I am grateful for his response and his strong commitment.

I am so thankful for the outpouring of support from faith-based and charitable organizations and from the countless first responders and volunteers who are working tirelessly to help Louisiana recover.

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

HURRICANE LAURA RECOVERY IN LOUISIANA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of Jan-

uary 3, 2019, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. HIGGINS) is recognized for the remainder of the hour as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues in Congress should provide, as I was saying, every necessary Federal resource. We must do everything in our power to ensure that southwest Louisiana is not forgotten as we work through the long and difficult recovery.

I have seen firsthand the best of Louisiana, neighbors helping neighbors, communities coming together to rebuild and recover.

It is what Louisiana does. We stand back up. Our people are resilient. We will rebuild.

Louisiana, stand strong. You are not alone. You are loved. You are respected. You will never be forgotten. We stand with you as one through this recovery.

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

□ 1815

DEFENDING AMERICA'S VALUES AND PROTECTING AMERICA'S COMMUNITIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARRINGTON) for 30 minutes.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the topic of my Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, today's Special Order, which I am proud to host, is about defending America's values and protecting America's communities.

I have no doubt that the greatness of our beloved country can be found in "We the People," and I would say that America is great because of the people and the values which they hold so dear: the things that we believe collectively, the ideals that we hold out and strive for as a nation, imperfect people striving for a more perfect Union. And those values distinguish this experiment in liberty and democracy.

There is a reason that people from all over the world literally risk their lives to come here to be a part of this experiment in self-government, and I would say those ideals consist, first and foremost, in the belief that the American people run the affairs of this country, and we believe in that doctrine of popular sovereignty.

We believe that strong and healthy nations are nothing more than the cumulative effect of strong and healthy families; that is, the family is the cornerstone, at the cellular level it is the

strength of the fabric of this country, and we should not make any apologies for policies that strengthen that core fabric.

We believe in the rule of law. We believe in the Constitution. We believe that we are a nation of laws, not of men. And we in this Chamber, in this great body of the people's House, should uphold, should promote, should defend these values; and when they are under assault and when they are not being lived up to, we should call that out. We should make sure that we are keepers of these values.

I have a lot to say about one element that is a cornerstone of our democracy, and, quite frankly, it is a cornerstone of civil society anywhere, and that is law and order. That is justice.

These are words, Mr. Speaker, that are easily found in the mission statement of our Federal Government, articulated, framed in the Constitution's preamble.

Domestic tranquillity—nobody, I would submit, knows more about the importance of rule of law, justice, and domestic tranquillity than my colleague, Mr. CLAY HIGGINS from Louisiana. He has been a decorated law enforcement officer.

Like all of our men and women in uniform, he has put everything on the line to keep the bad guys away from our law-abiding citizens and their families and to make sure that we restrain evil and chaos so that we can continue the persistence of this great constitutional democratic Republic.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. HIGGINS), my dear friend.

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and I thank you, Mr. Speaker, for recognizing me.

My friend and colleague is discussing the deterioration of traditional American values in our Nation this evening, and I think it is appropriate that we as a nation take pause and reflect upon our own lives, our own families and our histories, the traditions and cultures which we represent, the men and women we strive to be as we seek, from bended knee, the very deepest part of ourselves, the whisper of our Lord Himself within us, His spirit that dwells there, to seek perhaps the best part of us, the undiscovered and sometimes difficult-to-recognize truth that He has placed within our breast.

During the course of my life—I am 59 years old. I was born in 1961, the seventh of eight children. I have witnessed the deterioration of traditional American values.

As a failed and fallen man, arisen myself, redeemed by the blood of our Lord and savior, I have contributed to the demise and deterioration of our society in my small part. I struggle as a man.

Our journey, if you will, is to recognize that we are imperfect and to seek that perfection, for our Nation itself was founded by imperfect men who were driven by perfect intent.

The founding words of our original documents include, "in order to form a more perfect Union." This is a very humble statement by men of wisdom and great stature of spirit. "In order to form a more perfect Union" are words that recognize that we are imperfect men.

Therefore, during this time, this era of turmoil and tribulation and violence and mob rule, great division—included amongst that division is this Chamber—I think it is appropriate that my friend, that my brother brings this to the focus of the Nation today.

Growing up in high school in the seventies, attended high school in the seventies, every vehicle in the parking lot, a country school, had a rifle or a shotgun in the back glass, maybe a pistol under the seat, maybe all three. We didn't have school shootings.

When I began college in 1979 at LSU, I began to work my way through college as a carpenter. The company I worked for, we did historical renovations. In order to qualify, Mr. Speaker and my friend, for the historical plaque for that renovation, a certain process had to be followed. We had to determine the original structure of that residence. You could tell by the nature of the cut, whether it was a power cut or hand cut, how old it was; and with careful review and knowledgeable eyes, you knew exactly how that home was originally built. This is what fascinated me as a young man beginning college and working hard with my hands with the skills my father had taught me.

Do you know what these houses built 100 years ago in the middle of a large city, Baton Rouge, Louisiana, do you know what they didn't have, Mr. Speaker and my friend?

I will answer that question to observe the rules of the House.

Do you know what those houses did not have 100 years ago? Locks. They had no locks.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I ask us all to reflect on what happened to that country. What happened to the country that was bequeathed unto us, a country where the parking lots of high schools were filled with vehicles with weapons and we had no school shootings, a country where homes were built in cities with no locks? What happened to that country?

I am prayerful that the answer to what happened to that country lies, as it always has, deep within us as men and women, as children of God. And we must seek, as a nation and within this Chamber, by this body, we must seek the guidance of our savior, His whisper deep to guide us through these troubling times.

I am thankful for men and leaders like my friend Representative ARRINGTON, who has, by the grace of God, brought this topic to the floor today, and I am humbled that he would allow me to rise unscripted and address my colleagues on both sides of the aisle and the American people, whom I love.

Let us return to the civility, love, and respect that founded our Nation, for therein is born courage and the will to move forward through any challenge.

Mr. ARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I am so grateful that my colleague and dear friend, Representative HIGGINS, joined this important conversation.

It is clear, Mr. Speaker, my friend was not prepared or scripted formally, but he carries this great American story and the love and passion for public service and for a better, stronger, safer, freer America in his heart. If you cut this man, he bleeds red, white, and blue, and I feel blessed to serve alongside of him.

Mr. Speaker, I thank him for his remarks.

Mr. Speaker, as we talk about those values that have made America great and as we look out on the near horizon, we see a tremendous contrast and a distinct, maybe as definitive and distinct as we have ever had before the electorate of the vision, plans, and policies of one party versus another:

One with vast greater authority and power in the government; one that would continue to treasure, defend, and promote free people in a free country.

One would want to plan the economy from Washington, D.C.; the other vision and plan and policies would trust the ingenuity and the God-given gifts of the American people to create value for their fellow Americans and the free exchange of ideas of services and products, the free enterprise system, which has made this country the most prosperous country on the face of the planet and in the history of the world.

□ 1830

Yes, Mr. Speaker, it is freedom. And it is our core values of in God we trust and out of many one that we have elevated the human spirit like no other system of self-governance.

And I have friends here who are friends of freedom. They are champions of the Constitution. And they are keepers of the flame of these precious values that every day they take to the floor of the House to defend.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to CHIP ROY, a fellow Texan, so he may come and share his heart. He was so eloquent in our first series on defending America's values. Today we have added to that defending and protecting our communities and respecting rule of law.

Mr. CHIP ROY from the Lone Star State.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Texas for yielding.

I would note, my friend, I think we have got another little bit of time reserved on the back end that I will take and see my time, and I am happy to let others use that time as well, if we go over and blend that time together, and I would be happy to turn it over to my colleagues, as well.

I just want to thank you for doing this.

Again, this institution, we ought to be meeting here together with 435

Members present. It is our obligation and our solemn duty to do so, but instead, we continue to play political games, political theater. And we are seeing the carnage on our streets in terms of businesses and in terms of real lives, in terms of law enforcement.

Two deputies in Los Angeles shot point blank just this last week, and people egging it on, cheering it on and encouraging them to die. What kind of cultural rot do we have in our communities while this body sits here empty, putting on a show because that is what this body has become, putting on a show?

So I would say to the Speaker of the House: Where are you? Why is the Speaker not here right now? Why is the majority leader not here right now?

We come back in to finally meet in September. We have had 19 days so far of voting on the floor of this body over the last 6 months. Think about that. It is absolutely irresponsible.

I say: Where is the Speaker? Why aren't we here doing the hard work for the American people so that we can get our small businesses working again, get our economy back again?

And why aren't we right here standing up unified, saying that we stand alongside the law enforcement community of the United States? Why aren't we standing up with the cops: Federal, State, and local? Why aren't we saying we stand with them, this body, the people's House?

And that is what this is about, American greatness and standing up and protecting our communities, protecting those values, securing the blessings of liberty as articulated in the Constitution of the United States which reflects the Declaration of Independence which articulated the rights of mankind for the first time in human history.

That is what this Nation is about, and I am glad to stand up, and I will join you in a little bit more.

Mr. ARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend and colleague, and I would just pose the question to the American people who are watching us in the people's House: Should we be focused on what our Speaker and Democratic colleagues suggest is an imperative in this time of unprecedented crisis, unprecedented lawlessness, to have a sense of Congress, or a House Resolution that condemns the use of the place of origin of this virus? Or should we have a sense of Congress uniting all Americans in condemning the lawlessness and the violence that is burning through the great American cities without nigh even a word.

I would suggest my colleagues who remain silent are complicit as much as the local leaders who have abandoned their law-abiding citizens at such a time as this.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative ROY for his love of country and his passion for public service.

Mr. Speaker, I will pass the mike, if you will, to my colleague from the

Peach State, who is—I think he would be okay with me saying that he works for the people of the 10th District of Georgia, but he serves the King of Kings. He was a minister of the gospel and will always be first and foremost a proud representative and ambassador of our Lord Jesus. Again, honored to serve with him.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to Georgia's 10th District Representative JODY HICE.

Mr. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I appreciate those kind words, and it is an honor, indeed, in every way to serve with you both here in the Congress and for the kingdom of our Lord.

I go back, and I think of some of the words of our very first President. He said that there were two indispensable supports, indispensable supports, upon which this entire Nation rests. They were religion and morality.

And about those things he said: In vain would that person claim the tribute of patriotism, who would labor to subvert these two pillars of human happiness. In fact, he said, you could not claim to be a patriot if you did not understand the role of religion and morality as indispensable supports of this great country.

And the reason for that is because this concept of limited government can only work when the people are able to self-govern their own lives with an authentic understanding of right and wrong.

It is when people are able to govern their lives properly that we are able to enjoy the blessings of liberty in a country with limited government over-seeing and bearing down on our lives.

And so these are indispensable supports, supports these days that we are chipping away at, chipping away at on a regular basis. We see the results of it as now night after night on television we are watching radical left groups hijacking our cities and turning them into war zones.

We are watching the horror, the spectacle of the violence and the burning and the looting, the destruction of human lives and businesses, of dreams, of what America consists of. And here we sit in this place doing virtually nothing about it. The silence is not only deafening, it is frightful, as we sit here doing nothing.

In fact, the chants continue. From the other side of the aisle it seems as though there is an embracing of these types of chants that all cops are bad, to defund the police. It is as though we don't realize that it is impossible to have law and order if in the mix of it somewhere we don't have law enforcement. These types of chants are not only idiotic, they are dangerous, and they have consequences. This type of rhetoric in and of itself lights a fire for more of it. And we are watching the consequences, as my friend just talked about a few moments ago, as police officers are killed and shot and cities destroyed.

Is this the kind of country we want to leave to our children and our grand-

children? Do we want to pass this problem on to them and say: Tag, you're it; you go fix it?

This is our country, both sides of the aisle. This is our country. These are our dreams. These are our values of life and liberty and the pursuit of happiness, and we are watching them burn down right in front of us while we do nothing about it.

Now is the time for this Chamber to stand up and to be vocal that we as Americans, from both sides of the aisle, love those things that unite us as a Nation, as we continue down this path of opposition to the Judeo-Christian principles upon which our Nation was founded on. The truth is Marxism and anarchy have no place in America, and it is our responsibility to defend those rights, to defend those blessings. Now is the time to stand up and discontinue this assault on our country and the values that bring us together and bring people from all over the world to this great Nation, rather than for us to continue burning them down.

I want to thank my friend. The reality is if we do not stand up for American values and these great principles, no one else will. It is our task in this Chamber to do the right thing. And I deeply appreciate my friend for leading the way on this issue and for allowing me a few moments to speak.

Mr. ARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to have Representative JODY HICE, a warrior for America's traditional values, for our Constitution, for our rule of law join in this important conversation with the American people in the people's House. I am honored to have you and grateful for your words.

Who would have thought that we would be here while once great American cities are being terrorized by violent, mob thugs who kill law enforcement officers in cold blood and then go to the hospital for those who have survived and to cry death to the cops. These are men and women who risk their life and limb to make sure we have civil order, justice, and domestic tranquility at the heart of this great Nation, defense, safety, security for our fellow Americans.

Mr. Speaker, VICKY HARTZLER is another champion for the people of the Fourth District of Missouri. She is the chairwoman of the Value Action Team, so she is the lead keeper of that flame, and we are honored that she is here from the Show Me State.

And after all is said and done in Washington—more is said than done—she is a show-me leader. She is a doer, and she is fighting every day for these American values and for the next generation of Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to Mrs. VICKY HARTZLER.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative ARRINGTON for yielding and for hosting this event and focusing on our need to protect America's communities. With what is happening right now this topic is foremost in everyone's minds, and the need could not be greater.

Daily we are shown footage of yet another riot in one of America's great cities. Mobs are destroying property, defacing buildings, breaking out windows of family-owned businesses, and looting the merchandise. Cars are being set on fire, and people are getting hurt.

We need safe and secure neighborhoods again. We need law and order to be restored. We need peace to prevail in our hearts, in our families, and in our communities.

That is where our peace officers come in. They are the ones who keep the peace. They are the ones who allow our families to live in safety, security, peace and quiet. We need that now. We need them now.

They sometimes are called law enforcement officers. That is accurate, but I like another term, peace officers. Because that is what they are.

Every year during Police Week, May 15 is designated as Peace Officers Memorial Day to pay tribute to the local, State, and Federal peace officers who have died or who have been disabled in the line of duty.

Sadly, I have had a police officer from my district, whose name was added to this memorial. And sadly, many more names are going to be added to the memorial next year, including a selfless peace officer from Missouri named David Dorn.

David had served his fellow man preserving the peace for over 38 years. He was a loyal friend, a devoted husband, and a beloved member of the St. Louis community. And on the night of June 2nd he volunteered to help a friend in need who owned a small business, which was in danger of being destroyed by looters and rioters. He didn't want his friend's life's work to be turned into rubble, so he went down to help by sitting in front of the business and, hopefully, discouraging any harm from being done to his friend's business.

Tragically, David was fatally shot by violent protestors, and left to die on the sidewalk. His execution was broadcast live on Facebook while his son watched at home. No arrests were made. His killer got away in the thick of violence and riots.

Nothing about this protest was peaceful. There are peaceful protests, and I commend them. There is a national conversation that is worth having to ensure everyone feels safe in our communities, but what we are seeing night after night in many of our cities is not a peaceful protest. It is thugs hijacking a legitimate cause to advance their agenda of personal gain, anarchy, and destruction. And it must end.

We must work to bring peace back into our communities by restoring law and order, by valuing our selfless peace officers, and by establishing clear punitive consequences for those who incite violence.

□ 1845

We must deter and stop those who incite riots in any capacity, from orga-

nizing and promoting a riot to participating or assisting those who do. Those who loot and destroy must be held to account.

That is why I am proud to support H.R. 8031, the David Dorn Act of 2020. This bill increases the maximum imprisonment penalty for rioting to 10 years and sets the minimum fine to \$1,000.

It sends a clear message to rioters that their reckless actions are reprehensible and that we are committed to making sure not a single peace officer faces the same fate as David Dorn.

The answer to this mayhem is not to defund our peace officers; it is to defend them and to give them the tools that they need to keep the peace.

In the Commitment to America House Republicans announced today, we propose to increase funding by \$1.75 billion for better police training, community policing, and more equipment, including 500,000 more body cameras.

This is the right way to secure the peace, not by destroying our neighborhoods.

Mr. Speaker, I call on all Americans to work together to be peacemakers and restore peace and quiet and security to our neighborhoods and to embrace and defend the values that made America great.

Now is our time of decision; now is when we will choose which road we will go on; and now is the time to stand up and to defend what we know is best and true and right and will truly bring security and peace to our neighborhoods.

Mr. ARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman and dear friend from the Show Me State for showing us the right path to condemn this violence, to support our men and women in uniform who are risking life and limb to keep us safe and to keep the bad guys away.

Mr. Speaker, how much time is remaining on our Special Order? I fear my time is running short, as you stand from your chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 15 seconds remaining.

Mr. ARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I know we have 30 more minutes that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY) was kind enough to share in the context of Defending America's Values.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative CHIP ROY for joining me tonight on the Special Order, and I yield back the balance of my time.

PROTECTING AMERICA'S VALUES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY) for 30 minutes.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARRINGTON) for organizing this Special Order to talk about such an important topic.

Mr. Speaker, I have some things that I am going to talk about as well, but I

yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BAIRD).

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the time, and I thank my friend from Texas for giving me this opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the timeless American principles of freedom, equality, and opportunity. These principles are the foundation on which our Nation was built, an idea that all men are created equal and have certain unalienable rights given by our creator.

You can come to America and be free to pursue your dreams and be equal to your peers in the eyes of the law.

There are some people who believe that socialism is a better tool to achieve the American Dream. Using history as a guide, we know that this is wrong.

Our Constitution is special because it limits the power of government while safeguarding our freedoms and our civil rights.

As we strive to make this country better, let us remember the selfless Americans who throughout our history have struggled, fought, and died in the hopes of creating a more perfect union.

I will fight to keep America as the shining light on the hill.

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

Mr. ARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, we have one more defender of America's values, and he is a constitutional scholar and attorney, but he also is the leader of the largest conservative caucus in the Republican Conference and a dear friend of us all. We are grateful for his time, Mr. MIKE JOHNSON from the great State of Louisiana.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I give thanks to both the gentlemen from Texas for organizing this Special Order tonight, to all of our colleagues who have spoken tonight, and to my dear friend Congressman BAIRD for all that he has given for his country. The words that he shared he means from his heart, and he has shown and proven that.

We organized this Special Order to talk about protecting America's values and protecting our communities.

There is a lot of outrage. There is a lot of alarm in the country today. And it is justified.

It was just a couple of days ago, of course, in Los Angeles where two sheriff's deputies, a 24-year-old man and a 31-year-old young mother, were brutally attacked as they just sat in their police cruiser.

As they were rushed to the hospital, protesters were blocking the entrances and exits to the emergency room, chanting: "We hope they die. Kill the police."

It is outrageous. It is alarming.

This is just the latest example, of course, of the violence and vitriol

going largely ignored by the Democrat majority in the House. Unfortunately, it is the predictable result of what happens when leaders make radical calls to defund the police.

We have widespread unrest in major cities across this country right now. We have violent riots and businesses being destroyed and law enforcement officers being targets of heinous crimes, things that would have been unthinkable even a couple of years ago.

In Portland, we have leftwing groups that set a police station on fire, besieged a Federal courthouse for weeks on end.

In Seattle, leftwing activists created an autonomous zone, they said. They evicted police and occupied the abandoned precinct.

In Chicago, 31 police officers were injured in riots that occurred in July and August.

In Minnesota and Wisconsin, rioters exploited peaceful protests as a vehicle to incite violence and create chaos.

Here in the Nation's Capital just up the street, leftwing groups staged a mock execution of the President of the United States and then harassed people as they left the White House.

The economic fallout from all this, of course, will be disastrous. The human toll will take generations to recover.

We have seen reports from minority-owned small businesses, for example, in these communities where a person has worked their entire life just to build a business, to build a legacy to pass along to their children and grandchildren, all to have it go up in flames because their city leadership refused to preserve law and order.

We have seen the President's actions, and we know that he is doing all that he possibly can to restore order in these cities. But, of course, he is being rebuffed by these leftwing mayors at every turn.

I mean, the Portland mayor has rejected offers of Federal assistance multiple times. The rioters who are actually arrested by local police are simply released by the district attorney so they can just return again to create chaos the next evening.

Despite this stonewalling, Attorney General Barr is doing his job. Secretary Wolf is doing his job. They have been able to secure the arrest of dozens of bad actors, but we all know this is just the tip of the iceberg.

The question remains, what do we in Congress begin to do to tackle this issue?

I would suggest that my friends on the other side can start right here in this building by at least first acknowledging that there is a problem. I mean, it doesn't seem too much to ask to denounce the violence that is plaguing so many parts of the country.

Mr. Speaker, you could imagine our dismay in the House Judiciary Committee when we heard our chairman call the Antifa violence in Portland a "myth."

I mean, he contends that all this chaos and destruction is merely a fig-

ment of our imagination. One month after the chairman made those remarks, a self-proclaimed Antifa member murdered a Trump rally participant in Portland in cold blood.

We have been calling for weeks for the chairman to hold hearings in the Judiciary Committee to look into this widespread violence. We in the Judiciary Committee are uniquely situated, because of our jurisdiction, to dive into this crisis of leftwing violence and formulate policy solutions that will protect the life and property of all Americans. But the chairman would rather sweep things under the rug and brush it off as a mere myth.

The Democrat silence and dismissiveness have turned into a real life-or-death situation for millions of Americans now.

I know our side is ready and willing to act. This is not just idle discussion tonight. We are not just standing up here talking about America's values and the need to protect our communities. We are ready to act.

It is time to call out these leftwing groups for what they are, to denounce specifically the violence and the chaos they create, and to restore law and order for the American people. This action is our responsibility, and it is long overdue. We will keep pushing on this side of the aisle to make this happen.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for the time, and I appreciate what my friend stands for.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JOHNSON) for his heartfelt remarks about something that is such an important topic. I thank him for his steadfast commitment to the Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARRINGTON) for arranging this earlier gathering where we could all join together in this important moment to talk about this.

Mr. Speaker, I would like for those sitting at home to focus in on this number 43. This number 43, you want to know what this number represents? This number represents the number of law enforcement officers who have been killed thus far in 2020—43 law enforcement officers who have been killed thus far in 2020, over 40 percent more than in the same period in 2019.

Eight were categorized as premeditated murder. Two were a victim of unprovoked attacks. Eight fatal shots were fired at pointblank range, zero to 5 feet from the officer; eight shot in the front of the head, two from the back of the head, six in the neck, nine in the chest.

These are 43 law enforcement officers who have lost their lives in 2020.

Where is the NBA? Where is the NBA?

Where is the Speaker of the House? That is what I want to know. Where is the Speaker of the House? Condemning 43 law enforcement officers who have been murdered.

Are their names on the back of any jerseys, or is that just for preening and

posturing by the true privileged who play sports for a living?

These are real people.

David Dorn died June 2 at 2:30 a.m. in the middle of the street after he was shot in the torso while attempting to protect a friend's pawnshop from suspected looters. Mr. Dorn had served 38 years in the St. Louis Police Department before retiring.

David Patrick Underwood died from gunshot wounds after he was shot from a vehicle on May 29 in Oakland, California. He was working as a contract security officer for Federal Protective Services.

According to authorities, the man charged in the murder of Mr. Underwood had specifically traveled to Oakland with the intent to kill police. He thought he could get away with it due to the large protest gatherings.

Sergeant Damon Gutzwiller was investigating a suspect vehicle linked to this case when he, too, was killed after being ambushed with explosive devices and an assault rifle. He had served the Santa Cruz County community since 2006.

Shay Mikalonis, a Las Vegas Metropolitan Police officer, was seriously injured after being shot in the head while attempting to disperse protesters in June.

This week—we have already alluded to it—two L.A. County sheriff's deputies were sitting in their vehicle when they were ambushed and shot, ambushed and shot in the streets of Los Angeles. The deputies, a 31-year-old mother and a 24-year-old man, were transported to a local hospital. While fighting for their lives, a group of protestors arrived at the hospital and shouted: "We hope they die."

This is what is happening on the streets of America right now, and it is being fomented by our so-called national leaders.

Again, I would like to say, where is the people's House? Going out for a fundraiser? Having a nice dinner here in Washington, D.C., right now? Getting a steak dinner with somebody, patting each other on the back? Where are they?

Mr. Speaker, do you hear the echo of my voice? It is echoing for a reason. This Chamber is empty, with the exception of one or two colleagues.

Where is the Speaker? It is almost like that book, "Where's Waldo?" Where is the Speaker? Let's walk around Washington, D.C. Let's go try to find the Speaker because she sure as heck is not here right now on the floor of the House of Representatives leading this body. We are sure not having any votes right now. We are not having amendments. We are not having any debate.

Forty-three. Forty-three dead law enforcement officers.

□ 1900

You know what else we are not focusing on? The businesses destroyed by riots and the businesses ravaged by

government shutdown in the face of a virus.

As we talked about all these riots, I read with interest the story of 93 percent peaceful, leaving 7 percent unpeaceful. All the headlines said 93 percent peaceful.

Well, how about that 7 percent, including roughly 550 violent demonstrations across the county since June?

Minneapolis Star Tribune: More than 360 businesses across Twin Cities vandalized, looted; 66 destroyed completely by fire. Property damage to more than 1,500 locations. Set fire to nearly 150 buildings.

Insurance experts estimate the cost to be \$500 million.

Portland: \$20 million in damage.

How about some of these headlines? "Riots, Arson Leave Minnesota Communities of Color Devastated."

Philadelphia, "Philadelphia Black-Owned Businesses Damaged and Looted."

New York Times said: "... businesses, already ailing from an outbreak of the coronavirus that has been particularly devastating to small and minority-owned business, may not recover."

FOX Milwaukee: "Many Milwaukee businesses damaged by vandals during violent protests are minority owned."

Between May 25 and June 8, in the heat of a lot of these protests, at least 17 people were killed.

What is the carnage in the Black community? I read a stat recently that upwards of 45 percent of Black-owned businesses have closed down since the beginning of the pandemic as we know it and during this time of civil unrest.

Is the NBA wearing anybody's names who lost a business on their jersey? Are they painting any of their names on the floor while they make \$20 million to play basketball, or \$50 million? No, I don't see that.

Why aren't we having a resolution here with 435 Members saying we stand up for law enforcement? That is not to say we can't have a vigorous debate about court-created qualified immunity.

I am a conservative. I don't like courts creating law. I don't like that the court created qualified immunity and that is not as perfect as we could make it. But I believe there should be some level of immunity, so let's have that conversation. Let's debate it. Let's discuss it.

Or I can just sit here and speak to an empty Chamber and have a speech that is on C-SPAN and then tweet it out, and then there will be some speeches and people will go out and then there will be an election in November.

Let's be honest. We know that is what all this is about: posturing for a November election.

Well, you know what? I could be out doing one of these dinners. We could be doing something. We are all in races. Or we could be right here doing our darn job, because that is what we should be doing. We should actually be

having a debate in this Chamber. We never do that.

We haven't had a vote on an open amendment on the floor of the House since May of 2016. That is both parties in control of this Chamber, by the way. That is absurd. It is facially absurd.

We are a nation governed by a Rules Committee that throws bills on the floor and then says: Hey, you are going to vote on this with a gun to your head, and we are going to put whatever we can in there to make it a tough vote so that we can then run ads against you and then have a campaign in November.

That is no way for a representative government to work.

We make policy based on Twitter. We don't have legitimate hearings where we go through all of the information and make tough additions, roll our sleeves up. That is the way this body is supposed to work. It hasn't worked that way in a long time—either party in control, by the way.

One day we might aspire for this body's approval rating to jump above 20 percent. Wouldn't that be something? But why would you approve of this body? What do we ever do?

Rhetorical question.

I would actually like to ask the question: What do we actually do?

We sure as heck don't pass appropriations bills that have any chance of being reasonable or financially prudent. \$27 trillion of debt later, we are barreling toward \$30 trillion. Everybody knows it. Our dollar is going to be devalued. Our economy is going to be weaker. Our kids are inheriting \$30 trillion-plus of debt.

What are we doing?

The Speaker, leader in the Senate, Treasury Secretary, they are all meeting in rooms—I don't ever see any of this stuff till I read about it in the press—figuring out which number they are going to put in front of trillion for some deal.

Why don't we start with a bill on the floor of this Chamber? For example, why don't we just start with a PPP extension bill? Why not?

We managed to pass a bill in June, DEAN PHILLIPS, freshman Democrat from Minnesota, and myself, seven pages, because we ignored the normal process. And we went out and we got a bunch of support for it and we, basically, forced the issue. We got a vote and it extended the PPP, granting true reprieve and help to small businesses in Texas and throughout this country.

The PPP is at 5.2 million loans and \$525 billion since the spring. In Texas, over 400,000 loans of \$41 billion. Eighty-six percent of the total count were less than \$150,000. The average loan is \$101,000.

We have \$130 billion left. Why don't we extend it? Why don't we add to it? Why don't we make this work for small businesses that, I am told, in Texas are going to run out of money in September, run out of money in October: live music venues closing, small res-

taurants closing, family-owned establishments that have been there for decades closing.

Now we are playing Russian roulette with other people's lives. You have got local politicians and Governors who have shut down people's livelihoods: wineries, breweries, distilleries, live music venues, restaurants unable to stay in business in significant part because of government action, in part because of the virus and people's concerns.

Why aren't we doing something right now?

What is more important at 7 tonight than us, this body, meeting and coming up with solutions? A dinner? A fundraiser? An interview on MSNBC, CNN, or FOX? Some meeting with some higher-ups and the Speaker and the leader and some folks in the administration telling us what to do when we are every bit as duly elected as they are? But that is what is happening, because there sure as heck isn't anybody on the floor of the House Chamber here at 7.

Over the last 180 days, since mid-March when we all left, around spring break time for a lot of our kids, over this 6 months, 180 days, we have met and voted, I think, 19 of those days. Today might be the 20th. That is absurd. And none of those votes, by the way, were us actually sitting down here and debating.

My friend agrees. He knows.

Have we been down here debating? Have there been any grand debates here on the floor of the people's House? There have not.

I can't tell you how many Members on the other side of the aisle and this side of the aisle I talk to about wanting to restore regular order. It is the fundamental problem we have among our so-called leaders in this town is we don't do that.

Right now, we have H.R. 7894 that I did with my friends Congressman CURTIS, Congressmen WILD, MEUSER, VAN DREW, a number of folks, bipartisan, that would extend the PPP.

You know what? I don't care. Don't use that bill. There is the RESTART Act. There are others. But why don't we just pull up a bill, debate it, and vote on it? It is a novel idea.

Or no, why don't we just wait for the powers that be to put together a \$3 trillion bill that has virtually no chance of getting any kind of unified support because it has got 50 different moving parts and then wonder why the American people look at us and say: What is wrong with you?

Just put a bill on the floor and let's debate it and vote on it. What are we afraid of? I am happy to vote, and my constituents can choose what to do in November. But let's debate and vote.

That bill I just mentioned, it has 35 significant organizations and entities that support it: National Restaurant Association, a bunch of the business community that supports it.

Fine. Again, I don't care, that bill, another bill. Let's just have a bill and

a vote on a bill that will help our small business community.

But again, where is the Speaker? Why are we playing politics with small businesses? I don't get it.

Where is the Speaker? Where is this body on 43, 43 dead law enforcement officers, up a significant amount, almost 50 percent since last year?

I would say, as I said before, that bill that we got passed in June on a bipartisan basis, the PPP bill we passed in the spring, this is just my district alone, the district I represent, Texas 21: businesses supported, 18,400; non-profits supported, 511; total jobs supported, 90,900; funding distributed, over \$600 million. That is one congressional district.

Let's do our job. Let's pass an extension of that.

Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to use the time that I have remaining not lamenting some of my frustrations about the floor of the House but talking about why it matters. I would like to talk about this magnificent young lady, Rebekah Wendt.

I rise here tonight to remember Rebekah, who loved her country, a martyr who lost her life striving to do what we all came here to do: to make America better.

Rebekah is the granddaughter of Chuck and Judy Wendt, daughter of Tim and Erika Wendt, and sister of two of my staffers, one current and one former, Jonah and Manfred Haden Wendt.

On July 10, a little bit before midnight, I received a phone call from my aide, Jonah. He informed me that his sister, Rebekah, had just passed away in a car accident while working on a campaign in west Texas for a candidate she believed in to make a little extra money to buy textbooks for school.

Rebekah Susanna Wendt was born on May 12, 2000, to Tim and Erika Wendt. She was baptized on August 13 of 2000 and confirmed on May 17 of 2015 at St. Paul Lutheran in Fort Worth, Texas. She was a rising sophomore at Trinity University, which I am proud to represent.

On July 10, 2020, she was embraced at the pearly gates of heaven by our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ. She was greeted by those who had gone before her: Oma, Opa, Anita, Willard, and Jeff.

Rebekah's story is nothing of inspirational.

As a child, Rebekah struggled with language. Speaking, reading, and writing—putting her thoughts into written language—were difficult for Rebekah. Many thought she would never be able to read, but she overcame and flourished.

As a child, she was able to do what most adults today cannot even do: ask for help.

Rebekah had a wonderful gift for the fine arts. She danced and sang choir

with poise and self-confidence. Rebekah learned to work through her difficulties and blossomed into an aspiring architect and historian. She would eventually follow her big brothers to Trinity University.

Rebekah was a student of history and a lover of architecture. She loved to read about World War II, particularly the Battle of the Bulge.

I thank my friend, a veteran, for coming in and holding this for me just as I am talking about the sacrifices of our wonderful World War II generation.

As a self-described architecture geek, she worked hand in hand with her father to design their new home.

Having just finished her freshman year at Trinity University, Rebekah was just beginning to come into her own.

Her classmates at Trinity University remember her as a devoted Christian who lived out her faith every day: warm and enthusiastic, charmingly silly and unsure of herself, but brave and willing to ask for help. They will also remember her as a keenly aware friend.

Her family will forever remember her as the introvert who just needed a stage to perform on; the sister who was already planning out who would host Christmas, Easter, and Thanksgiving; an apologetic history buff who would blurt out a fact only to excuse herself for being a self-described nerd; an old soul who found comfort in "MASH," "Golden Girls," and anything vintage; a fighter who overcame the odds and never gave up on her dreams, with a smile that lit up rooms and a roaring laugh that the whole neighborhood knew.

Her mother, Erika, will fondly recall her daughter as her best friend, kitchen partner, an ally in all things gluten-free, and caretaker of her two brothers. They need some caretaking.

Her father, Tim, will never forget designing the family's new house with his beloved daughter. While Rebekah may have gone to Heaven, the family house will remain here on Earth as a testament to her love and devotion for her family.

Following Rebekah's service, a friend of the Wendt family noted that the funeral had reminded her of Matthew 25:21: "Well done, my good and faithful servant."

Well done, Rebekah. You have run the race. You have kept the faith.

Rebekah's story has touched the lives of many people who she didn't even know.

She passed away doing what I pledged to do when running for Congress: preserve the promise of America for our children and our grandchildren.

She didn't have to be out on a campaign knocking on doors during a virus and all the chaos of 2020, but she did. In fact, Rebekah was not particularly political, but she loved her country, and she was proud of our history and all who had come before her in the name of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

□ 1915

She loved America; she loved her God; she loved Jesus Christ; and she loved her German Lutheran heritage. She will be remembered as a very good German who loved her God, her family, and her country.

She served as an inspiration to me and someone that I have honored, am honoring now, and will continue to honor as I serve not just in the United States Congress but the rest of my life.

Thank you, Rebekah. While your time on Earth has come to an end sooner than we all would have liked, your legacy will remain long after. You are an inspiration for many and will not soon be forgotten.

I thank my friend for his assistance. I thank Rebekah for her service. I thank her family for their love and support that they are offering to each other and everybody in the community.

I will just say this in closing. We all have these stories. We all have people we lose. I went through a battle with cancer. We are here to make this country better. We are here to represent the people of the United States. I would just ask that we come together and let's solve those problems. Let's roll up our sleeves and do our job. That is what we were elected to do. And let's stand up for America together.

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

LETTER SUBMITTED PURSUANT TO SECTION 4(b) OF HOUSE RESOLUTION 965, 116TH CONGRESS

COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND REFORM

SEPTEMBER 14, 2020.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER PELOSI: Pursuant to section 4(b) of House Resolution 965, we are writing to inform you that the Committee on Oversight and Reform has met the requirements for conducting a business meeting outlined in regulation E.1 of the remote committee proceedings regulations, inserted into the Congressional Record on May 15, 2020, and that the Committee is prepared to conduct a remote meeting and permit remote participation.

In meeting these requirements, the Committee held a non-public business meeting rehearsal on Friday, September 11, 2020; public full Committee hearings with remote participation, including on Thursday, September 10, 2020; and public subcommittee hearings with remote participation, including on Monday, August 3, 2020.

Sincerely,

CAROLYN B. MALONEY, *Chairwoman,*
Committee on Oversight and Reform.

Wm. Lacy Clay, Eleanor Holmes Norton, Stephen F. Lynch, Jim Cooper, Raja Krishnamoorthi, Ro Khanna, Debbie Wasserman-Schultz, Peter Welch, Robin L. Kelly, Brenda L. Lawrence, Gerald E. Connolly, Jamie Raskin, Kweisi Mfume, John P. Sarbanes, Jackie Speier, Mark DeSaulnier, Stacy E. Plaskett, Jimmy Gomez, Ayanna Pressley, Katie Porter, Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez, Rashida Tlaib, *Members, Committee on Oversight and Reform.*

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 7 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, September 16, 2020, at 9 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,
ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

5273. A letter from the Principal Deputy, Directorate of Standards and Guidance, Occupational Safety and Health Administration, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule — Occupational Exposure to Beryllium and Beryllium Compounds in Construction and Shipyard Sectors [Docket No.: OSHA-H005C-2006-0870] (RIN: 1218-AD29) received September 8, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

5274. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, National Institutes of Health, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standards of Care of Chimpanzees Held in the Federally Supported Sanctuary System [Docket No.: NIH-2019-0001] (RIN: 0925-AA66) received September 8, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5275. A letter from the Program Analyst, Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Advanced Methods to Target and Eliminate Unlawful Robocalls; Alarm Industry Communications Committee Petition for Clarifications or Reconsideration; American Dental Association Petition for Clarification or Reconsideration [CG Docket No.: 17-59] received September 8, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5276. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final methodology — Basic Health Program; Federal Funding Methodology for Program Year 2021 [CMS-2432-FN] (RIN: 0938-ZB56) received September 8, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON
PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PALLONE: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 4447. A bill to establish an energy storage and microgrid grant and technical assistance program; with an amendment (Rept. 116-504, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GRIJALVA: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 895. A bill to allow tribal grant schools to participate in the Federal Employee Health Benefits program (Rept. 116-505, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

[Omitted from the Record of September 8, 2020]

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committees on House Administration, Oversight and Reform, and the Judiciary discharged from further consideration. H.R. 2694 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committees on Oversight and Reform and Energy and Commerce discharged from further consideration. H.R. 895 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology discharged from further consideration. H.R. 4447 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mrs. WAGNER:

H.R. 8251. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit preventing access to lifesaving medical procedures and treatments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN of Texas (for himself and Mr. ROUDA):

H.R. 8252. A bill to require the Director of the Federal Housing Finance Agency to require each enterprise to include a military service question on the form known as the Uniform Residential Loan Application above the signature line of such application, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BEYER (for himself and Mr. ROONEY of Florida):

H.R. 8253. A bill to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to require 30 percent of revenues from offshore wind energy to be deposited in the National Oceans and Coastal Security Fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER (for himself, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mrs. RODGERS of Washington, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. WENSTRUP, and Ms. SHALALA):

H.R. 8254. A bill to establish a demonstration program to provide integrated care for Medicare beneficiaries with end-stage renal disease, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BUTTERFIELD (for himself, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina, Mr. TIMMONS, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina):

H.R. 8255. A bill to clarify the status of gaming conducted by the Catawba Indian Nation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. CHENEY (for herself, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. PERRY, Mr. STAUBER, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. WESTERMAN, and Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana):

H.R. 8256. A bill to amend the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 to provide a rule to determine venue for a proceeding for judicial review of certain agency actions; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KILDEE (for himself and Mr. BERGMAN):

H.R. 8257. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide to a member of the uniformed services who is denied a traumatic injury protection claim under Servicemembers' Group Life Insurance certain information related to that denial; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LEVIN of California:

H.R. 8258. A bill to direct the Secretary of energy to conduct an advanced fuel cycle research, development, demonstration, and commercial application program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. MEEKS (for himself, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. KEATING, Mr. COHEN, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. TRONE, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. KINZINGER, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. SUOZZI, and Mr. TED LIEU of California):

H.R. 8259. A bill to prohibit Russian participation in the G7, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. OLSON:

H.R. 8260. A bill to provide a payroll tax credit for best practices training expenses associated with protecting employees from COVID-19; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RUIZ:

H.R. 8261. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for a presumption of service connection for certain diseases associated with exposure to toxins, including emissions from open burn pits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Armed Services, and Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. VELAZQUEZ (for herself and Ms. MOORE):

H.R. 8262. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to establish a grant program for infrastructure improvement projects at transportation access points to facilitate or increase the use of transportation facilities by individuals with limited mobility; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. WITTMAN (for himself and Ms. HAALAND):

H.R. 8263. A bill to ensure opportunities for Department of Defense participation in wildlife conservation banking programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. JUDY CHU of California (for herself, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. SHERMAN, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. RASKIN):

H. Res. 1109. A resolution recognizing the 40th anniversary of the founding of The Planetary Society; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself and Mr. MCCAUL):

H. Res. 1110. A resolution supporting the announcements of the establishment of full diplomatic relations between the State of Israel and the United Arab Emirates and the State of Israel and the Kingdom of Bahrain, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KEATING (for himself, Mr. KINZINGER, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. RASKIN, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. COHEN, Mr. TRONE, Mr. COSTA, and Mr. CICILLINE):

H. Res. 1111. A resolution supporting the people of Belarus and their democratic aspirations and condemning the election rigging and subsequent violent crackdowns on peaceful protestors by the Government of the Republic of Belarus; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. QUIGLEY (for himself, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mrs. BUSTOS, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. CASTEN of Illinois, Mr. RUSH, Ms. UNDERWOOD, and Mr. PENCE):

H. Res. 1112. A resolution recognizing the 150th anniversary of the founding of Loyola University Chicago; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SOTO (for himself, Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico, Mr. HASTINGS, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. CRIST, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. YOUNG, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, Ms. SHALALA, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. FRANKEL, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Ms. CAS-TOR of Florida):

H. Res. 1113. A resolution to state the need for action on statehood for Puerto Rico if the status wins a majority of the vote on the question in the territory's plebiscite on November 3; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. VEASEY (for himself, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. GRIMALVA):

H. Res. 1114. A resolution expressing support for the designation of the month of September as "National Voting Rights Month"; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on House Administration, Intelligence (Permanent Select), Oversight and Reform, Science, Space, and Technology, Education and Labor, Ways and Means, Financial Services, Ethics, and Homeland Security, 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.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

196. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the State of Hawaii, relative to Senate Resolution No. 2, Strongly Urging The United States Department Of Housing And Urban Development And The United States Congress To Provide Additional Federal Funds For Native Hawaiian Housing Block Grants Under The Native American Housing Assistance And Self-Determination Act And Identify And Secure Other Forms Of Direct Assistance To Address The Affordable Housing Needs Of The Native Hawaiian Population And Urging The Department Of Ha-

waiian Home Lands To Assist And Train Individual Hawaiian Homesteads On The Technical Aspects And Processes Involved In Expending And Utilizing Native Hawaiian Housing Block Grants; to the Committee on Financial Services.

197. Also, a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey, relative to Assembly Resolution No. 149, urging the President and the Congress of the United States to continue federal Public Service Loan Forgiveness Program; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

198. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Hawaii, relative to Senate Resolution No. 14, Urging Congress To Pass The Clinical Treatment Act To Amend Title XIX Of The Social Security Act To Require Medicaid To Cover The Routine Costs Of Care For Patients With Life-Threatening Conditions Who Are Enrolled In Clinical Trials; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

199. Also, a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey, relative to Assembly Resolution No. 178, urging the Congress and the President of the United States to remove Confederate statues in the U.S. Capitol building; to the Committee on House Administration.

200. Also, a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey, relative to Assembly Resolution No. 125, urging the Congress and the President of the United States to eliminate funding disparities among land-grant institutions of higher education; jointly to the Committees on Education and Labor and Agriculture.

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 Mrs. WAGNER:

H.R. 8251.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18

By Mr. GREEN of Texas:

H.R. 8252.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. 1, Sec. 8, Cl. 18)

By Mr. BEYER:

H.R. 8253.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 8254.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. BUTTERFIELD:

H.R. 8255.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution, Congress has the power to collect taxes and expend funds to provide for the general welfare of the United States. Congress may also make laws that are necessary and proper for carrying into execution their powers enumerated under Article I.

By Ms. CHENEY:

H.R. 8256.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section VIII

The 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. KILDEE:

H.R. 8257.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. LEVIN of California:

H.R. 8258.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. MEEKS:

H.R. 8259.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

ARTICLE 1.

By Mr. OLSON:

H.R. 8260.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. RUIZ:

H.R. 8261.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution, to provide for the general welfare and make all laws necessary and proper to carry out the powers of Congress.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

H.R. 8262.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to . . . provide for the . . . general Welfare of the United States; . . .

By Mr. WITTMAN:

H.R. 8263.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3: The Congress shall have the Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 784: Mr. CRENSHAW.

H.R. 1185: Mr. CLYBURN.

H.R. 1445: Mr. SIMPSON and Mr. LAMALFA.

H.R. 1570: Mrs. HARTZLER.

H.R. 1705: Mr. DESAULNIER.

H.R. 1763: Ms. SHERRILL, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. ROSE of New York, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. EVANS, and Ms. CRAIG.

H.R. 1857: Ms. SHERRILL, Mr. NEAL, Mr. CLYBURN, and Mr. RUIZ.

H.R. 2014: Mr. MOLENAAR.

H.R. 2086: Mrs. RODGERS of Washington and Mrs. TRAHAN.

H.R. 2264: Mr. CROW.

H.R. 2350: Mr. SCHWEIKERT.

H.R. 2442: Mr. CONNOLLY.

H.R. 2571: Mr. GOODEN.

H.R. 2648: Mr. RASKIN and Mr. TED LIEU of California.

H.R. 2650: Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 2653: Mr. NEAL and Mr. DELGADO.

H.R. 2693: Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 2731: Ms. NORTON, Ms. OMAR, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. ROUDA, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mrs. AXNE, Ms. KELLY of

Illinois, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Ms. SCANLON.
 H.R. 2733: Ms. TLAIB.
 H.R. 2771: Mr. TIFFANY and Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina.
 H.R. 3103: Mrs. MCBATH.
 H.R. 3114: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mrs. FLETCHER, Ms. UNDERWOOD, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Ms. SCHRIER, Mr. CROW, Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico, Ms. HOULAHAN, Ms. FINKENAUER, Ms. SHERRILL, Ms. ESHOO, and Mr. NEAL.
 H.R. 3157: Mr. HASTINGS.
 H.R. 3396: Mr. MCGOVERN.
 H.R. 3659: Mr. VAN DREW.
 H.R. 3762: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. LURIA, Mrs. LESKO, Mr. COLE, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. MEEKS, and Mr. PERLMUTTER.
 H.R. 3884: Mr. SAN NICOLAS, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, and Mr. CROW.
 H.R. 3975: Mr. LOWENTHAL and Mrs. TORRES of California.
 H.R. 3986: Mrs. HAYES.
 H.R. 4104: Ms. SPANBERGER, Mr. RUIZ, and Mr. SHIMKUS.
 H.R. 4172: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
 H.R. 4194: Mr. RUSH, Mr. TAKANO, and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.
 H.R. 4309: Mr. LAMB.
 H.R. 4439: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
 H.R. 4507: Mr. TRONE and Mr. CASTRO of Texas.
 H.R. 4681: Mr. STEIL.
 H.R. 4684: Ms. LOFGREN and Mr. VARGAS.
 H.R. 4823: Mr. SAN NICOLAS.
 H.R. 4924: Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. SWALWELL of California, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
 H.R. 5002: Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. EVANS, Ms. SCHRIER, Mr. COURTNEY, Mrs. LURIA, and Mr. O'HALLERAN.
 H.R. 5046: Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio.
 H.R. 5172: Ms. FINKENAUER, Mr. GIANFORTE, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. HARDER of California, and Mr. CORREA.
 H.R. 5297: Mr. FULCHER.
 H.R. 5427: Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas.
 H.R. 5447: Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. CLEAVER.
 H.R. 5554: Mr. SIREs.
 H.R. 5572: Mr. LUJÁN and Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma.
 H.R. 5605: Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. ROSE of New York, Mr. LAMBORN, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. CRIST, and Mr. KIM.
 H.R. 5610: Mr. TURNER.
 H.R. 5619: Mr. DELGADO.
 H.R. 5648: Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina.
 H.R. 5734: Ms. BASS, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.
 H.R. 5741: Mr. RUTHERFORD.
 H.R. 5824: Mr. KATKO.
 H.R. 6104: Ms. WILD.
 H.R. 6143: Ms. FINKENAUER.
 H.R. 6510: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. RYAN, Ms. LEE of California, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. EVANS, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, and Ms. NORTON.
 H.R. 6556: Mr. SOTO, Mr. CORREA, and Ms. SPEIER.
 H.R. 6561: Ms. SÁNCHEZ.
 H.R. 6661: Mr. AGUILAR.
 H.R. 6802: Mr. LONG.
 H.R. 6829: Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. HARRIS, and Mr. RASKIN.

H.R. 6910: Mr. GREEN of Tennessee.
 H.R. 6921: Mr. GARAMENDI.
 H.R. 7052: Mr. NUNES, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, and Mr. COX of California.
 H.R. 7071: Mr. RYAN, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. MULLIN, Ms. WILD, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. WELCH, Ms. HAALAND, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mrs. MCBATH, Mr. LUCAS, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, and Mr. BIGGS.
 H.R. 7103: Mr. UPTON and Mr. SAN NICOLAS.
 H.R. 7111: Mrs. BEATTY.
 H.R. 7148: Mr. DIAZ-BALART.
 H.R. 7158: Ms. CLARKE of New York.
 H.R. 7200: Mr. FOSTER.
 H.R. 7208: Mr. GREEN of Tennessee.
 H.R. 7233: Mr. PENCE.
 H.R. 7272: Mr. CÁRDENAS.
 H.R. 7278: Mr. PETERSON.
 H.R. 7302: Mr. DEFazio.
 H.R. 7312: Mr. VELA.
 H.R. 7315: Ms. JAYAPAL.
 H.R. 7370: Ms. ESCOBAR, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. HASTINGS, and Mr. TED LIEU of California.
 H.R. 7414: Mr. BALDERSON.
 H.R. 7534: Mr. COLE.
 H.R. 7541: Mr. CARBAJAL.
 H.R. 7557: Mr. RUIZ.
 H.R. 7566: Mr. GALLAGHER.
 H.R. 7642: Mr. STIVERS, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. RUIZ, Ms. DEAN, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee, Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma, Ms. WEXTON, Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, Mr. EVANS, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. HARDER of California, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. HUDSON, Mrs. TORRES of California, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, and Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio.
 H.R. 7658: Mr. RICE of South Carolina.
 H.R. 7659: Mr. EVANS, Ms. HOULAHAN, Mr. FERGUSON, and Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 7673: Mr. PHILLIPS.
 H.R. 7705: Mr. GOTTHEIMER.
 H.R. 7715: Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina.
 H.R. 7734: Mr. ESTES.
 H.R. 7759: Mr. VAN DREW, Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma, Mr. TIFFANY, Mr. BANKS, and Mrs. HARTZLER.
 H.R. 7761: Mr. FOSTER.
 H.R. 7774: Mr. CASE and Mr. SAN NICOLAS.
 H.R. 7781: Ms. NORTON, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. HASTINGS, and Ms. PINGREE.
 H.R. 7809: Mr. BYRNE and Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma.
 H.R. 7814: Mr. BURGESS.
 H.R. 7832: Mr. DOGGETT and Mr. GOODEN.
 H.R. 7883: Mr. BALDERSON and Mr. DELGADO.
 H.R. 7894: Mr. CUELLAR.
 H.R. 7905: Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina and Mr. LOUDERMILK.
 H.R. 7909: Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. TRONE, Mr. WENSTRUP, and Mr. CROW.
 H.R. 7947: Mr. NEAL, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, and Mr. HORSFORD.
 H.R. 7950: Ms. SHERRILL.
 H.R. 7951: Mr. COOK.
 H.R. 8012: Mr. GROTHMAN.
 H.R. 8013: Mr. GROTHMAN.
 H.R. 8053: Mr. MCGOVERN.
 H.R. 8068: Mr. CARBAJAL.

H.R. 8077: Mr. MEUSER, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. RESCHENTHALER, and Mr. PERRY.
 H.R. 8095: Ms. ESHOO and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
 H.R. 8099: Mr. AGUILAR.
 H.R. 8125: Mr. TRONE.
 H.R. 8140: Ms. PRESSLEY.
 H.R. 8141: Mrs. HAYES, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, and Ms. BONAMICI.
 H.R. 8162: Ms. FINKENAUER.
 H.R. 8164: Mr. LAMALFA.
 H.R. 8171: Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, and Mr. RYAN.
 H.R. 8181: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
 H.R. 8217: Ms. SCHRIER.
 H.R. 8225: Mr. CORREA.
 H.R. 8236: Mr. RUTHERFORD.
 H.R. 8237: Mrs. WALORSKI.
 H.R. 8249: Ms. WILD, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.
 H.J. Res. 94: Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania and Mr. RYAN.
 H. Con. Res. 71: Ms. BONAMICI.
 H. Con. Res. 100: Mr. TONKO.
 H. Res. 78: Mr. PHILLIPS.
 H. Res. 114: Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. WENSTRUP.
 H. Res. 549: Mr. CICILLINE and Mr. SOTO.
 H. Res. 594: Ms. LEE of California.
 H. Res. 701: Mr. SAN NICOLAS.
 H. Res. 714: Ms. WILD.
 H. Res. 823: Mr. KATKO, Ms. MATSUI, and Ms. STEVENS.
 H. Res. 908: Mr. GOTTHEIMER.
 H. Res. 1050: Mr. FORTENBERRY.
 H. Res. 1099: Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. CÁRDENAS.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII, petitions and papers were laid on the clerk's desk and referred as follows:

133. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco, California, relative to Resolution No. 182-20, urging the United States Congress and the Federal Executive Branch to expeditiously pass and enact subsequent interim emergency coronavirus release stimulus packages in addition to the Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security Act (CARES) with at least \$500 billion more in economic aid and \$250 billion more in investments for small business loans, specifically targeting women, people of color, veteran-owned businesses, and nonprofits, bolstering community-based lenders and smaller financial institutions; to the Committee on Small Business.

134. Also, a petition of Mr. Gregory D. Watson, a citizen of Austin, Texas, relative to respectfully requesting Federal legislation which would require recipients of public financial assistance, consisting at least partial of Federal funds, to undergo quarterly drug-testing — with negative results for illegal substances — in order to continue receiving such public financial assistance with a lifetime limit of five years of receipt of such public financial assistance as long as the recipient remains able-bodied; to the Committee on Ways and Means.