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

Printed on recycled paper.

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 Tikhanovsky, Viktar Babaryka, Coordination Council members Liliya Vlasova, Sergei Dylevsky, Maria Kalesnikava, and Maxim Znak, as well as several of their staff and volunteers, Svetlana Tikhanovskaya, 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 detainment 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 detainment 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 detainment 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 detainment 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 detainment 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 detainment 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 detainment 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 detainment 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 detainment 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 detainment 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 detainment 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 witness 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 lifesaving 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 whereases'', 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 Schrier, 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 Cárdenas, Vicente Gonzalez, Nanette Diaz Barragán, 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 police 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 noncontroversial 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
Aguilar
Allred
Axne
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brindisi
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Case
Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Cox (CA)
Craig
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Cunningham
Davids (KS)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Evans
Finkenauer
Fletcher
Foster
Frankel
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Gomez
Gottheimer
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Haaland
Harder (CA)
Hastings
Hayes
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Horn, Kendra S.
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luján
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Mfume
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Norcross
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rose (NY)
Rouda
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shalala
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (WA)
Spanberger
Speier
Stanton
Stevens
Suozzi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres Small (NM)
Trahan
Underwood
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NAYS—170

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

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

NOT VOTING—41

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

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

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.

□ 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

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Axne
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Case
Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Cox (CA)
Craig
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Cunningham
Davids (KS)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Evans
Finkenauer
Fletcher
Foster
Frankel
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Golden
Gomez
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Haaland
Harder (CA)
Hastings
Hayes
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Horn, Kendra S.
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luján
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Mfume
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rose (NY)
Rouda
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shalala
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (WA)
Spanberger
Speier
Stanton
Stevens
Suozzi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Trahan
Underwood
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NAYS—157

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

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

NOT VOTING—57

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

□ 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

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

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 gentlewoman 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 interdistrict 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 necessary 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 commonsense 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 solutions, 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, microschools, 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 supported 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 noes 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:

(11) 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. Automatically 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 requires 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:

(11) 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 gentlewoman 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 county 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)
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Jacobs
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
Lesko
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Marchant
Marshall
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McKinley
Meuser
Miller
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Murphy (NC)
Newhouse
Norman
Nunes
Olson
Palmer
Pence
Perry
Posey
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (SC)
Roby
Rodgers (WA)
Roe, David P.
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose, John W.
Rouzer
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Shimkus
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smucker
Spano
Stauber
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiffany
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Van Drew
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Waltz
Watkins
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Zeldin

NAYS—243

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Axne
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Biggs
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brindisi
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Buck
Budd
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Case
Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Cloud
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Cox (CA)
Craig
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Cunningham
Davids (KS)
Davidson (OH)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Engel
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Evans
Finkenauer
Fitzpatrick
Fletcher
Foster
Frankel
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Gosar
Gottheimer
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Haaland
Harder (CA)
Harris
Hastings
Hayes
Heck
Hice (GA)
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Horn, Kendra S.
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Hurd (TX)
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luján
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Massie
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Mfume
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Norcross
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rose (NY)
Rouda
Roy
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Rutherford
Ryan
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shalala
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Spanberger
Speier
Stanton
Stevens
Suozzi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres Small (NM)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth
Yoho

NOT VOTING—16

Abraham
Calvert
Castro (TX)
DeFazio
Graves (GA)
McHenry
Palazzo
Quigley
Riggleman
Rooney (FL)
Simpson
Soto
Timmons
Walker
Wright
Young

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

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
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allred
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Axne
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Bergman
Beyer
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NC)
Bishop (UT)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bost
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady
Brindisi
Brooks (IN)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Case
Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Cloud
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Comer
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Cox (CA)
Craig
Crenshaw
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Cunningham
Curtis
Davids (KS)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny K.
Davis, Rodney
Dean
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Dunn
Emmer
Engel
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Estes
Evans
Finkenauer
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fletcher
Flores
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx (NC)
Frankel
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallagher
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia (CA)
Garcia (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Gianforte
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez (OH)
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Granger
Graves (LA)
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Haaland
Hagedorn
Harder (CA)
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings
Hayes
Heck
Hern, Kevin
Herrera Beutler
Higgins (NY)
Hill (AR)
Himes
Holding
Hollingsworth
Horn, Kendra S.
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Hudson
Huffman
Huizenga
Hurd (TX)
Jackson Lee
Jacobs
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson (TX)
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Keller
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer

Kim
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamb
Lamborn
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Lesko
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marshall
Mast
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McKinley
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Meuser
Mfume
Miller
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (NC)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Newhouse
Norcross
Nunes
O'Halleran
Olson
Omar
Pallone
Palmer
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Posey
Pressley
Price (NC)
Raskin
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Roby
Rodgers (WA)
Roe, David P.
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose (NY)
Rose, John W.
Rouda
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Rutherford
Ryan
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scalise
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shalala
Sherman
Sherrill
Shimkus
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Smucker
Spanberger
Spano
Speier
Stanton
Stauber
Stefanik
Steil
Stevens
Stewart
Stivers
Suozzi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres Small (NM)
Trahan
Trone
Turner
Underwood
Upton
Van Drew
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Waltz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watkins
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Wexton
Wild
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Young
Zeldin

NAYS—34

Allen
Amash
Babin
Biggs
Brooks (AL)
Buck
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cheney
Cline
Crawford
Davidson (OH)
Duncan
Ferguson
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gibbs
Gohmert
Gooden
Gosar
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Griffith
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Jordan
Loudermilk
Massie
Mullin
Norman
Roy
Steube
Tiffany
Yoho

NOT VOTING—17

Abraham
Castro (TX)
Conaway
DeFazio
Doyle, Michael F.
Graves (GA)
McHenry
Ocasio-Cortez
Palazzo
Quigley
Riggleman
Rooney (FL)
Simpson
Soto
Timmons
Walker
Wright

□ 1648

Mr. FULCHER changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. PASCRELL, 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

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

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
Aguilar
Allred
Axne
Bacon
Balderson
Barragán
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brindisi
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Case
Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Cox (CA)
Craig
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Cunningham
Davids (KS)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny K.
Davis, Rodney
Dean
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Engel
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Evans
Finkenauer
Fitzpatrick
Fletcher
Foster
Frankel
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez (OH)
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Haaland
Harder (CA)
Hastings
Hayes
Heck
Herrera Beutler
Higgins (NY)
Hill (AR)
Himes
Hollingsworth
Horn, Kendra S.
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Hurd (TX)
Jackson Lee
Jacobs
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Joyce (OH)
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luján
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Mfume
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Norcross
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Reed
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rose (NY)
Rouda
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shalala
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Spanberger
Speier
Stanton
Stevens
Stivers
Suozzi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres Small (NM)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Upton
Van Drew
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walden
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NAYS—167

Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Baird
Banks
Barr
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (NC)
Bishop (UT)
Bost
Brady
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Cline
Cloud
Cole
Collins (GA)
Comer
Conaway
Cook
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curtis
Davidson (OH)
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duncan
Dunn
Emmer
Estes
Ferguson
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxx (NC)
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garcia (CA)
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gooden
Gosar
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harris
Hartzler
Hern, Kevin
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Holding
Hudson
Huizenga
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (PA)
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
Lesko
Long
Loudermilk

Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McKinley
Meuser
Miller
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Murphy (NC)
Newhouse
Norman
Nunes
Olson
Palmer
Pence
Perry
Posey
Reschenthaler
Roby
Rodgers (WA)
Roe, David P.
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rooney (FL)
Rose, John W.
Rouzer
Roy
Rutherford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Shimkus
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smucker
Spano
Stauber
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Taylor
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiffany
Tipton
Turner
Walberg
Walorski
Waltz
Watkins
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoho
Young
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—15

Abraham
Babin
Bass
Castro (TX)
DeFazio
Gohmert
Graves (GA)
McHenry
Palazzo
Riggleman
Simpson
Soto
Timmons
Walker
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)
Blumenauer (Beyer)
Butterfield (Kildee)
Chu, Judy (Takano)
Clay (Davids (KS))
Cohen (Beyer)
Davis, Danny K. (Underwood)
DeSaulnier (Matsui)
Frankel (Clark (MA))
García (IL) (Raskin)
Grijalva (Raskin)
Hastings (Wasserman Schultz)
Jayapal (Raskin)
Khanna (Gomez)
Kirkpatrick (Gallego)
Langevin (Lynch)
Lawrence (Kildee)
Lawson (FL) (Evans)
Lieu, Ted (Beyer)
Lipinski (Cooper)
Lofgren (Jeffries)
Lowenthal (Beyer)
Lowey (Tonko)
Meng (Clark (MA))
Moore (Beyer)
Napolitano (Correa)
Payne (Wasserman Schultz)
Pingree (Clark (MA))
Pocan (Raskin)
Porter (Wexton)
Rooney (FL) (Beyer)
Roybal-Allard (Aguilar)
Rush (Underwood)
Serrano (Jeffries)
Sewell (AL) (DelBene)
Thompson (MS) (Fudge)
Trahan (McGovern)
Watson Coleman (Pallone)
Welch (McGovern)
Wilson (FL) (Hayes)

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 inkling 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 teleschool.

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 January 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 right 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 overseeing 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 grandchildren? 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 thicket 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 organizing 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 figment 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 restaurants 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; nonprofits 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. VELÁZQUEZ (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. KRISHNAMOORTHI, 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. CASTOR 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. GRIJALVA):

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 Hawaiian 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 1, 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. MOOLENAAR.

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. KRISHNAMOORTHI, Mrs. AXNE, Ms. KELLY of

Ilinois, 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.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 166 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 15, 2020 No. 159

Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. GRASSLEY).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal God, we are grateful that You continue to rule the universe. We acknowledge that though wrong seems so strong, Your purposes will be fulfilled.

Lord, we praise You for Your promise that, in everything, You continue to work for the good of those who love You.

Mighty God, let Your will be done. Bless our lawmakers, listen to their prayers, and guide them with Your truth. Quench their thirst for Your presence with Your abiding love. May they not forget the many times You have helped them in the past. We pray in Your gracious Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH). The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 1 minute in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, the signing of the Abraham Accords today at the White House represents a very historic breakthrough for peace in the Middle East. I am not saying that this accord alone will bring peace to that troubled region, but this is the first tangible progress toward peace in that area in a quarter century.

I met Anwar Sadat at the time of the Camp David Accords in 1978, when he was present in the Ways and Means Committee room over in the House of Representatives, and I had an opportunity also to witness, at the White House, the handshake between Rabin and Arafat in 1993. Both events seemed to herald a new peace in the Middle East that, quite frankly, never materialized, and yet we still have peace between Israel and Egypt and between Israel and Jordan.

Israel has been a country for over 72 years. It is the only democracy in the region. It is a major economic, military, and political power, and, of course, it is our greatest ally in the Middle East. It is overdue for other states, then, and those states that are in that area especially to recognize Israel and pursue normal relations.

The outdated notion that recognition of Israel's existence should be withheld until somehow Israelis and Palestinians agree on the details of a two-state solution has not worked. The two-state solution hasn't made an agreement more likely, but it has prevented diplomatic interactions that could be a stabilizing force in an unstable region.

In a polarized time, today's historic accord between Israel and the UAE and Israel and Bahrain is good news that anyone can celebrate. We ought to give President Trump great credit for his leadership in this area. He has delivered in a lot of areas where both Republican and Democratic Presidents could not deliver in the past.

I yield the floor.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, yesterday, I discussed a tide of good news flowing out of the Middle East. Peace agreements between Israel and the UAE and Israel and Bahrain will be documented at the White House later today. Even more Arab countries are reportedly considering following suit. The winds of change are blowing across the Middle East. Thanks, in large part, to the hard work of the Trump administration, they are blowing toward peace.

I also mentioned yesterday that not everyone is happy. Not everyone in the Middle East is living in the 21st century. Some are too vested in the old fights and enmities and are afraid to let them go. President Abbas, who is now in the 16th year of a 4-year term at the head of the Palestinian Authority, predictably, tried to dismiss the compromise as nonsense. But, as the Obama administration's Middle East expert Dennis Ross wrote a few days ago, continuing this failed approach would just guarantee Palestinians will be left behind while the rest of the Arab world builds a better future.

And then there is the theocratic basket case that is Iran. Last weekend, as if perfectly scripted to contrast with the hopeful news of optimism and peace coming from the Arab world, the mullahs reminded the whole world of their flagrant disdain for human dignity and basic human rights. They carried out a hurried execution in the face of international condemnation.

Navid Afkari, a 27-year-old Iranian wrestler arrested during a government protest in 2018, was tortured into confessing to the murder of a security guard. He was hanged on Saturday. According to his mother, who was barred from visiting her son before his execution, Navid and his two brothers arrested alongside him were forced to testify against one another. As they mourn their brother, these two young men themselves face decades in prison

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

for standing up to the brutal injustices of the Iranian regime.

Stories like this are tragic, but they aren't shocking—not in a country where dissent and free expression are denied and not from rulers who regularly use both domestic and international terrorism. This regime has its fingerprints on destabilizing campaigns, assassinations, and violence against civilians in every single corner of the Middle East—from the shores of the Mediterranean to the Gulf of Aden.

The Obama-Biden administration's Iran deal, the JCPOA, did not improve any of this bad behavior. It ignored Iran's nonnuclear aggression. It let Tehran continue R&D on enriched uranium. If anything, Iran's behavior has only gotten worse, and that bad deal is still doing damage.

This year, it will sunset a prudent U.N. Security Council resolution that had kept Iran from buying conventional weapons. This summer, the U.N. Security Council, with the votes of Russia and China, refused to extend this 13-year-old embargo.

Returning to the JCPOA has become a sort of mantra for our political left here in the United States. But really, the reflex to oppose everything President Trump does can be a gift to our adversaries. Former Vice President Biden promises to rush back into a bad deal without securing any improvements. He proposes we would be able to renegotiate the bad deal from the inside of it after tossing away any leverage in advance.

There is one right way to deal with regimes like Iran—toughness and resolve. That is why President Trump successfully restored an important measure of deterrence when he removed Iran's top terrorist, Soleimani, from the battlefield forever.

Even though Tehran is weakened by sanctions, political unrest, and economic unease, they are also emboldened by our internal divisions and eager to exploit rifts among our allies. We know from publicly released intelligence that Iran seeks to interfere in our own politics. We know that Iranian-backed groups continue to threaten our forces in Iraq and Syria. We know that Iranian proxies like Hezbollah pose a growing threat to our ally Israel.

Unity, strength and resolve are the way to defend our security and our interests—not capitulation.

PROTESTS

Madam President, now, one final matter. For months now, it has been clear to basically every reasonable American that our country can and must hold two sets of true statements in our minds at the same time.

No. 1, our country has unfinished work to ensure that policing is fair to everyone and that Black Americans do not feel unfairly treated or targeted by law enforcement. And, No. 2, the vast majority of law enforcement officers are heroes, and the toxicity, anger, and actual violence that far-left mobs have inflicted on police men and women across our country is simply beyond the pale.

The American people want racial justice, and we want good, strong policing to ensure equal protection of the laws. We understand there is no contradiction here—none whatsoever. Most people are outraged by the killings of Black Americans that have shocked our country.

Sunday marked 6 months since the death of Breonna Taylor in my hometown of Louisville, KY. Our people want answers. Our Nation wants answers. Most Americans also feel sick when they hear about events like what happened last weekend in Los Angeles. Two sheriff's deputies were ambushed and shot while they sat in their patrol car in Compton. And then far-left protesters tried to literally block—block—an entrance to the hospital chanting things like ''kill the police'' and ''I hope they [effing] die.''

Fortunately, both deputies are out of surgery, but the hateful climate that creates these acts is still with us. One of our two political parties should do more to repudiate the underlying climate on their side.

To be clear, Democratic leaders, including Vice President Biden and our colleague like the junior Senator from California, spoke up quickly to condemn the actual shootings of these officers themselves. That was absolutely the right thing to do—no question. But what about the underlying climate? For months, the political left in this country has put all its might behind a false narrative that says disorder is acceptable, riots are free speech, and law enforcement is the real enemy of certain communities.

One prominent national newspaper, which found a straightforward op-ed from our colleague, Senator COTTON, to be more than they could bear, had no problem publishing a submission entitled, ''Yes, We Mean Literally Abolish the Police.'' No problem publishing that—''Yes, We Mean Literally Abolish the Police.''

When the Speaker of the House was asked to respond to rioters illegally toppling statues across the country, she blithely responded: ''People will do what they will do.'' That was about the topic of statues. From one liberal big city to another, we have seen mayors and local leaders who apparently find it easier to propose cutting police funding and criticize their men and women in uniform than to denounce out-of-control riots in their very own cities.

Just yesterday, with this Los Angeles story making headlines nationwide, the junior Senator from Massachusetts decided to criticize police officers on his Twitter feed and proposed a nationwide ban on nonlethal measures like tear gas and rubber bullets—a nationwide ban on nonlethal measures like tear gas and rubber bullets.

We are now at a point where some of our Democratic colleagues survey the Nation, survey the way law enforcement officers are being treated, and decide the answer is to keep rhetorically throwing cops under the bus—throwing them under the bus—and try to ban their nonlethal means of self-defense while they are at it.

The American people don't have any trouble rejecting terrible racism and discrimination and rejecting lawlessness, violence, and anti-police prejudice with equal clarity and equal force. They deserve leaders who can do likewise.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Mark C. Scarsi, of California, to be United States District Judge for the Central District of California.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to finish my remarks before the vote begins.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CORONAVIRUS

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, after the Senate Republicans spent 4 months dithering and delaying, last week, Leader MCCONNELL pushed a partisan, emaciated COVID bill. It was so paltry and ladened with poison pills that it was clearly designed to fail. And fail it did.

It is time for the Senate Republicans to wake up to the gravity of the crisis in our country and work with Democrats on a comprehensive bill that delivers real help to Americans.

Speaker PELOSI and I have already come down $1 trillion from our initial

request. Leader MCCONNELL and Senate Republicans must drop the cynical and political games and instead work with Democrats to find common ground and reach a compromise.

If Republican leadership lets the 20 Members of their caucus who barely want to provide any more relief and allows them to dictate their party's agenda, it will block the path to a compromise, and Republicans will have to answer to the American people.

Our country still does not have a strong grasp on COVID–19. America continues to lead the world in the number of confirmed cases by far—over 6.5 million. Nearly 200,000 Americans have died. Yet, unthinkably, it was reported that in one of his interviews with Bob Woodward, President Trump said that ''nothing more could have been done'' to combat the coronavirus. ''Nothing more could have been done''—that is what President Trump said. Of the many lies the President has told about COVID–19, this is one of the most monumental and one of the most galling.

There were so many vital things the President could have done to fight COVID–19 and protect our country. In the early days of the virus, hospitals, medical centers, and essential workers were short on PPE, ventilators, swabs, masks, and gloves. President Trump never mobilized the resources of the Federal Government, never fully invoked the Defense Production Act, and never set up a national clearing house to get resources where they needed to go.

It has been 7 months and President Trump still doesn't have a national testing strategy. There has never been a national plan for contact tracing. The President took months before he even encouraged Americans to wear a mask. This is an entire universe of actions that President Trump could have taken to help slow the spread of the virus and save American lives and American jobs, but he didn't. He never took strong action, never took responsibility. It is what it is.

In many cases, it would have been better, actually, if the President did nothing instead of what he did. It would have been better if the President never downplayed the virus, never called it a hoax, never pushed quack medicines, never speculated about injecting bleach, and never held rallies.

Every week—every week—brings new evidence that his administration is totally unequipped to right the ship, especially the Department of Health and Human Services. Over the weekend, there were numerous reports that political appointees at HHS have been interfering with CDC's report on COVID–19, trying to delay, edit out, or halt the release of facts that would have been politically embarrassing to the President. This is not the first time the administration has tried to hide reports and facts that would better inform the American people.

Meanwhile, as that is happening, President Trump has pressured HHS to ''slow the testing down.'' He has overstated the benefits of certain treatments and pressured the FDA to approve them and accused FDA officials of holding back a vaccine, and too many people within HHS are trying to suppress the science.

The Secretary of Health and Human Services, Alex Azar, has not only failed to push back against these outrageous moves by President Trump, but he has been almost entirely silent about the chaos and mismanagement in his own agency.

In Trump's administration, the most important skill is the ability to stand up to the President and resist political influence—more so in an agency like HHS than others, where the health of Americans is at stake.

It has become abundantly clear that the leadership of the Department of Health and Human Services has allowed perhaps the most important Federal agency right now to become subservient to the President's daily whims.

So, today, I am calling on Secretary Azar to resign immediately. We need a Secretary of Health and Human Services who will look out for the American people, not President Trump's political interests.

WILDFIRES

Madam President, now on another topic, wildfires: For the last several weeks, much of the American West has been ravaged by a historic wave of wildfires. At least 35 people have been killed. Thousands of homes have been destroyed. Over 5 million acres of land have been incinerated, roughly the size of Rhode Island and Connecticut combined. The sky glows with ghastly shades of red and orange.

It is impossible to have a serious conversation about these wildfires without talking about climate change. We know that climate change contributes to the frequency of these fires. We know it accelerates their destructive power. Six of the 20 largest fires in California history have happened this year alone. Heat waves and dry air make these disasters more likely.

These past few years have been some of the hottest and driest on record, but at a press conference yesterday with FEMA and California State officials, President Trump brushed aside any possibility that climate change had an effect, suggesting idiotically that the planet will ''start getting cooler; you just watch.''

This is just like what he did with COVID. He tries to deny it, and he makes it worse. He encourages people to ignore it, and the problem grows.

When the head of the California Natural Resources Agency told the President that science disagreed with him, the President said: ''I don't think science knows.'' This exchange where the President said ''It'll start getting cooler; you just watch,'' when he was upbraided by a scientific expert and says ''I don't think science knows'' captures everything you need to know about President Trump's grasp of basic scientific facts—and especially the science of climate change.

Without a shred of evidence or knowledge, President Trump said that our planet will just ''start getting cooler.'' It is just like his attitude toward this pandemic, which he promised would magically disappear.

You would think the situation would be better here in Congress, but, regrettably, the Republican Senate doesn't seem to take the threat of climate change seriously either. The Republican majority has had 6 years in charge of the Senate to show that they want to make progress on climate change but have done next to nothing—next to nothing—to curb emissions or protect our environment from the damaging effects of a warming planet.

The only time Republicans even brought up climate change legislation was when Leader MCCONNELL scheduled a sham vote on a climate bill so his own Members could vote against it. That is right. The only climate bill Leader MCCONNELL has brought to the floor is a bill he wanted his Members to vote against.

Democrats, on the other hand, believe protecting our planet is a moral obligation. Senate Democrats created the first-ever Senate special committee to study the climate crisis. We have committed to creating clean energy jobs and building resiliency in any infrastructure bill.

I have introduced legislation called Clean Cars for America that would make all vehicles on the road carbon-neutral by 2040, and we have committed to creating at least 10 million new clean energy jobs and dedicating 40 percent of climate funding to environmental justice and the disadvantaged and communities of color.

Just last week, I joined with Senator MARKEY and many grassroots organizations to introduce the THRIVE resolution, calling for millions of new jobs in renewable energy and making new investments in Black, Hispanic, and indigenous communities so that clean air, clean water, and clean energy are not privileges for the wealthy few but abundant for all.

This is about protecting our planet so that our kids and grandkids can live in a world with clean air, clean water, and the same kinds of opportunities we grew up with.

Republicans have had 6 years in the Senate to show they are serious about the defining crisis of our time, something that, over the years, will be even worse than COVID—much worse—and they have failed to take any action, just like they did on COVID: no action. Democrats would not make the same mistake again. We will not delay on climate the way Republicans have delayed on COVID and not done what is needed.

I yield the floor.

VOTE ON SCARSI NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, all postcloture time has expired.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Scarsi nomination?

Mr. GARDNER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) and the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. MURKOWSKI). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 83, nays 12, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 170 Ex.]

YEAS—83

Alexander	Graham	Portman
Baldwin	Grassley	Reed
Barrasso	Hassan	Risch
Bennet	Hawley	Roberts
Blackburn	Heinrich	Romney
Blunt	Hirono	Rosen
Boozman	Hoeven	Rounds
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Brown	Inhofe	Sasse
Burr	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Cardin	Jones	Scott (SC)
Carper	Kaine	Shaheen
Casey	Kennedy	Shelby
Cassidy	King	Sinema
Collins	Lankford	Smith
Cornyn	Leahy	Stabenow
Cortez Masto	Lee	Sullivan
Cotton	Loeffler	Tester
Crapo	Manchin	Thune
Cruz	McConnell	Tillis
Daines	McSally	Toomey
Duckworth	Menendez	Udall
Durbin	Moran	Van Hollen
Enzi	Murkowski	Warner
Ernst	Murphy	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Paul	Wicker
Fischer	Perdue	Young
Gardner	Peters	

NAYS—12

Blumenthal	Klobuchar	Schatz
Booker	Markey	Schumer
Cantwell	Merkley	Warren
Gillibrand	Murray	Wyden

NOT VOTING—5

Capito	Cramer	Sanders
Coons	Harris	

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's actions.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Stanley Blumenfeld, of California, to be United States District Judge for the Central District of California.

Mitch McConnell, Martha McSally, Tom Cotton, John Cornyn, Kevin Cramer, John Barrasso, Roy Blunt, John Boozman, Marco Rubio, Richard Burr, Mike Crapo, Roger F. Wicker, Rob Portman, Lamar Alexander, John Thune, Steve Daines, James Lankford.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Stanley Blumenfeld, of California, to be United States District Judge for the Central District of California, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) and the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 89, nays 6, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 171 Ex.]

YEAS—89

Alexander	Graham	Portman
Baldwin	Grassley	Reed
Barrasso	Hassan	Risch
Bennet	Hawley	Roberts
Blackburn	Heinrich	Romney
Blunt	Hoeven	Rosen
Booker	Hyde-Smith	Rounds
Boozman	Inhofe	Rubio
Braun	Johnson	Sasse
Brown	Jones	Schatz
Burr	Kaine	Schumer
Cantwell	Kennedy	Scott (FL)
Cardin	King	Scott (SC)
Carper	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Casey	Lankford	Shelby
Cassidy	Leahy	Sinema
Collins	Lee	Smith
Cornyn	Loeffler	Stabenow
Cortez Masto	Manchin	Sullivan
Cotton	McConnell	Tester
Crapo	McSally	Thune
Cruz	Menendez	Tillis
Daines	Merkley	Toomey
Duckworth	Moran	Udall
Durbin	Murkowski	Warner
Enzi	Murphy	Whitehouse
Ernst	Murray	Wicker
Feinstein	Paul	Wyden
Fischer	Perdue	Young
Gardner	Peters	

NAYS—6

Blumenthal	Hirono	Van Hollen
Gillibrand	Markey	Warren

NOT VOTING—5

Capito	Cramer	Sanders
Coons	Harris	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 89, the nays are 6.

The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Stanley Blumenfeld, of California, to be United States District Judge for the Central District of California.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

FILIBUSTER

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, last week, Leader MCCONNELL called up a bill to the floor of the U.S. Senate. It was a coronavirus relief bill, which included a number of components that both sides had agreed needed to be in any coronavirus relief bill. It was a targeted bill. It was a fiscally responsible bill, and it was a bill that was rooted in reality. In other words, there was a belief that it could be signed into law if, in fact, it was passed by the Congress.

So, when it was called up, obviously, we talked about the features in the bill, many of which are things, as I said, enjoyed bipartisan support. When I said it was fiscally responsible, it actually repurposed funds from the previous coronavirus relief bill, from the CARES Act, that had not yet been spent. So it took some of those dollars, repurposed them, used them in another way, which I think would be a fiscally responsible way in which to approach the whole issue of how we spend taxpayer dollars on any issue, including a crisis. So there was a repurposing that I think, again, represents a fiscally responsible approach to doing this.

It also addressed the issue of people who were unemployed. It had a provision in there that allowed people to continue to receive unemployment insurance above and beyond what their States offered in terms of the benefits—$300 above that on a per-week basis, which, on average, represents about an 85-percent wage replacement. So it was about an 85-percent wage replacement in terms of an unemployment benefit. It also included bipartisan improvements and bipartisan amendments and modifications to the PPP program, things which both sides had agreed upon. That program has been very successful but needed to be expanded and reauthorized, so it included those changes—again, bipartisan changes.

It included significant funding for both elementary and secondary education—about $70 billion there to help our schools open safely and another $30 billion to $35 billion for colleges and universities for the same purpose: to help them be able to open safely—again, a bipartisan priority.

Those are just a few of the things that were included. It also included, of course, additional funding for vaccines, therapies, testing, all things that we think are vitally important if we are going to defeat the virus.

Those were all components that were included in the bill last week that was brought up to the floor by the majority

leader, Senator MCCONNELL, and it was blocked. It was filibustered by the Democrats. Now, when I say blocked, I am not talking about blocking the end bill. I am talking about blocking even getting on the bill. It was a motion to proceed under the Senate rules, something that is necessary to get on a bill.

It is important, I think, to point out that there are several ways in which a bill can be stopped, and they require a supermajority—60 votes in the Senate. Once you are on a bill and it is subject to an amendment process, you can, at the end of that, if you don't like the bill, you can still block it with 41 votes. In other words, it takes 60 votes to get on a bill, to proceed to a bill, and 60 votes to get off the bill, to report it out. So there are several places where if you are opposed to something and you think that you haven't been treated fairly, you can block it.

But blocking the motion to proceed means you are blocking a bill—even just the idea of getting on the bill and opening it up to an amendment process and debating it on the floor of the Senate. That is not, obviously, the first time that has happened. It happened in the police reform bill. It happened earlier this year in the original CARES package.

But on the police reform bill, you had, again, a bill that had many bipartisan provisions in it. In fact, about 75 to 80 percent of the bill were things that both sides agreed upon, and, there again, the motion to proceed just to get on the bill was blocked. It was by the use of the filibuster. It was by the use of the 60-vote threshold in the Senate to prevent the Senate from even proceeding to the bill—even after, I would add, the manager of that bill and the author of that bill, Senator TIM SCOTT from South Carolina, had indicated through the leadership that they would be willing to accept up to 10 amendments or up to 20 amendments. They were offered unanimous consent to get 10 or 20 amendments offered in the police reform bill, but it was still blocked even on the motion to proceed by the Democrats in the Senate.

So, when they blocked the bill last week, it was pointed out, I think, accurately by the media reporting on the bill. These were a few of the headlines to give you a sense of the reaction.

The Hill: ''Senate Democrats block GOP relief bill.'' The Washington Post said: ''Democrats block slimmed-down GOP coronavirus relief bill. . . .'' ABC News said: ''Democrats block Senate GOP COVID 19 relief proposal.'' National Public Radio said: ''Senate Democrats Block GOP's $300 Billion Pandemic Relief Bill.''

So those were some of the headlines. Maybe this doesn't mean anything to anybody but Congress watchers, but I am sure the irony is not lost on anybody who follows this process. The Democrats used the legislative filibuster. When I say blocking a motion to proceed, it was the use of a legislative filibuster to block a bill last week—as I mentioned, several times earlier this year—at the same time that they are calling for an end to the legislative filibuster.

Imagine that. Think about the irony of that. On Friday, NBC News reported: ''Democratic insiders are assembling a coalition behind the scenes to wage an all-out war on the Senate filibuster in bullish anticipation of sweeping the 2020 election. . . .''

So the very mechanism that they used repeatedly here just in the last year—but, frankly, for the last 6 years that they have been in the minority—to block or, in some cases, even to improve a bill that comes to the floor of the U.S. Senate, they are now talking about getting rid of that very rule. I mean, think about that. The irony of that is pretty rich.

It was a disturbing confirmation that the campaign by some Democrats to eliminate the Senate's nearly 200-year-old practice for considering legislation has become official. It used to be sort of whispered around here and talked about, but now they are talking openly about getting rid of the filibuster. It puts into stark contrast the choice the voters are going to face in November.

So what is the legislative filibuster? Well, it is the product of the Senate's tradition of unlimited debate. The legislative filibuster is essentially the requirement that 60 Senators agree before the Senate can end debate and vote on a contentious bill. In other words, you need 60 percent of the Senate to agree before you can pass a bill.

Now, what this means in practice is that unlike the House of Representatives, where legislation can easily pass with the support of just one party, in the Senate, you generally need the support of at least some Members of the other party before you can pass legislation. Nowadays, the Senate's filibuster rule could be said to be the primary thing that distinguishes the Senate from the House of Representatives.

That matters because the Senate is supposed to be different from the House of Representatives. The Framers of the Constitution designed the Senate to be, as the minority leader once said—alluding to the legendary exchange between Washington and Jefferson—the cooling saucer of democracy.

Wary of—to quote Federalist 62—''the propensity of all single and numerous assemblies, to yield to the impulse of sudden and violent passions,'' the Founders created the Senate as a check on the House of Representatives. They made the Senate smaller and Senators' terms of office longer with the intention of creating a more stable, more thoughtful, and more deliberative legislative body to check ill-considered or intemperate legislation.

As time has gone on, the legislative filibuster is the Senate rule that has had perhaps the greatest impact in preserving the Founders' vision of the Senate. Thanks to the filibuster, it is often harder to get legislation through the Senate than through the House. It requires more thought, more debate, and greater consensus.

Those are good things. Historically, Senators of both parties have recognized this. They have seen beyond the narrow partisan advantage of the moment and fought for the preservation of the filibuster.

In 2005, when there was talk of abolishing the judicial filibuster, Democratic Senators, some of whom still serve in this body today, fought fiercely to safeguard it. At a rally in March of that year, the current Democratic leader said:

> They believe if you get 51% of the vote, there should be one party rule. We will stand in their way! Because an America of checks and balances is the America we love. It's the America the Founding Fathers created. It's been the America that has kept us successful for 200 years and we're not going to let them change it! . . . We will fight, and we will preserve the Constitution.

That is from the current Democratic leader back in 2005, speaking about proposals to eliminate the filibuster. Well, unfortunately, the Democrats changed their tune a few years later when they thought abolishing the judicial filibuster would serve their advantage. But even then, Democrats—and later Republicans—sought to distinguish between confirming nominees and the importance of preserving debate on legislation. Now they are talking about abolishing the fundamental practice of the Senate, the legislative filibuster, for the same prospect of temporary partisan gaming.

''Nothing's off the table,'' the minority leader said when asked about Democrats' intentions for the legislative filibuster if they win back the Senate. It is a far cry from what he said just a few years ago.

Eliminating the legislative filibuster would permanently change the nature of the Senate. The cooling saucer that the Founders envisioned would essentially be gone, and the one-party rule the Democratic leader decried back in 2005 would become a reality.

Some might ask why one-party rule is a problem. After all, sometimes one party wins the Senate, the House, and the Presidency. Shouldn't that party be able to pass whatever legislation it wants? Well, the answer is no. Our country is relatively evenly split down the middle, with the advantage sometimes moving to the Republicans and sometimes to the Democrats, but even if one party were a permanent minority in this country, one-party rule still wouldn't be acceptable.

Let me go back to the Federalist papers for just a minute. Federalist 10 and 51 discuss two issues that the Founders were concerned about: minority rights and the tyranny of the majority. While we tend to think of tyrants as single individuals, the Founders recognized that a majority could be tyrannical as well. So the Founders created a system of government designed to prevent tyrannical majority from running roughshod over the rights of the minority, and one of those checks was the Senate.

Today, the legislative filibuster may be the single most important thing preserving the Senate's constitutional role as a check on majority tyranny. By requiring 60 votes, the filibuster ensures that any legislation has to take into account the views of a broad group of Senators. With a 60-vote threshold, you are unlikely to get your legislation passed unless you bring some Senators of the opposite party on board, and that means the minority party has a real role in shaping legislation in the Senate, something the minority party in the House lacks.

Democrats have repeatedly, as I pointed out earlier, used the legislative filibuster to their advantage during this Congress. In March, Democrats filibustered our largest coronavirus relief bill, the CARES Act, until Republicans agreed to add some Democratic priorities, and Democrats quickly took credit for making the bill better. You would think that Democrats would want to preserve this influence, especially—especially—now that Democrats have experienced the consequences of their decision to abolish the judicial filibuster.

Of course, when they say they want to abolish the legislative filibuster, Democrats mean that they want to abolish the legislative filibuster if they win a majority in November. They have a lot of legislation they want to pass, and they don't want to have to moderate that legislation to address Republicans' or Americans' concerns.

But I would remind my colleagues that no one is in power forever. If Democrats do win in November and abolish the legislative filibuster, they may quickly come to regret that decision once they are in the minority again, because no matter how permanent a majority thinks it will be, sooner or later every majority party returns to minority status.

In addition to doing away with the bipartisan nature of the Senate, ending the legislative filibuster would also erode the stability of government. Legislation would become more partisan because the majority would not have to take into account the opinions of the minority party. That would make legislation likely to be reversed as soon as the opposite party gains the majority in a future Congress.

Without the legislative filibuster, it is not hard to see a future in which national policy on a host of issues could fluctuate wildly every few years. Taxes could go up and down on a regular basis. Government programs could be stopped and started every few years. The consequences for individuals, businesses, and our economy would not just be unpleasant but potentially devastating.

I understand the frustration of my Democratic colleagues. I have been in the minority of the Senate. I was in the minority my first 8 years here.

I also know what it is like when you get into the majority and can't pass everything you want because the minority party will filibuster your bills. I have certainly had moments when I wished we could just pass legislation with a simple majority, especially coming from the House of Representatives.

Democrats have stood in the way of a lot of legislation I would like to have passed this year, from Senator SCOTT's police reform bill, which I mentioned earlier, to additional coronavirus relief, to pro-life legislation.

It is also important to note that not every filibuster has been undertaken for noble purposes. Like every tool, it can be misused. But I know that no matter how frustrating the filibuster may be in the moment, preserving it is essential to preserving the institution of the Senate and the purpose for which it was created. It is essential to protecting minority rights, and it is an essential check on tyrannical majorities that would seek to curtail our freedoms.

Legend has it that when Benjamin Franklin was leaving the Constitutional Convention, someone asked him what form of government the convention had instituted. ''A republic,'' Franklin said, ''if you can keep it''—''if you can keep it.''

Today, the legislative filibuster is the key rule preserving the Senate's constitutional role as a check on partisan passion. I pray that no future Senate will destroy the Senate's essential role in our system of government for temporary partisan gain.

I yield the floor.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield for a question?

Mr. THUNE. I will be happy to yield to the Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I want to just start by saying amen to everything the Senator has said.

I listened to his words carefully, and I hear a great deal of caution in his words about actions that the Senate may take as a body that would be in response to perhaps short-term gain or immediate political gain—but a gain that could be finite.

Over the course of the years that I have been in the Senate, I, too, have shared the same frustration about legislation that I cared deeply about that I believe had been blocked. Our parliamentarian rules have actually worked to delay things unnecessarily or oftentimes delayed things to the point where they never came to fruition. I have seen the frustration. I also see the benefit of being more methodical, of being that cooling saucer in the process of governance and particularly good governance.

But the words that you used are very, very cautionary. It is as if you are suggesting that if we change the filibuster rules, we will, in effect, have changed the institution of the Senate going forward and have changed the institution so that it is, perhaps, just a smaller body than the House but subject to the same rules, where those who have the most votes on one side win.

My question to the Senator from South Dakota is, Do you believe that a change in the filibuster rules here in the U.S. Senate would be permanently detrimental to the institution of the Senate going forward?

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I would say, through the Chair, to my colleague from Alaska that that is absolutely the case. I don't think there is any question but that, if the legislative filibuster is done away with in a future Senate—and, again, Members on the Democratic side are talking openly about doing that if they gain the majority after the election in November—it will transform the institution of the Senate and, by extension, transform our country.

The institution that was designed to protect minority rights and to put a check on a majority will no longer be a functioning institution in the way the Founders intended. In fact, it will essentially become, as the Senator from Alaska pointed out, the House of Representatives with longer terms.

I think that would be unfortunate for a country that was based upon a system of checks and balances and that recognized very early on how critical it was that minority rights be a part of our public debate and discussion and that those voices not be muffled or that those voices not be completely put out of the public debate.

I would simply say to my colleague from Alaska that I think this is a monumental issue in terms of what this institution has meant to this country and what it will continue to mean in the future if these rules are changed and this constitutional protection, as we have pointed out, is done away with. It will transform the Senate, and it will transform the country in ways that would be very detrimental to what the Founders intended.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. I thank the Senator from South Dakota.

I would hope that on a matter as significant as what we are talking about, which is effectively the operational integrity of this institution, there would be good, thorough open discussion and debate on this floor and amongst floor Members.

But the concerns we are hearing that there are efforts on the outside of this body that would push us to change our rules and do so in a way that could permanently erode and undercut the ability of the U.S. Senate to operate as intended would be, I believe, a travesty.

Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROUNDS). The assistant Democratic leader.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I listened to this debate very carefully because I have great respect for both of the Senators—the Senator from Alaska and the Senator from South Dakota.

I have seen both of them operate as effective legislators on the floor of the U.S. Senate. I have seen both of them entertain amendments, both friendly and not so friendly, on the floor of the

Senate and deal with them in a fair fashion. I have seen both of them use the U.S. Senate to achieve legislative goals, some that I shared and some that I didn't share.

But I have to ask them, in all candor, as I listened to the speech about preserving the Senate as we know it, if they are really taking a look around at the Senate as we know it. Do you know how many amendments were debated on the floor of the U.S. Senate in the year 2019—in the entire year? America's greatest deliberative body considered 22 amendments in that year. Six of them were offered by one Senator—Senator RAND PAUL, the junior Senator from Kentucky. You remember them, as I do. He basically said: Here is a gun to your head. If you want to go home, I get a vote. He got his vote. And as he reminded me, he lost every one of those amendments. So 6 of the 22 amendments were, frankly, one Senator's effort to have a recorded vote, and that is all it was.

Sixteen substantive amendments in a year, and you are arguing that we cannot change the Senate, we cannot transform the Senate, we cannot consider changes to the rules of the Senate. I know better.

I know that you are a good legislator, and you are as well, Senator. I know that you can take a bill through a committee, bring it to the floor, defend it on the floor, and go through the amendment process. We all know that that is how the Senate was designed to work.

What happened? What happened to the Senate? Well, if you take a look at the number of cloture motions to end a filibuster that were filed some 13 years ago, they averaged about 68 a year. Do you know how many we now have? Over 250 a year.

This is out of control. It is so much out of control that when you take a look at the ordinary business of the U.S. Senate and you take a look at the memories you may have of passing a budget resolution, we don't do that anymore, do we? You take a look at passing appropriation bills. You remember sitting on the Appropriations Committee and proud to be there, as I am too. I loved that committee. It was a great committee to serve on. We actually took agencies and went through hearings and drew up budgets and took them to Appropriations subcommittees and actually considered amendments in the committee and then brought them to the floor and had amendments on the floor. Yes, that happened in your political lifetime and in mine. It no longer occurs. Do you understand the Senate which you are defending is a Senate which no longer engages in that kind of debate?

What does it boil down to? There were meetings of the Big 4 or the Big 8, or whatever number there happens to be. They decide all 12 appropriations bills, and we sit on the outside of the room holding our hands patiently, hoping that something we wanted is included. Is that the Senate that you ran for? Is that the Senate you do not want to change? Tell me seriously. It can't be.

Those of us on this side of the aisle say to younger Members: You would have loved the Senate if you just could have seen it, but you have only been here 6 years. So you missed it.

There was a time when we did debate on the floor. Do you remember when Dodd-Frank came to the floor? Senator Dodd and Senator SHELBY were managing that bill. This was the most dramatic change in Wall Street policy in a generation or more. I remember it because I offered what I believe was the 25th amendment on the floor—25 amendments on this bill that had already come out of the Banking Committee. I offered the 25th amendment on debit cards, and they announced that it would be a 60-vote margin. All the others had been a simple majority to that point. I surprised everybody, including myself, and passed that amendment. And then more were offered.

Do you remember the immigration reform bill? Do you recall what happened there? I can tell you because I was on the Gang of 8 that wrote the bill. We went through the Judiciary Committee, and Senator Jeff Sessions of Alabama was determined to derail the bill. He said: I have dozens of amendments, and I am going to offer them all. Well, he stopped at about 20 because he wasn't passing most of his amendments. Then it came to the floor, and we faced the same amendment process, amendment after amendment, and the bill was passed on the floor of the Senate.

That was within my political lifetime and yours as well. It worked. Why is it not working now? Why is this such an empty Chamber? Why are there all of these empty desks when there are so many things that need to be done in America? Because we have stopped legislating. We have stopped debating. We have stopped amending.

You say: Boy, we have to preserve this. We have to do everything we can to preserve this.

We know better than that. This is not the Senate that we are witnessing. This is some aberration, some use of the filibuster.

In the first 3 years, with Senator MCCONNELL in charge, we had more filibusters and cloture votes than in the entire history of the U.S. Senate. It is out of control, my friends, my colleagues, fellow Senators.

It is out of control, my friends, my colleagues, my fellow Senators. I don't know what the answer is in terms of rule changes, but I will tell you this.

Mr. THUNE. Would the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DURBIN. In just one moment.

I will tell you this: To argue that we need to preserve this is to really discourage anyone from becoming a Member of this body if we are not going to legislate, if we are not going to tackle the real issues of our time.

I look at the Presiding Officer. He stepped up on the last immigration debate that we had on a bipartisan measure. I thank him for doing it. It wasn't easy, politically. That was what the Senate once was not that long ago.

I do yield for a question.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, would the Senator from Illinois agree, however—because I think it is important to point out that this is not something that happened in the last few years. The Senator from Alaska had a colleague elected in 2008 who, when he ran again for election in 2014, the argument could be made against him that he had never gotten a vote on the floor of the U.S. Senate on a single amendment in a 6-year term in the Senate.

I came here in 2005. In the first 8 years that I was here as a Senator, I witnessed time and again the very thing you are talking about, where amendments were shut down, the tree was filled, in the parliamentary language that we use here in the Senate.

So I would ask the Senator: Is this not a—this is not an issue that has cropped up in the last few years. Is this not a problem that originated some time ago and, as the Senator is suggesting, that we need to do away with the supermajority requirement that requires us here as Senators to work together in a bipartisan way to find common ground to fix what ails the Senate?

I would argue and a lot would argue that what ails the Senate right now requires nothing more than behavioral change. We have to agree that when somebody offers an amendment on one side, that it is not going to be blocked immediately and we get into this lockdown. That is what happened in recent years and in the last couple of examples we have had, as recently as last week, blocking the motion to proceed to the bill.

I mean, if you want to have an amendment process, you have to get on the bill in the first place. That has been, now, the routine that has been executed by the minority, is to prevent even a motion to proceed, which would enable us to get to an amendment process.

So this is not something that happened when Senator MCCONNELL came; this was happening well before that. As I pointed out, the Senator from Alaska's colleague went through an entire 6-year term without getting a vote—a Democratic colleague—when he was in the majority here in the Senate.

Mr. DURBIN. I would say to the Senator from South Dakota, thank you. I said earlier, and I meant it—I think you are a good legislator, as are the Senator from Alaska and many others, and given a chance, you prove it. We just don't get the chance anymore. No budget resolution. No appropriations bills. One bill, really, of any substance comes to the floor of the Senate each year now. It is the Defense authorization bill, by tradition. Come hell or high water, we are going to bring up

that bill. And I am glad we do, but that is it. End of story. The rest of the time, what do we spend our days doing? Watching the clock go by for 30 hours so we can have a vote on the next nomination. Is that the Senate you ran for? Is that why you went through the sacrifice and asked your family to join you in that sacrifice to be in public life? No. Not for me, it isn't. I am here to do something. I think we can do something. We have proven it in the past.

The Affordable Care Act. Books will be written—they have already been written about what it took to finally pass it, but eventually it was enacted into law and signed by the President and changed the lives of millions of Americans. I am glad I voted for it. It was not a bipartisan effort at any stage. I wish it were.

The point I am getting to is this: I don't know what the answer is in terms of changing the rules, but I am not going to stand in defense of the status quo. I do not believe the notion that we cannot touch the Senate and its traditions really is defensible in light of what we have seen on the Senate floor for the last several years—years.

I just have to tell you, I am surprised now that the Republican position articulated by your leader and by the whip is status quo: Leave it as is. It is fine. It is just great. Don't you change the Senate.

Well, I think the Senate needs to change.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I have one last question for the Senator from Illinois.

I don't disagree that, again, we can do a better job—both sides—of making the Senate a more open place where we have an opportunity to debate, which I think is the history and tradition of the Senate, but I don't think blowing up the Senate rules accomplishes that.

I just want to read for you from this morning—I was on the floor here, but in an interview on NPR, the junior Senator from Massachusetts was asked if there are parts of the Green New Deal that might attract bipartisan support. How did he reply? He replied that we need to enact the whole thing, and if Republicans disagree, Democrats should eliminate the filibuster.

Now, wanting to preserve the filibuster doesn't mean we can't reform the Senate, but it does mean that we shouldn't allow a majority to steamroll a minority. That is what the filibuster and the rules of the Senate were designed to protect.

What your Members are talking openly about doing—including your leader—is nuking the filibuster, blowing up the Senate, and changing and transforming it in a way that will transform not only the Senate and the way the government, I think, was designed to work by our Founders but also transform the country.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I would love the junior Senator from Massachusetts to address that question himself when he gets his chance on the floor.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one last question?

Mr. DURBIN. Happy to yield.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, to follow the Senator from South Dakota's comments about using the tool that would effectively blow up the Senate, if you will—these are not words that we use freely, but I think it is fair to suggest that utilizing this tool that would eliminate the filibuster, that would eliminate, really, the strongest tool for a minority party, is akin to the nuclear option. We use that term around here in legislative prose.

I would agree with much of what you have said. You and I have served on the Appropriations Committee now for years. We have had an opportunity to be engaged in good, substantive debates that have yielded good, substantive, enduring laws.

As I think about our role around here, it is not just to engage in the partisan message of the day; it is actually to enact laws. But when we enact laws that are good for just one party, that are wholly partisan, you can kind of predict the direction that will be taken when that minority party that voted against that particular policy then regains power and takes the majority and then attempts to overturn whatever that policy may be.

When we think about ways that we can help an economy that is struggling right now, one of the things that I am hearing from businesses is this: The one thing we would really like out of Washington, DC, the one thing we would really like is some level of certainty with policies, that it is not kind of this whiplash, back and forth from one administration to the next.

Well, the way you do that is through a level of consensus. As we know, on this floor right now, where it is still pretty quiet, consensus has been harder and harder to achieve on a bipartisan basis. Maybe this is a place in time where we are, and it is just dark. As our friend John McCain would say: It is always darkest before it goes pitch-black. Well, maybe we are getting close to the pitch-black. One can only hope.

But I do hear your words that the status quo is not acceptable. I agree with you, my friend. It is not acceptable. It is not acceptable that we are in that place where we can't get votes on amendments that are legitimate and pertinent to the legislation that we have.

I am trying to advance an energy bill right now, to get to final passage, and we are going through the procedural hurdles. I will work through those. But we are at a point where, as an institution, I believe we are failing. We are failing the American public. We are failing our constituents. We are failing in our role in governing.

I do think that when people look to the anxiety that is at play right now with our national elections, with a Presidential election that is as volatile as we have seen, if there is some level of comfort and security that they might have, they might think that just maybe the Congress, maybe the Senate, can get its act together and be working together.

So I hear you. The status quo is not acceptable. I am not one who is going to say we can't change any of the rules, but we have to do better. Whether it is behavioral attitudes that need to change or whether we need to work together to change the rules, that is where we should be, not unilaterally bomb-throwing, not unilaterally making the decision that is going to benefit our party today, and then when we lose the majority, we will deal with it later. We owe it to the Senate and we owe it to the country to do better.

I appreciate this back-and-forth today. I would welcome other colleagues to join us. I would hope that we look very, very closely at where we are right now because we are using our own rules to do damage to the institution of the Senate.

So let's not take the last tool that holds us in check—this filibuster—and throw it away as well because we will regret it. In the meantime, let's figure out what we can be doing as Democrats and Republicans to do better for the institution of the Senate and do better for the American people.

I apologize. That wasn't by way of a question; it was occupying the time of the Senator from Illinois. But I think we have a lot of work to do here, and I hope we are able to do it together.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, with her permission, I will add a question mark to the end of that statement to the Senator from Alaska, to thank her and warn her that we are coming dangerously close to debating on the floor of the Senate. It almost never happens, and we are coming close to it.

We are actually asking one another: Do we have to change the rules to finally make the Senate work, or is there another way? I am open to other ways. I am open to demonstrations of that. But I will tell you, it is a frustration. It is the determination to make certain that, for the people of Illinois who returned me to the Senate, we actually do something, achieve something; that we go home, win or lose, with the feeling that we have been engaged in a process that respected our rights as individual Senators and ended in a vote up or down and a measure passed or failed. That, to me, is why I ran for this job, and I think probably for yourself as well. We are not there, and we are not close to being there.

CORONAVIRUS

Mr. President, to date, we have lost nearly 200,000 Americans to the coronavirus, and we are quickly approaching 7 million cases in the United States.

This virus has changed life as we know it, and Americans are in need of help from Congress. However, despite

the urgent needs of families, businesses, workers, and unemployed Americans across the country, Senate Republicans have dragged their feet and offered up only a few weak measures that barely address the needs of the Nation.

The majority leader knows what needs to be done. The playbook is right in front of us. We did it back in March with the CARES Act, which passed 96–0.

To negotiate a real package with real solutions for the American people, he needs to show up at the negotiating table and give up these rogue attempts to pass empty, half-hearted measures.

In the meantime, more data is coming in every day, giving us a clearer picture of just how devastating this pandemic has been to so many Americans. A new report from the Robert John Wood Foundation found some troubling outcomes that COVID has had on Chicago residents. Half of Chicago households reported facing serious financial problems during the pandemic and troubles caring for children, with 35 percent reporting that they used up all or most of their savings.

As we know, the pandemic has disproportionately affected our minority communities, with nearly 70 percent of Black and 63 percent of Latinx households in Chicago reported having serious financial problems. And I am sad to say that this study found half of Chicago households report having lost their jobs, been furloughed, or seen reductions in wages or work hours since the start of the pandemic.

We all know how important an internet connection is during this pandemic. According to the report, 40 percent of Chicago households are either struggling with their internet connection or lack access to high-speed internet in their home needed to complete schoolwork or their jobs.

While these statistics reflect the reality of many in Chicago, there is little doubt that this is also the story in so many cities and States across the Nation. This is why we need a substantial federal response. We need to do what is necessary to help struggling families, businesses, cities, and States get back on their feet.

Last week, Senate Republicans proposed another inadequate, partisan coronavirus response bill that failed to prioritize the needs of struggling Americans. The bill failed to provide another round of economic impact payments for families or hazard pay for essential workers.

It failed to provide relief to States and local governments so they can continue to pay teachers, EMTs, and firefighters. And it failed to provide any housing assistance or nutrition assistance so struggling families can keep a roof over their heads and food on the table.

It has been 4 months since the House passed the HEROES Act, and week after week Senate Republicans refuse to make a good faith, bipartisan effort to pass a relief measure that meets the severity of this crisis. History will judge us on how we responded to the worst pandemic in a century and the deepest recession in 75 years. In response to this crisis, did we help prevent millions from slipping into poverty through another round of economic impact payments and extending enhanced unemployment benefits? Did we give schools and teachers the appropriate resources so they can help our children learn in a safe environment?

What steps did we take to preserve one of our country's greatest assets: the health and safety of our workforce? Did we throw caution to the wind by prematurely reopening simply because it's an election year?

Our country needs help, and the proposal that we voted on last week offered little help to struggling Americans.

Our Nation is suffering right now, and there is a long road to recovery ahead of us. Unfortunately, Leader MCCONNELL wasted precious time by pitching a half-baked proposal that prioritized the needs of corporations over the needs of American families.

Let's pass a bill that matches the gravity of this crisis, and let's pass it now.

I will close with a brief comment on substance. On March 26 we shocked America in the Senate. I know it. I went home, and they told me so. Do you know how we shocked them? By a vote of 96 to 0, we passed the CARES Act—96 to 0—with not a single dissenting vote in the Senate—$3 trillion to address our economic problems and the coronavirus epidemic we were facing. We did it on March 26—yes, in this calendar year—and we did it knowing that the measures we were taking had a life expectancy of just a few months because we thought that would be the end of our challenge. It is not.

The challenges that we faced in passing the CARES Act in March still are challenges America faces. When it comes to COVID–19, the numbers are sobering. The infection rate of COVID–19 in the United States is double the infection rate of the same virus in Canada—Canada. How can the United States be in a position where twice as many Americans are getting sick as those living just on the other side of the border?

When you look at the overall numbers, you have to shake your head. We have 4½ percent of the world's population living in the United States—4½ percent—and over 20 percent of the COVID–19 deaths in the world—4½ percent and 20 percent. What is going on here?

In this Nation, this great Nation, with all of its wealth and all of its resources and all of its talent and all of its great hospitals and doctors and pharmaceutical companies, we have a rate of COVID–19 deaths that is just indefensible.

So I would say to my colleagues: When Senator MCCONNELL came to the floor and said ''Here is our package; take it or leave it,'' that is not how this can possibly end. That is not the way the debate ended on March 26. It ended when Senator MCCONNELL and his House Republican counterpart, Congressman MCCARTHY, met with Speaker PELOSI, Leader SCHUMER, and Treasury Secretary Mnuchin in a room and worked it out. That is what it takes.

We need to return to that now and get it done before we leave for any reason—election or whatever it may be. There is no excuse. There are too many unemployed people desperate to get by. There are too many businesses desperate to survive. There are too many tests that we cannot take in America because we haven't invested in the resources. There are too many school districts telling me: Senator, reopening safely for these kids and teachers is going to take some money. Can you help?

There is an election coming up November 3, where election authorities—because people want to vote in the safety of their homes—will receive a dramatic increase in paper ballots cast, and they need a helping hand in processing them in an orderly, honest way.

The demands are out there. State and local governments are in trouble. Small towns in Southern Illinois—I speak to their mayors, and I hear the same things that I hear from the mayor of Chicago: We have had a downturn in revenues; we are going to have to lay off policemen and firefighters and healthcare workers if you don't give us a helping hand.

We cannot walk away from this. Senator MCCONNELL can't take the position of ''my way or the highway.'' We have to work on a bipartisan basis to negotiate an answer to this, and I hope we do soon.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be able to address the Senate for 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, we are fast approaching nearly 200,000 deaths from the coronavirus. But the moral and physical injury done to our country during the pandemic will never be contained in just one number. As that number continues to climb, so too do the frustration and the pain and the outrage of the American people.

We know that Donald Trump recognized the threat of the coronavirus and deliberately downplayed it for his own political gain. He is in large part responsible for these deaths.

We now have 31 million workers who have either received or applied for unemployment benefits. Since March 15, Massachusetts alone has seen more than 2 million claims to our unemployment programs. In Massachusetts, we have the highest unemployment rate in the United States.

Families across the country are facing devastating choices. Cities and towns are struggling to keep programs running and employees at work. We know the Republicans recognize these threats, and they are choosing to ignore them. They are, in part, responsible for the suffering.

After 4 months of callous calculations, when they chose to respond, the Republicans put out on the floor a coronavirus package that was insulting to Americans who have been awaiting relief. The extent of the misery facing our families is unimaginable. Yet Republicans and Leader MCCONNELL responded by designing a bill so intentionally weak and insufficient that it was destined to fail.

It is all just a game to the Republican Party, but for Americans, this economic and public health crisis is a matter of life and death. We need a robust, comprehensive response right now that matches the scale of this crisis, and we have an opportunity to deliver some real justice to working Americans and their families.

First, we need to give Americans a monthly cash payment of $2,000 so that they have the funding to able to pay their bills. A single check is not sufficient for households. Families need more than just one payment.

Providing recurring monthly payments is the most direct and efficient mechanism for delivering economic relief to those most vulnerable, for lower income families, immigrant families, and our gig and service workers.

I see these families suffering today. They are the same kinds of working families I grew up with in Malden. I know that $2,000 each month would mean the world to them—so that they can sleep at night; they can pay the rent; they can pay the electricity bill; they can buy the medications they need.

A monthly payment is the kind of big policy that provides relief on the scale that is needed. Our government needs to tell our families: We are here for you. We will not let you down during this crisis.

Second, we need at least $4 billion for my E-rate Program to connect every student to the internet at home. The pandemic has shown a bright light on the homework gap being experienced by the 16 million students in this country who do not have internet access at home and are unable to complete their homework. This is unconscionable and a threat to our country's future.

We cannot allow this homework gap to become a larger learning gap, which ultimately is going to become an opportunity gap for these young people. Research shows that the homework gap affects students in both rural and urban areas and disproportionately affects lower income students and students of color. Trump and the Republicans are blocking this investment in education, but we can't let them. We will not leave these students behind.

Third, we need to extend unemployment insurance, the weekly $600 benefit, through January of 2021. This is not just a line in the budget; it is a lifeline for workers who cannot go to work through no fault of their own. This crisis will be solved only by investing in workers. We cannot simply cut them off when we know harder days lie ahead for those workers in our country.

Fourth, we must continue a national evictions moratorium and provide $100 billion in emergency rental assistance. No one should have to suffer the indignity of being escorted out of their home by the police. A country that allows evictions during a pandemic—because of a pandemic—has failed its people.

The same goes for electricity and energy shutoffs. We need a national moratorium that keeps the lights on, ensures drinking water, ensures that wastewater services aren't disconnected or interrupted during the emergency period due to nonpayment. We cannot cast families into the dark as they are struggling to stay afloat.

It is wrong to allow a pandemic that has not been created by these families to result in catastrophic conditions that will look like the Great Depression in terms of their impact on families in the same way that it impacted my family during the Great Depression. We owe these people more. They have worked hard. They have worked constantly throughout their lives. Now, through no fault of their own, the pandemic has hit them, and they are unemployed.

Finally, we need $1 trillion in funding for State and local governments so that our teachers, nurses, postal workers, and other dedicated public servants are not laid off—the essential workers who drive the buses, pick up the garbage, fight the deadliest of fires, educate our young people. Despite providing the services we rely upon every day—including every single one of us in this Chamber—our municipalities are aren't getting any money because Republicans refuse to provide it. State and local governments have been pushed to the brink to support their residents and are in desperate need of relief.

To my Republican colleagues I say that this funding isn't blue or red; it is green. And all of our mayors and Governors and city councilors—whether Republican or Democrat—need that money right now.

I have been traveling around my home State of Massachusetts talking to families. They tell me the same thing: They want a livable future for their children. That means they need the government to do its job effectively in managing this COVID–19 pandemic. Instead of making excuses, they need a government that works on solutions, even if the problems are unprecedented, and they want that government to recognize the rights and dignity of everyone.

Our families want something so basic and so simple, they almost shouldn't have to say it: They want their children to dream about the future instead of fearing about the future.

They need political leadership from us right now—not political games, not the political calculation of just 20 Members of the Senate Republican caucus.

To my colleagues I say that the gravity of this crisis requires us to respond right now. We know we have a President in the White House who is irresponsible. The President knew. It turns out he knew the virus was deadly. He knew it as well as we knew it, but he lied to us. He told us it would magically disappear. He said it was no worse than the flu while on tape we hear him say that it is lethal. On February 10, he said: You know, a lot of people think it goes away in April with the heat, when the heat comes in. That is what the President said in February about the coronavirus.

He also tells us that climate change is a myth. He tells us that our planet is not in grave danger. He makes fun of the science of climate change the way he makes fun of wearing a mask.

Now the ''Denier in Chief'' says when it gets cooler it will go away, that the fires in the west coast will just go away. His answer to coronavirus is that when it gets warmer, it will go away. When he deals with the science of climate change, he says: When it gets cooler, the fires will go away.

The west coast of the United States is on fire, and 10 percent of Oregon is under evacuation order. A warning—that is half a million people. We have dozens of wildfires burning right now in California, including the largest in the history of that State. It has blotted out the sun for hundreds and hundreds of miles. The Southwest is shrouded in a horrifying, constant twilight.

We can keep looking at these things in isolation, as if somehow or other they are not connected. Each fiery conflagration, each hurricane, each devastating flood, each ungodly windstorm that wipes out a whole year of crops—we can say they have nothing to do with each other or we can look at the truth and listen to the science and say enough is enough.

We can lie to ourselves and say, as Trump does, that one day these things will just ''magically disappear,'' depending upon whether the heat or cooling will solve the problem. But we all know better. We know that unless we act now, the fires will happen annually and burn hotter and larger each summer, each fall in our country. We know that the hurricanes will get worse and more frequent. Two made landfall at once this year. We know that they will disrupt and destroy the economies of the gulf and the eastern seaboard.

How many times can we ask our people to rebuild? We know that midwestern floods will grow each year, drowning out a whole way of life and making refugees of our farmers. We know that the windstorms like those this year will continue to destroy

crops. Iowa lost 43 percent of its corn and soybeans this year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has used his 10 minutes.

Mr. MARKEY. No, it will not magically disappear. We need a Green New Deal. We need a solution that matches the magnitude of the problem.

I yield back to the Presiding Officer. I appreciate his indulgence.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to complete my remarks before the lunch recess.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, let me say that I join my friend from Massachusetts in a desire to see us take up and pass another COVID–19 relief bill. I would say that so far, the House of Representatives has taken a completely unrealistic approach, including many non-COVID–19 relief provisions in the bill, including tax cuts for millionaires and billionaires. They literally include, in the COVID–19 bill they call the Heroes Act, a tax cut by removing the cap on deductibility on State and local taxes on your Federal income tax.

When we did that in the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, we felt it was improper to force States like the Presiding Officer's and mine to subsidize the irresponsible spending practices in major cities like New York and San Francisco.

If our Democratic friends are indeed serious about wanting to get a deal, we are open, certainly, to negotiating a deal, just as we did the first four bills that we passed, especially by unanimous vote.

It seems the closer we get to the election, which is now 49 days out, that the old partisan dysfunction begins to creep back in and you hear speeches like the Senator from Massachusetts just gave, advocating things like the Green New Deal as a solution to all the world's problems. It is just completely pie in the sky and a pipedream that is obviously not going anywhere.

That doesn't stop our friends across the aisle blaming this side of the aisle or the President for everything that happens in the world, including hurricanes and forest fires, which are largely as a result of failing to undertake proper forest management that we know can prevent fires. They blame it on climate change. It is an easy argument claiming science is on their side.

We need to be good stewards about our environment, no doubt about it. I have no doubt the climate is changing and humans contribute to that, but there are smarter and better ways for us to approach it other than eliminating jobs and burdening people on fixed incomes with higher electricity and energy costs and just embracing an ideological solution, which is no solution at all and will create more problems than it solves.

I would just say, finally, on this point, that we know that the guidance from the Centers for Disease Control has evolved over time. I went back and checked. My friend in Massachusetts says the President did this; he did that; he said this; he didn't do this. I remember going back and looking at the Centers for Disease Control guidance before April. They said masks were ineffective; they didn't do anything. They came back after some additional investigation and research and said: Well, they can help. That is why we are all wearing masks, especially when we can't socially distance.

Looking at this pandemic now in September as opposed to the way it looked in March, we have learned a lot, thank goodness. Our medical professionals have saved a lot of lives. We learned how to mitigate the risks. We learned how to live with the virus at the same time we are investing heavily in therapies and a vaccine, which can't come soon enough.

Senate Republicans have made attempt after attempt to deliver another round of coronavirus relief to the American people. In July, we proposed the HEALS Act, which was a starting point for negotiations. We realized this wasn't the end-all and be-all any more than the Democrats' Heroes Act, this $3 trillion hodgepodge of an ideological wish list that we knew wasn't going to pass, but we knew we needed to start somewhere.

Speaker PELOSI didn't help when she quickly disparaged our starting proposal as ''pathetic.'' And, of course, Senator SCHUMER, the minority leader in the Senate, called it ''unworkable.'' I guess they thought they finished their job, and they dismissed it outright and did nothing to negotiate in good faith toward a resolution. They simply have no interest in amending the bill or trying to find a common ground. They just stiff-armed it.

This August, when we attempted to narrow the scope of the negotiation to the most urgent matters—things like continuing Federal unemployment benefits, which expired at the end of July—this time our Democratic colleagues rejected what they called a ''piecemeal'' approach. Never mind the fact that the House returned to Washington to pass a bill only to help the Postal Service, which was actually bipartisan. Apparently, that kind of piecemeal is acceptable as long as it is a Democratic-sponsored and authored bill.

That brings us to September. Last week, we gave it another shot. The majority leader brought the bill to the floor to address some of the most pressing challenges facing the American people: funding schools, vaccine research, more testing, unemployment benefits, helping small businesses, again, through the extension of the Paycheck Protection Program—all of which should be and I believe, in truth, are bipartisan goals.

Unfortunately, our Democratic colleagues couldn't resist that old temptation of partisan dysfunction this close to the election. They pulled out the same playbook they used all summer. Once again, they refused to engage in any meaningful negotiations. They resorted to name-calling and blocked the bill from even being debated. You can't pass a bill unless you are willing to start considering it, but they weren't willing to even do that.

Here we are battling a pandemic, which has claimed more than 190,000 Americans, and Democrats blocked every attempt to pass a piece of legislation since March. Rather than trying to negotiate or amend these bills or reach a bipartisan compromise, they seem to be content with airing their grievances at press conferences.

I agree with one thing the Senator from Massachusetts said: There are people who are hurting and need help. We should not take some perverse delight in exacerbating that pain or noting that pain and being unwilling to do anything to relieve it.

This may be a political game for some of our colleagues. It may be a way to try to score points against the President or try to gain advantage in the runup to the election on November 3, but I assure you, it is not an honest attempt to try to solve a problem; it is not a genuine attempt to try to provide relief to the American people who are hurting; and it is not moving us any closer to defeating this virus once and for all.

In the bills we passed so far—again, on a bipartisan basis, largely unanimously—we provided unprecedented support for American families, including direct payments, bolstered unemployment benefits, and provided the ability to defer student loan payments. We sent help to farmers, ranchers, and producers. We helped our schools prepare for the new school year and gave small businesses and their employees the resources to stay afloat. We have provided stability for families and communities across Texas and across the Nation.

More help is needed, especially to bolster our response to the virus itself. We know we are in a global race to develop a vaccine and treatment. Our brightest scientific minds are working 24/7 to deliver those lifesaving drugs to the world as quickly as we can, safely and effectively, but they need more money to succeed.

At the same time, our communities are trying to test as many people as they can, whether it is people attending college football games or surveillance testing in communities or at colleges or grade schools. Our constituents don't care about our partisan disagreements. They just want us to do everything we can to help them and to help us defeat this virus.

During the month of August, I was able to travel around the State and to listen to feedback from my constituents on how the funding we provided so far has aided in the fight against COVID–19. Congress has provided more than $234 billion to support our

healthcare response. That includes $10 billion for research and development of a vaccine through Operation Warp Speed, $16 billion for personal protective equipment, $26 billion for testing, and, of course, the $173 billion Provider Relief Fund to help our hospitals.

More than 23,000 hospitals and healthcare providers in my State alone have received more than $5.1 billion in Federal funding, allowing them to procure critical resources like masks and gloves and to cover mounting costs due to the deferral of elective procedures.

In August, I had a chance to personally thank some of the healthcare workers in Abilene, Waco, Wichita Falls, Amarillo, Lubbock, and Corpus Christi. I also had lunch and visited with the children of healthcare workers in the Rio Grande Valley who, even at such a young age, are amazed by the heroic work of their parents.

As our war against this virus carries on, we need to ensure that our frontline workers and healthcare providers have the resources they need to sustain this fight.

I also visited with the Family Health Center in Waco, which is 1 of 73 federally qualified health centers in Texas operating more than 500 sites. This is really a critical part of our healthcare safety net in my State and across the Nation.

I have always been a strong supporter of our community health centers and cofounded the Senate Community Health Centers Caucus several years ago. As I said, these facilities make quality healthcare a reality for so many Texans, whether they have Medicare, Medicaid, private insurance, or no insurance. Texans can go to these health centers and receive the care they need when they need it.

The particular Family Health Center I visited in Waco was founded more than 50 years ago to address a shortage of doctors and primary care access for low-income patients and has since grown to 15 clinics across McLennan County, which provide not only primary and preventive care but dental and behavioral healthcare too.

As Family Health Center CEO, Dr. Jackson Griggs, said community-oriented primary care is difficult in any era, and it has been uniquely challenging during COVID–19. Unexpected operating costs and lost revenue created serious financial hardship, but because of the $3 million in the CARES Act and other Federal funding they got, they have continued to provide quality healthcare during this time of critical need. Because of Federal funding, they have been able to test every person who comes in with symptoms. They received the equipment, the kits, the mobile computer systems, tents, and the air-conditioning units that allows staff to test patients outdoors, even during a hot Texas summer.

During our visit, Dr. Griggs told me they conducted more than 7,400 tests, with over 1,500 patients testing positive. Of those, 53 percent were uninsured. Without legislation passed by Congress, who knows what these patients would have been able to afford or even get access to a COVID–19 test. This funding has also provided more than 187,000 pieces of PPE to the Family Health Center's doctors, nurses, dentists, social workers, and staff who are trying to stay safe and healthy while they continue to care for their patients.

On top of that, the funds have provided the information technology infrastructure to get telehealth services started in record time and nearly 11,000 hours of paid leave for healthcare workers and other staff members who become ill or need to quarantine because of the virus.

The legislation we passed has also helped community health centers, hospitals, clinics, nursing homes, and healthcare facilities throughout the State continue to serve their communities.

As we keep working to deliver the assistance for the American people, we need to continue to support our healthcare response. This means ensuring that the providers continue to have the resources needed to operate throughout this crisis. It means more resources for testing and contact tracing to stop the spread. It means an even greater investment in the race to discover a vaccine and treatment so we can finally bring this crisis to an end. It means continuing to provide healthcare coverage for those who are laid off or furloughed or lost employer coverage.

I recently introduced a bill with my friend Senator MCSALLY from Arizona to provide some degree of certainty for folks who found themselves without a job or health coverage through no fault of their own. It is called the Continuous Health Coverage for Workers Act, which would provide premium assistance for COBRA coverage during the rest of the year. As the coronavirus has wreaked havoc on our job market, it has filled countless Texans' lives with uncertainty. By passing this legislation as part of the next relief bill, we can ensure that those who previously maintained their health coverage through their employer can continue to do so through the end of the year.

Let me just say in conclusion that COVID–19 is not a partisan issue. It hasn't been up until this point. Unfortunately, the wheels came off, at least for the time being. We need to put those wheels back on the car. We are all on the same team fighting a common enemy. I hope we can rediscover the sense of bipartisanship and common purpose that helped us pass four bills up through and including March.

During August, I was able to spend time speaking with countless of my constituents about the bills we had passed and discussing what more was needed. In addition to hearing from the healthcare workers and providers who had been on the frontlines, I also joined students and teachers for socially distanced conversations about the challenges that had been brought on by the start of the new school year. I held a video call with restaurant owners about the ongoing impact of the pandemic on their businesses. On telephone townhalls, I heard from constituents about their struggles to make ends meet after they lost their jobs and then lost the extra $600 a week in Federal unemployment benefits, which lapsed because our colleagues wouldn't allow us to take up and consider, at some level, a continuation of those enhanced benefits.

As our Democratic colleagues have continued to play games, these are the folks who have been hurt, and I am sure there are similar situations in each of their States. For these Texans whom I have described, COVID–19 isn't about political points or sound bites—it is about their health, their families' safety, and their livelihoods.

While it seems like some have yielded to the temptation of using this pandemic for political gain, I am committed to continuing to work with all of our colleagues who are willing to ensure that we don't lose any of the ground we have gained in the war against COVID–19. We are literally up against the clock, and enough time has been wasted on name-calling, finger-pointing, and political posturing. It is time for the games to end so that we can finally provide our constituents, including our frontline heroes, with the resources they need in order to sustain and win this fight.

I yield the floor.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 1:01 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. KENNEDY).

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued

VOTE ON BLUMENFELD NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, all postcloture time has expired on the Blumenfeld nomination.

The question is, Shall the Senate advise and consent to the Blumenfeld nomination?

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 92, nays 4, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 172 Ex.]

YEAS—92

Alexander	Graham	Portman
Baldwin	Grassley	Reed
Barrasso	Hassan	Risch
Bennet	Hawley	Roberts
Blackburn	Heinrich	Romney
Blunt	Hirono	Rosen
Booker	Hoeven	Rounds
Boozman	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Braun	Inhofe	Sasse
Brown	Johnson	Schatz
Burr	Jones	Schumer
Cantwell	Kaine	Scott (FL)
Cardin	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Carper	King	Shaheen
Casey	Klobuchar	Shelby
Cassidy	Lankford	Sinema
Collins	Leahy	Smith
Cornyn	Lee	Stabenow
Cortez Masto	Loeffler	Sullivan
Cotton	Manchin	Tester
Cramer	McConnell	Thune
Crapo	McSally	Tillis
Cruz	Menendez	Toomey
Daines	Merkley	Udall
Duckworth	Moran	Van Hollen
Durbin	Murkowski	Warner
Enzi	Murphy	Whitehouse
Ernst	Murray	Wicker
Feinstein	Paul	Wyden
Fischer	Perdue	Young
Gardner	Peters	

NAYS—4

Blumenthal	Markey
Gillibrand	Warren

NOT VOTING—4

Capito	Harris
Coons	Sanders

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of John W. Holcomb, of California, to be United States District Judge for the Central District of California.

Mitch McConnell, Roy Blunt, Mike Rounds, Todd Young, Pat Roberts, Cindy Hyde-Smith, John Thune, Kevin Cramer, Thom Tillis, Michael B. Enzi, James Lankford, John Barrasso, Joni Ernst, Lamar Alexander, Rob Portman, Tim Scott, Steve Daines.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of John W. Holcomb, of California, to be United States District Judge for the Central District of California, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRAMER). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 83, nays 13, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 173 Ex.]

YEAS—83

Alexander	Gardner	Portman
Baldwin	Graham	Reed
Barrasso	Grassley	Risch
Bennet	Hassan	Roberts
Blackburn	Hawley	Romney
Blunt	Heinrich	Rosen
Boozman	Hoeven	Rounds
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Brown	Inhofe	Sasse
Burr	Johnson	Schatz
Cardin	Jones	Scott (FL)
Carper	Kaine	Scott (SC)
Casey	Kennedy	Shaheen
Cassidy	King	Shelby
Collins	Lankford	Sinema
Cornyn	Leahy	Smith
Cortez Masto	Lee	Stabenow
Cotton	Loeffler	Sullivan
Cramer	Manchin	Tester
Crapo	McConnell	Thune
Cruz	McSally	Tillis
Daines	Menendez	Toomey
Duckworth	Moran	Udall
Durbin	Murkowski	Warner
Enzi	Murphy	Whitehouse
Ernst	Paul	Wicker
Feinstein	Perdue	Wyden
Fischer	Peters	Young

NAYS—13

Blumenthal	Klobuchar	Van Hollen
Booker	Markey	Warren
Cantwell	Merkley	Wyden
Gillibrand	Murray	
Hirono	Schumer	

NOT VOTING—4

Capito	Harris
Coons	Sanders

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 83, the nays are 13.

The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of John W. Holcomb, of California, to be United States District Judge for the Central District of California.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The senior assistant bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Todd Wallace Robinson, of California, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of California.

Mitch McConnell, Roy Blunt, Mike Rounds, Todd Young, Pat Roberts, Cindy Hyde-Smith, John Thune, Kevin Cramer, Thom Tillis, Michael B. Enzi, James Lankford, John Barrasso, Joni Ernst, Lamar Alexander, Rob Portman, Tim Scott, Steve Daines.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Todd Wallace Robinson, of California, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of California, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 83, nays 13, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 174 Ex.]

YEAS—83

Alexander	Gardner	Portman
Baldwin	Graham	Reed
Barrasso	Grassley	Risch
Bennet	Hassan	Roberts
Blackburn	Hawley	Romney
Blunt	Heinrich	Rosen
Boozman	Hoeven	Rounds
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Brown	Inhofe	Sasse
Burr	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Cardin	Jones	Scott (SC)
Carper	Kaine	Shaheen
Casey	Kennedy	Shelby
Cassidy	King	Sinema
Collins	Lankford	Smith
Cornyn	Leahy	Stabenow
Cortez Masto	Lee	Sullivan
Cotton	Loeffler	Tester
Cramer	Manchin	Thune
Crapo	McConnell	Tillis
Cruz	McSally	Toomey
Daines	Menendez	Udall
Duckworth	Moran	Warner
Durbin	Murkowski	Whitehouse
Enzi	Murphy	Wicker
Ernst	Paul	Wyden
Feinstein	Perdue	Young
Fischer	Peters	

NAYS—13

Blumenthal	Klobuchar	Schumer
Booker	Markey	Van Hollen
Cantwell	Merkley	Warren
Gillibrand	Murray	
Hirono	Schatz	

NOT VOTING—4

Capito	Harris
Coons	Sanders

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 83, the nays are 13.

The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Todd Wallace Robinson, of California,

to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of California.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 1508

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, I have a unanimous consent request.

''We hope they die.'' ''We hope they die.'' ''We hope they die.''

These are the vile words that anti-police protesters yelled on Saturday night, outside St. Francis Medical Center, in Los Angeles County, CA. They were yelling that about two deputy sheriffs, who, at the time, were clinging to life inside the hospital. They were clinging to life, just barely, because, earlier that night, those two deputy sheriffs were brutally ambushed by a gunman, who shot them multiple times as they sat in their patrol car while they were simply doing their jobs of patrolling the local train station.

One of the deputies is a 31-year-old mother of a 6-year-old boy. The other deputy is a 24-year-old man. Both joined the force about 14 months ago. The female deputy was shot through the jaw, but, heroically, she still managed to radio for help and apply a tourniquet to her partner's wounds.

What happened to these deputies in Los Angeles was horrific and dangerous. It is a reminder that, every single day, law enforcement officers put on a badge and then risk their lives to protect all of us—and I mean every single day.

Just this past Sunday, a police officer in Lancaster, PA, responded to a domestic violence call. It came from a home in the city. His body cam video captured what happened next. When the officer arrived, a full-grown man, wielding a huge carving knife and waving it over his head, came charging out of the house and charged straight at the officer. The man who did this, as it happens, is scheduled to go on trial in October on charges of stabbing four people last year.

What happened to the deputies in Los Angeles is not only horrific but is part of a disturbing trend of violence against police. According to the FBI, 37 law enforcement officials have been intentionally killed in the line of duty so far this year. That is a 23-percent increase from the same period last year. Rioters have attacked law enforcement. We have seen them hurling bricks and rocks and other dangerous objects. We have seen them ram them with their vehicles and set police cars on fire.

This violence against police is not happening in a vacuum. It is not. In recent months, the Nation has been engaged in an important, substantive debate about the relationship between law enforcement and the communities they serve and protect. I happen to think the debate is important. It is one of the reasons I supported Senator TIM SCOTT's bill—to provide more accountability and transparency with respect to law enforcement.

Unfortunately, our Democratic colleagues blocked us from even being able to hold a debate on that bill. Senator SCOTT and the Republicans were willing to allow votes on any Democratic amendments. They could have changed the bill in any way they had seen fit if they could have made the case with their amendments, but they refused to even have a process—they refused to even allow anyone, including themselves, to offer amendments. They refused to let us even consider the bill.

The police reform debate has exposed some radical voices. Unfortunately, that sometimes includes government officials who spew anti-police rhetoric. They call for defunding—sometimes even for abolishing—the police, and they want to bail out rioters in Minneapolis.

For example, after the two Los Angeles deputy sheriffs were shot on Saturday, not only did anti-police protesters yell ''We hope they die'' and other vile things outside the hospital, but the city manager of Lynwood, CA—the very city where the deputies were clinging to their lives in the hospital—the city manager responded to the shooting by posting on social media a message saying ''Chickens come home to roost.'' Can you imagine?

Well, protesters feed off the failure of elected officials to support and defend the police. In Lancaster, after that knife-wielding man was shot by an officer who was just protecting his own life, which was obviously under serious risk, protesters came out and started rioting—throwing bricks, rocks, and bottles at police, smashing windows at a police station and a post office, setting a dumpster on fire—despite the fact that the video clearly shows that the officer was being attacked. He was simply defending his life. I have no idea why anyone would protest a police officer defending his own life.

In my own State of Pennsylvania, a local Democratic elected official in Delaware County recently posted an image—unbelievable—on social media of two Black men holding guns to the head of a White police officer with a caption that said ''Does it have to come to this to make them stop murdering and terrorizing us?'' What kind of message is that?

As the Los Angeles County sheriff noted on Saturday—after his officers were shot, he said: ''Words have consequences.'' They do.

You know, instead of defunding the police, we should be defending the police—defending them against this kind of violence both in word and especially in deed. That is why I am here today, calling on the Senate to pass my Thin Blue Line Act today.

My bill sends a very simple and clear message: Anyone who murders a law enforcement official should be prepared to pay the ultimate price. Under Federal law, killing a Federal law enforcement official is an aggravating factor for the Federal jury to weigh when considering whether to impose the death penalty on a cop killer, but that consideration does not apply when a State or local law enforcement officer is killed. So the Thin Blue Line Act provides that same level of justice to State and local law enforcement officers that we already apply to Federal law enforcement officers by also making the killing of a local law enforcement officer an aggravating factor in determining whether to impose the death penalty in a Federal case.

In 2017, the House passed this bill with bipartisan support, including support of liberals like ADAM SCHIFF and Beto O'Rourke. The bill has very broad support from law enforcement groups, as you might imagine, including from the Fraternal Order of Police, the National Sheriffs' Association, the National Association of Police Organizations, and others.

The Thin Blue Line Act is commonsense, bipartisan legislation that the Senate should pass now. Our law enforcement officers put themselves in harm's way every day, and we are reminded of that every day. They are out there protecting us, and I am not sure that has ever been more dangerous for law enforcement than it is today. We need to do our part to support them, to send a message to them that we support them but to send a message to criminals and potential assassins that they will pay the ultimate price.

In the tragic event that a police officer is killed in the line of duty, we owe that officer justice, and I am going to keep fighting for them to receive it.

So, as if in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. 1508 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; further, that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. UDALL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. President, thank you for the recognition.

As a former New Mexico attorney general and assistant U.S. attorney, I have worked hard to prosecute violent crimes. I have been privileged to work with law enforcement, and we are all thankful for the tremendous work the Capitol Police do here in our Nation's Capital.

The recent shootings of two sheriff's deputies in California was heinous. Our prayers go out to the officers and their families. The perpetrator must be brought to justice. But I do not support rushing through this bill in response to the California shootings.

Under California law, murder of a law enforcement officer already makes someone eligible for the death penalty. This bill needlessly expands the Federal death penalty.

As I understand this bill, for someone to be eligible for the death penalty, he

or she would have to first be convicted of Federal murder, and then it would need to be proven beyond a reasonable doubt that the victim was killed or targeted because he or she was a law enforcement officer.

I also want to point out that the death penalty itself has widespread issues and many instances of misapplication. DNA testing and other science have proven that innocent people have been executed. The Innocence Project has found that 21 of 375 individuals who were falsely convicted and exonerated by DNA testing since 1989 had served time on death row.

The death penalty has also been applied in a racially discriminatory way. A 1990 GAO report on capital sentencing noted that 82 percent of studies conducted between 1972 and 1990 found that the race of the victim influenced whether a capital murder charge was brought or a death sentence imposed.

As Justice Breyer has noted, ''The factors that most clearly ought to affect application of the death penalty, namely, comparative egregiousness of the crime, often do not. Instead, circumstances that ought not to affect application of the death penalty, such as race, gender or geography, often do.'' That is in a recent Supreme Court case here in 2015.

I also understand that this bill has not been through the regular order in the Judiciary Committee. It is important that legislation that would have serious consequences is fully examined by the Judiciary Committee, the committee of jurisdiction here.

I would also like to take this opportunity to call attention to key legislation that addresses violence and should come to the floor, and that is the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act.

VAWA authorization expired over a year and a half ago, on February 15, 2019. Funding continues, but key improvements are being delayed by lack of reauthorization.

The Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2019 is supported by all 47 Democratic Senators. The House passed the bill 263 to 158. Thirty-three House Republicans voted yes on that bill. This bill would extend VAWA for 5 years, through 2024.

As the vice chairman of the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs, I know how critical this bill is to Indian Country. Data from the U.S. Department of Justice indicates that Native women face murder rates that are more than 10 times the national average murder rate. There are more than 5,000 cases of missing American Indian and Alaska Native women, and 55 percent of Native women have experienced domestic violence. More than four in five American Indian and Alaska Native women experience violence in their lifetimes. Without enactment of a VAWA reauthorization, these Tribes will lack the jurisdictional tools they need to keep their communities safe.

The VAWA bill also explicitly states that grant recipients can train staff to prevent LGBT discrimination, and it adds dating partners convicted of domestic violence and stalking to the category of persons barred from having handguns.

This bill would make a real difference in preventing violent crimes against women and has passed the House and has been pending before us here in the Senate for many months.

For these reasons, I respectfully object to the Senator's request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, first of all, let me just say that bringing up VAWA can't be anything other than an attempt to obfuscate from the case that is in front of us. I would be happy to talk about VAWA. I happen to agree that violence against women is a serious issue. It is a serious problem. All the programs in VAWA are still fully funded. They continue.

I don't think anybody in this body or the other body has done as much as I have done to make sure that the resources in the Crime Victims Fund go to the victims of crime—very much including women who are victims of violent crime and children and the groups who serve those victims.

As a matter of fact, I have supported previous versions of VAWA. There has been a bipartisan effort to get a new reauthorization of VAWA. Senator ERNST and Senator FEINSTEIN have spent months developing that. But that is not the version that has been under consideration here.

No, there is nothing incompatible about passing my legislation, the Thin Blue Line Act, standing up to protect local law enforcement, and having a separate consideration on VAWA. They are not mutually exclusive. They are not in any way related to each other. But, unfortunately, our Democratic colleagues are not willing to simply extend the same protection we extend to Federal law enforcement officials to the local law enforcement officials who are at risk every single day.

I am very disappointed that my colleague from New Mexico would object to a very simple and sensible bill that has bipartisan support.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 2843

Mr. UDALL. Mr. President, as if in legislation session, I ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. 2843, the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act, and that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; further, that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, for the reasons that I mentioned earlier in my comments, I object to this version of VAWA.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. President, thank you for the recognition today.

We rise—a number of Senators who will be speaking today in this hour—we rise today to demand that the White House immediately remove William Perry Pendley from exercising the authority of the Director of the Bureau of Land Management and nominate a qualified person to be Director, subject to Senate confirmation.

William Perry Pendley embodies the Trump administration's approach to conservation—they don't believe in it. He embodies the Trump administration's approach to Tribal sovereignty—they don't respect it. His continued employment at BLM embodies the Trump administration's approach to the law and the separation of powers—they will trample all over it every chance they get.

Mr. Pendley has been exercising the authority of the Director since July 2019. Let's get one thing straight: This title has no basis in law. He is serving as Acting BLM Director under temporary appointments that the Secretary keeps renewing in a cynical ploy to evade the Constitution, the Federal Vacancies Reform Act, and the judgment of the Senate.

Mr. Pendley's record on conservation is so bad, so antithetical to the agency he oversees, that the Trump administration knew he wouldn't survive a Senate confirmation. So, instead, they have concocted this shell game.

The Director of BLM is subject to Senate confirmation. This administration did not bother to nominate anyone for 4 years until June of this year when Mr. Pendley was formally nominated. However, the ink had barely dried on his nomination papers before the President was forced to withdraw the nomination.

From the beginning, the conservation outdoor recreation sports men and women communities have been uniformly opposed to Mr. Pendley's appointment, but that is not why the President withdrew his nomination. He withdrew the nomination because Mr. Pendley's extreme anti-public lands positions made him too toxic for Republican Senators from Western States facing tough reelections.

If Mr. Pendley can't be confirmed as BLM Director, he should not remain the de facto leader of the agency. He should be immediately removed. No more shell games. There are many reasons Mr. Pendley is unfit to serve, more than I have time to discuss, but let me discuss three with you now.

First, over the course of his 40-year career, he has established himself as one of the premier anti-public lands crusaders in the Nation. He has repeatedly advocated that the Federal Government sell off public lands, arguing that was the Nation's Founders' intent.

As recently as 2016, he penned an op-ed entitled—and I quote here from his

op-ed—''The Federal Government Should Follow the Constitution and Sell Its Western Lands.'' This is from the man who is now charged with running the agency that oversees our public lands. It is appalling.

BLM manages 245 million acres on behalf of the American people. Managing these public lands is the central mission of the job, and he doesn't think there should be any. It is no wonder he is trouble for western Republican candidates. Poll after poll of westerners show overwhelming support for public lands among Republicans, Democrats, and Independents. Selling off our national heritage to the highest bidder is extreme and extremely unpopular.

Mr. Pendley has been singularly focused on renting out our public lands to extraction industries to the exclusion of other purposes, such as conservation, outdoor recreation, and preservation of cultural and historic values.

As Deputy Assistant Secretary of Energy and Minerals for the Department of the Interior in the 1980s, Pendley was a tireless advocate for opening up public lands, from the Outer Continental Shelf to wilderness areas, to drilling and mining. When he was in charge of coal leasing in the interior in the 1980s, he helped coal companies get a sweetheart deal—leasing 1.6 million tons of coal in the Powder River Basin at bargain basement prices. The General Accounting Office concluded that Federal taxpayers received about $100 million below fair market value for that sale, or about $286 million in today's dollars.

Mr. Pendley was removed from his position after that GAO report, and he hasn't changed one bit over the years. As executive director of the Mountain States Legal Foundation for 30 years, Pendley fought tooth and nail for drilling and mining on our public lands. If left unchecked, I have no doubt Mr. Pendley will continue to turn back the clock on 60 years of our Nation reckoning with the devastating consequences of recklessly extracting from the Earth.

Second, Mr. Pendley's well-documented racist attitudes make him unfit for his role. He has disdain for Native Americans—their Tribal sovereignty and their religious practices. He is very anti-immigrant. He smears the Black Lives Matter movement. He called Native religious views: ''pantheism, paganism, and cultural myths.'' He has fought against protecting their sacred sites on Federal lands.

It is Pendley's BLM that wanted to hold virtual meetings to determine the future of the greater Chaco Canyon landscape at the same time that the Navajo Nation was facing one of the worst COVID–19 outbreaks in the country. And in that area that has some of the lowest broadband rates in the Nation—now talk about tone-deaf—as the vice chair of the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs, I am here to say that Mr. Pendley has no business managing lands that are home to sacred Native sites. He has questioned the basis of Tribal sovereignty and even Tribal recognition. He wrote: ''The day may come sooner than many expect given that, with ever-declining blood quantum per tribal member, recognized tribes may soon be little more than associations of financial convenience.''

Let's call Mr. Pendley's offensive statement what it is: overt racism. But his disdain for people of color is not limited to Native Americans. He has called undocumented immigrants ''a cancer.'' He has claimed immigration will lead to: ''You and I permanently losing the country we love.'' He has claimed undocumented immigrants create violent crime, crowded schools, and spread disease. Mr. Pendley's racism has no place in today's America. He is unqualified to manage public lands at a time when we all should be working to make them more accessible to all America.

People of color who have business before the Bureau of Land Management, as many do every day, have every right to wonder: Is the deck stacked against them? It shouldn't be that way.

And, finally, a third reason that all of us should demand Mr. Pendley be removed from his position: He is a climate change denier. The science of climate change that is happening and that is human-caused is well established. We are years and years beyond any scientific argument on these points. Just open your eyes and look at the wildfires that are raging throughout the West, forcing people to evacuate their homes and making wide swaths of the West look like an apocalyptic scene out over a Hollywood movie. Yet Pendley has claimed that climate change is like unicorns—neither exist.

Pendley's hostility to science comes as no surprise. He is working for a President who claimed just yesterday, as he made a belated visit to California, that ''I don't think science knows,'' referring to climate change. The President is saying: ''I don't think science knows.''

The President claims he knows, insisting, ''It will start getting cooler.'' This President tries to undermine any institution that challenges his world view—whether it is science, the press, our national intelligence agencies, or the courts.

But while Mr. Pendley and the President deny the reality of climate change, right now, today, in California and Oregon, BLM and other public lands are burning. While they put their heads in the sand on climate change, the families who have lost loved ones in this unprecedented fire season in that part of the country and the thousands who have lost homes don't have that luxury. In the view of William Pendley, the President, and his administration, the West is a place to be plundered for natural resources and then left to burn. And while Pendley and the Trump administration don't think the Interior Department has any role to play combating climate change, in fact, one-quarter—25 percent—of all U.S. carbon emissions come from fossil fuels extracted from public lands.

Our public lands are a big part of the climate change problem. Instead of being a source of pollution, public lands must be an integral part of the climate solution. William Pendley's vision for public lands is some terrible caricature that should be consigned to the history books, where our public lands are to be exploited, not conserved, where Native people are scorned and people of color are not seen, and where climate change does not exist.

William Pendley is an extremist, and he was never going to be confirmed by the U.S. Senate. It is time he is shown the door.

I now turn to my colleagues who are with me on the floor. I am very proud to introduce my good friend and colleague, New Mexico's junior—soon-to-be senior Senator—Senator MARTIN HEINRICH. Martin led the entire Senate Democratic caucus in a letter to the President opposing Mr. Pendley's nomination as BLM Director, and once the nomination was withdrawn, he led the caucus urging the Secretary to remove Mr. Pendley from his Acting position.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

HURRICANE LAURA

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, at the forbearance of my colleagues, if I can interpolate, if you will, and I will yield back. Thank you very much.

As I speak, Hurricane Sally threatens the gulf coast, including parts of Louisiana. Our prayers are with those in the path of Sally. I just spoke with the Coast Guard admiral in charge, and the Coast Guard is ready should there be a need.

But in the concern over Sally and other issues, we must remember the aftermath of Hurricane Laura, which made landfall August 27 in Cameron, LA, as a category 4–5 hurricane. In terms of wind speed, this is 150 miles an hour. A more powerful storm in that regard is Katrina, Rita, Gustav, Ike, and others.

As you might imagine, a storm of such magnitude left death, destruction, and pain from Southwest Louisiana into Texas to North Louisiana, Arkansas, and Mississippi.

There were 25 people who died directly or indirectly because of Hurricane Laura, and hundreds of thousands of lives have been upended. As one example—one measure—as of yesterday, 145,000 people in Louisiana have filed for assistance with FEMA. That is expected to grow to roughly 2,800 people a day applying for assistance.

Now, the sentiment at home is if you are without electricity, as 97 percent of Cameron Parish goes without electricity, and you are without internet, as most people are, the fear is that

folks have forgotten about Hurricane Laura, that recovery efforts will be stalled, and things will be ignored as attention turns to other issues—COVID–19, Presidential race, et cetera. And, anecdotally, there is, of course, evidence that public opinion has slipped.

Last week, I spoke with Gail McGovern, the president of the American Red Cross, who told me that donations are lagging well below that which the Red Cross had hoped to receive to cover the cost of their response. She assured me, though, that the Red Cross would still do everything needed. I saw testimony of that, by the way. I flew from Louisiana to Washington, DC, yesterday, and the jet was full of Red Cross volunteers. We are so appreciative.

I assure folks back home, just to say, that I did get a call from President Trump just as the hurricane hit. He assured me that whatever resources were needed, he would make sure they were there. As I told folks in Louisiana, there was an audience of one paying attention, a very important audience, and that is the President.

In this speech, I hope to continue to bring this hurricane and its aftermath to the attention of other fellow Americans because fellow Americans take care of ourselves and take care of each other. So I am here to be a voice for the people of Louisiana and share a story so that you may know what we are facing at home.

Again, I am appreciative of the United Way, American Red Cross, President Trump, and others for swiftly doing all they can do to help us through this recovery, but let's tell the story.

Here is a wonderful story from Lake Arthur, LA. She probably doesn't like the fact that I am showing this. She didn't like how she looked. I think she looks fantastic. This is Bethel Boudreaux, a great American patriot and a great Louisiana name. If you look at this picture, there is a tree that has fallen over the guy's house. There is a fellow in the tree cutting down limbs that is on top of his house. Here she is with a tree behind her and all the debris associated with it holding up an American flag. Now, her concern was that if we showed this picture, we recognize that her husband, a veteran, is familiar with how damaged flags should be destroyed, but this had been fluttering during the hurricane, and she just wanted to show it.

She has got a smile. This is 1 or 2 days after this devastating hurricane. With all this, in the spirit of Americans, she is holding that flag, and she is smiling. She is a great American patriot, but it also shows the attitude of Americans and the attitudes of people in Louisiana. We are resilient in the face of adversity.

There is more than enough adversity to go around. Let me just give you a couple of stories that are on our Facebook page. Mike Williams from Lake Charles gave our office a tour of his home. His metal roof was completely ripped off. Water came all through his house. The ceiling is falling in, and every single room has extensive water damage.

There is 20-year-old Hannah Vinson, who shared that her childhood home was gone. The roof collapsed, flooded, and a tree fell in her mother's bedroom and all across their yard. She has this semester off from school because of lack of access and expenses she cannot cover, even though she works.

She told us:

> It's overwhelming. People say why even go back when your school is destroyed? I start a new career, and that has to come to an end because where I work is gone now.

There are thousands more stories like theirs. But amid the devastation, there is hope. I am inspired by those who rushed to help however they could.

The Cajun Navy is an organization of volunteers who respond to disasters. They deployed immediately and continue to help today, delivering thousands of meals, clearing debris, helping people meet energy needs, and assisting where they can.

I recently went to Central Louisiana to hand out supplies and meet with storm victims and volunteers. I met a woman named Mandy in Hineston. Mandy has been loading up trailers of donated groceries. She takes them to the rural parts of the State, where folks can't access critical supplies in Central and Western Louisiana. This is a critical service because folks on the back roads couldn't get out, and there was a gas shortage in some storm-affected areas.

While I do believe Hurricane Laura recovery needs more attention nationally, I am so thankful for the thousands of workers who came to rebuild the electrical grid, as well as individuals and churches and nonprofits who came to help. There is a Facebook video from YAIPaks—a nonprofit organization in Clarksville, TN—who came down to Lake Charles with portable showers and trailers of supplies. The lady in the video said they handed out so many meals that they lost count.

I cannot say thank you enough to our fellow Americans and those from Louisiana who saw a need and answered the call to serve. Now I ask my colleagues to do the same.

Local governments' resources have been stretched to the limit because of COVID–19—tax base destroyed. Damage assessments are still underway, but we will likely need a disaster supplemental from Congress to continue the recovery. I ask my fellow Senators to consider the plight of Hurricane Laura victims and support such a bill, which should include California due to the terrible wildfires and perhaps those affected by Sally. Our prayers are with all of those as well.

Local government resources have been stretched to the limit because of COVID–19 in Louisiana, but I suspect in California and Alabama and Mississippi as well.

In June, I introduced legislation to do away with the FEMA cost share for local governments for 2020—for this year—given the strain on their budgets caused by COVID. I urge my colleagues to pass this bill.

Lastly, let's just reassure my constituents in Louisiana that they are not forgotten. The largest storm in our State's history made news for about 2 days with hardly a mention after. Don't forget about Hannah, who lost her childhood home and her job, or about Mike, who lost his house to the rain and wind, and about the nearly 150,000 people asking for help.

Americans are at our best when we help those in need. The time is now to extend that support once more.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT ACTING DIRECTOR WILLIAM PENDLEY

Mr. HEINRICH. Mr. President, I want to start by thanking my colleague Senator UDALL for organizing us to talk about the current Acting Director of the Bureau of Land Management. I say ''acting'' because this is an individual who would not be able to be confirmed by this body. But I want to take a step back and walk through a little bit about why this is important.

There was once a strong young man who rose up through New York City society. He led American soldiers in battle and went west to learn what it meant to truly to work hard on America's western landscapes.

This man took all of his hard-driving spirit with him to the White House and put it to work delivering for the American people. He took on big trusts and gigantic corporations that had monopolized the American economy and put a stranglehold on American workers. Despite coming from a wealthy New York family, this man focused on delivering a ''Square Deal'' to working-class Americans. But perhaps his most important and lasting legacy was this: After our country's previous century of explosive growth across the North American continent, he saw clearly that we needed to rein in the pillaging of our forests, the draining of our wetlands, the destruction of America's wildlife, and the loss of irreplaceable cultural resources. He saw that we had only one chance left to protect the splendors of our uniquely American landscapes for future generations.

When Donald Trump looks up every once in a while from his television screen or from yet another tweetstorm portrait on his phone to the portrait of that great American President, I am sure he sometimes tells himself that he could be just like Teddy Roosevelt.

I am sure he imagines that he is equally deserving of a place on Mount Rushmore and that if it weren't for his bone spurs, he could have been just as tough as Teddy, charging up San Juan Hill or riding on horseback through the Dakota Badlands rather than jumping

into a golf cart. These delusions of grandeur reached a new height last week, when the President told a crowd in Florida that he has been ''the number one environmental president since Teddy Roosevelt.''

I don't really need to tell you that this claim is just about as absurd as saying that he has done a great job protecting Americans from the coronavirus that has now led to the deaths of nearly 200,000 of our countrymen or his claims, frankly, that he deserves a Nobel Peace Prize for sending love letters to a nuclear-armed despot in North Korea or making long-term peace in the Middle East even more out of reach.

Let's pause and take a look at what President Trump's record has actually been on the environment. Yes, I will acknowledge that President Trump has signed some great pieces of conservation legislation that many of us here in the Senate worked hard to pass with veto-proof majorities. But since taking office, President Trump has also empowered an Army of former oil, coal, and timber industry lobbyists to roll back nearly every protection of wildlife habitat, clean air, and clean water that they could get their hands on.

He has systematically attacked climate science, setting us up for worse and worse natural disasters like the fires that we are now experiencing across the West.

Just 1 year into his Presidency, Donald Trump did something no President in the last 100 years would have ever thought to do. He completely erased national monument designation for treasured red rock landscapes in Southern Utah's Bears Ears. By doing so, he also gutted key protections for cultural sites that Tribal nations across the American Southwest hold to be sacred.

That egregious and, I believe, illegal action cut against the very heart of the Antiquities Act. This is the law that many Presidents over the last century used to protect so many of our national monuments and national parks. The Antiquities Act was truly Teddy Roosevelt's landmark conservation achievement during his Presidency.

Rather than carry on Roosevelt's legacy, President Trump used the Antiquities Act in a novel, new way. He used it to unprotect two national monuments—Bears Ears and Grand Staircase-Escalante. Now over 2 million acres of the most paleontologically important and culturally significant sites in the entire Southwest are open for uranium mining, ATV abuse, and fossil fuel extraction.

Just a few weeks ago, in a similarly destructive act, President Trump opened up our Nation's marquee national wildlife refuge in the Arctic to industrial oil and gas drilling. It seems there are no landscapes that are too sacred to make a quick buck in this White House. Not even the calving grounds of the porcupine caribou herd will have been spared. He is also now threatening to allow previously unthinkable proposals, like uranium mining in the Grand Canyon.

I don't think anyone in their right mind could call that a great record of conservation or environmentalism, not by any measure.

That takes us to why we are here today—President Trump's decision to put William Perry Pendley in charge of the public lands that are the birthright of every American.

We have a saying in New Mexico: ''Dime con quien andas y te dire quien eres.'' Loosely translated, it means: ''Tell me who you hang around with, and I will tell you who you are.'' I think it says a great deal that President Trump has chosen to hang around with William Perry Pendley.

For the last 30 years, Mr. Pendley has been a driving force in a campaign fueled by anti-government propaganda—and propped up by special interests and extractive industry dollars—to seize and sell off the American people's public lands.

As an industry-paid lawyer and lobbyist, Mr. Pendley has fought against hunting and fishing access laws and supported the elimination of protections for our national monuments. In fact, he has championed the repeal of the very law that Teddy Roosevelt used to protect our Grand Canyon.

He has filed numerous lawsuits in State and Federal courts, seeking to deny access to public lands for sportsmen and attacking key protections for wildlife, clean air, and clean water.

Now President Trump has placed him in charge of the Federal agency that manages so many of our public lands across the West. This is the man who is on record saying that we should ''sell all BLM lands'' east of the Mississippi. President Trump handpicked this zealot to lead the agency responsible for stewarding those very same public lands. What would Teddy Roosevelt think?

William Perry Pendley's beliefs hearken back to the era right before Teddy Roosevelt's Presidency, when railroad barons, hard rock mining operators, and timber companies were given free rein over our landscapes and our natural resources. By putting Mr. Pendley in charge of the Bureau of Land Management, President Trump is saying loud and clear that he wants to take us backward to those same failed and destructive policies of the past.

I am proud that the entire Senate Democratic caucus joined a broad coalition of hunters, fishermen, wildlife advocates, and outdoor recreation enthusiasts, all of whom called on President Trump to withdraw Mr. Pendley's nomination. Thanks to that widespread outcry from those of us who love our public lands, President Trump was forced to withdraw Mr. Pendley's nomination last month. But forcing the Trump administration to withdraw the Pendley nomination was only half the battle.

In fact, William Perry Pendley is still sitting in his office today, leading the Bureau of Land Management in his previous ''acting'' role.

President Trump has shown that he is willing to circumvent Congress and skip the constitutionally required confirmation process for other key Federal leadership posts by illegally placing people into unofficial and indefinite ''acting'' roles. Mr. Pendley has now been serving in one of these ''color outside the lines'' acting posts for well over a year.

As long as the Republican Senate majority refuses to act on its constitutional duty to hold this administration accountable on nominations like this, Mr. Pendley and other Trump officials in ''acting'' roles can and will continue to operate with impunity. That is not right, and in this case, we are talking about someone whose whole career has been built on opposition to the very idea that public lands should remain in public hands.

Mr. Pendley's role in the Trump administration represents a direct attack on Teddy Roosevelt's legacy for our environment. The mission of public land management should be focused on serving the American public and safeguarding the values that deliver benefits to the American people.

In these times, that means that work by the leaders of our land management agency should be rooted in the conservation of our wildlife, our water, and our landscapes. Their mission should include expanding access to outdoor recreation, preserving biodiversity, restoring healthy carbon sequestering forests and productive watersheds. They should work alongside Tribal nations and rural communities to protect cultural landscapes and promote sustainable economic development—or as Teddy Roosevelt put it more simply and much more artfully than I could all those years ago:

> Here is your country. Cherish these natural wonders, cherish the natural resources, cherish the history and romance as a sacred heritage. . . . Do not let selfish men or greedy interests skin your country of its beauty, it is riches or its romance.

The question before us here in the Senate is whether we will stand by as those greedy interests take what is our American birthright or whether we will stand up for our sacred heritage.

I choose to stand up. I hope the Presiding Officer and my colleagues will join us.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASSIDY). The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, as the ranking member on the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, I was especially pleased by President Trump's decision to withdraw the nomination of William Perry Pendley to lead the Bureau of Land Management, or the BLM, as we know it.

I said, when the President nominated Mr. Pendley, that he is the wrong person in the wrong job in the wrong place and he should not continue to lead the Bureau. The job of the Director of the Bureau of Land Management is not

just another Presidential appointment. It is a sacred public trust. The Director of the BLM is one of the principal stewards of our public lands, as we are hearing from our colleagues today.

The Bureau of Land Management manages 245 million acres of public land, more land than any other Federal agency. The Bureau is required by law to manage the lands committed to its care not only for the benefit of our own generation but for many generations to come. It must carefully balance the use of the land for grazing, timber production, mineral development, recreation, fish and wildlife, and the protection of scenic, scientific, and historic values of the lands.

In addition to the 245 million acres of surface land the Bureau manages, it also manages another 700 million acres of subsurface mineral rights. It manages over 63,000 oil and gas wells and over 300 coal leases, covering nearly half a million acres of coal lands, which together contribute about $4 billion a year to the Federal Treasury.

It manages another 55 million acres of timberlands and 155 million acres of grazing lands. It issues permits for wind, solar, and geothermal energy development. In addition, more than 10 years ago, Congress designated about 36 million acres of the lands by the Bureau as National Conservation Lands because of their outstanding cultural, ecological, and scientific value.

National Conservation Lands include 28 national monuments covering nearly 8 million acres, over 260 wilderness areas covering nearly 10 million acres, nearly 3,000 miles of wild and scenic rivers, and nearly 6,000 miles of historic and scenic trails.

Nearly 50 years ago, Congress declared that the public lands managed by the Bureau of Land Management should be retained in Federal ownership and managed to preserve and to protect them without permanent impairment of the productivity of the land and the quality of the environment.

That, in a nutshell, is the job of the Director of the Bureau of Land Management: to be a good and faithful steward of the people's lands so that we might pass them on to our children and our children's children in at least as good condition as we inherited them, if not better.

Mr. Pendley is not the right person for this job. He spent most of his adult life arguing against the principles upon which our Federal land management policy is based. He has called for the sale of the public lands that the BLM is responsible for retaining and managing. He has called for the repeal of the Antiquities Act, upon which our national monuments were founded.

He has denigrated the National Environmental Policy Act, the Endangered Species Act, and the Clean Water Act—the bedrock of environmental laws that the Bureau must operate under. He cannot be a good steward of the public domain if he does not believe the public should have a domain and he rejects the laws designed to preserve and protect it.

His extreme views and inflammatory rhetoric do not stop with the public lands. He has denied the existence of climate change, comparing it to a unicorn, and those who acknowledge it as ''kooks.'' He said that the Black Lives Matter movement is based on a lie. He has said that undocumented immigrants are ''like a cancer.''

Mr. Pendley was nominated for office once before. People might not realize that. President Reagan nominated him to be the Assistant Secretary for Energy and Minerals in 1983. While his nomination was pending, he was being investigated by the Department of the Interior's inspector general and the Department of Justice for possibly violating conflict of interest rules.

The Senate returned his nomination to the President, and he was not confirmed. The General Accounting Office later found that the Interior Department sold the coal leases in the Powder River Basin at roughly $100 million less than their estimated fair market value. The below-market sales were made possible by a change in bidding procedures approved by Mr. Pendley on the same day that he had dinner with the coal industry lawyers.

The inspector general referred the matter to the Justice Department for possible criminal prosecution. The Justice Department ultimately declined to prosecute Mr. Pendley, but he left the Department shortly afterward.

For all of these reasons, I think Mr. Pendley is the wrong person to lead the Bureau of Land Management. Today, he is still there in the position and having the authority to run the BLM. He should not be there a minute longer.

The President was right to withdraw his nomination. Now it would be right for the President to remove him from that position. Withdrawing his nomination doesn't solve the problem. We know that. It is outrageous that he continues to exercise the authority of the Director, despite having been nominated and withdrawn for cause.

Although the legality of his role is a matter of opinion in the courts right now, Mr. Pendley is still, in effect, running the Bureau of Land Management and continuing to make decisions negatively impacting millions of acres of public lands of significant importance to millions of Americans, all without the proper vetting and approval of the Senate. That is simply wrong, and I believe on both sides of the aisle we know wrong when we see it.

He should resign, Secretary Bernhardt should remove him, or the President should step in and remove him. Withdrawing his nomination was a step in the right direction, but for all the reasons I have outlined today, William Pendley is not qualified to be managing—to be managing—our Nation's treasured public lands in any capacity. So I would ask President Trump to kindly and respectfully step in and remove a person who does not justify the office that he is holding right now and the decisions he is making for all of us in our generation and in generations to come.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Ms. ROSEN. Mr. President, Nevada's public lands are a source of pride and natural beauty, but they are also so much more. They are a source of economic strength for our outdoor industries, and they help support our communities and our State's economy.

Each year, tens of thousands of visitors come to Nevada to see and experience our majestic public lands and our monuments firsthand. We must keep our State's public lands open and accessible for Nevadans, for visitors to our State, and for future generations. That is why we are passionate about protecting and preserving our State's natural wonders.

Public lands make up a big part of our State. In fact, over 80 percent of our land is managed by the Federal Government, and well over 60 percent of Nevada—close to 48 million acres—is managed by the Bureau of Land Management.

I stand here today before you because our Nation's public lands are in danger, not just from the threat of climate change or from deadly wildfires, which are raging across our Nation's Western States as we speak, but also from an unconfirmed and unaccountable acting head of the Bureau of Land Management, Mr. William Perry Pendley. It is well past time for him to go. Allow me to explain just how dangerous Mr. Pendley is for our public lands and for Nevada.

In the past, Nevada has been able to strike a balance between the protection of our public lands and the need for development. That is how things should be. But Mr. Pendley does not respect this balance. When it comes to our public lands, Mr. Pendley has a longtime and documented history of working to destroy our national treasures.

Some of the highlights of Mr. Pendley's disturbing anti-public-land actions and sentiments include this: working on behalf of private interests to roll back critical public land protections during his tenure at a law firm; advocating for the repeal of the Antiquities Act, a landmark law signed by President Teddy Roosevelt that protects our public lands and gives the President the power to designate national monuments; and fighting to drill on sacred Native American lands while mocking these same Native Americans' religious beliefs.

This is a man put in charge of one-third of our Nation's public lands who has referred to the National Environmental Policy Act, our Nation's bedrock environmental law, as ''a terrible burden,'' who has written that ''the Founding Fathers intended all lands

owned by the Federal Government to be sold,'' who has aggressively pushed oil and gas leasing on our public lands, and who views climate change as ''junk science.''

Mr. Pendley holds shocking and extremist views and has consistently worked to dismantle the very lands he is in charge of protecting. The administration knows just how bad Mr. Pendley is, which is why it has withdrawn his nomination to serve as Director of the BLM.

His nomination would never pass the Senate. However, it is unacceptable that Mr. Pendley continues to run the Bureau of Land Management as Acting BLM Director. This bureaucratic loophole allows Mr. Pendley to indefinitely serve as the de facto head of the BLM without a confirmation hearing before the American people and in direct defiance of the Senate's constitutional responsibility to advise and consent to executive nominations.

My office has heard from thousands of Nevadans about the importance of our public lands or to raise their concerns about Mr. Pendley—and with good reason. As I said before, the Bureau of Land Management oversees 67 percent of Nevada, and if Mr. Pendley sells off our State's public lands, Nevadans will be the ones paying the price.

I share the concerns of my constituents. Mr. Pendley was unfit to be confirmed as Director, and he is unfit to exercise the authority of the Director without being confirmed. For these reasons, this summer I joined my Senate colleagues in asking Secretary Bernhardt to remove Mr. Pendley from his unconfirmed position immediately.

I stand here today to reiterate: Mr. Pendley must step down or be removed. I call on the President to nominate a qualified Director through the standard confirmation process, one who understands the balance of conservation and development and who has respect for the job that they would hold, because Nevadans can't afford to find out if Mr. Pendley will put two-thirds of our State on the chopping block.

I yield the floor to my colleague from Colorado, Senator MICHAEL BENNET.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I appreciate very much my colleague from Nevada.

Let me start by welcoming the Presiding Officer back to the Senate. We are glad that you are here and that you are feeling better.

I thank my colleague from New Mexico, my neighbor, the senior Senator from New Mexico, Senator UDALL, for organizing this today. This is, I know, a matter that is very close to his heart. Thanks in large part to Senator UDALL's leadership and the leadership of the Senator from Arizona and others, we have worked really hard to not have public lands be a partisan issue in the Senate, and I think that reflects the way it is out West, where our public lands really are the foundation of our economy and who we are. They make us who we are. They are a cultural touchstone for all of us in the West.

Instead of comprehending this, President Trump, as he has done in so many other areas, has pursued a public lands agenda that is way outside the mainstream of conventional American thought. Few decisions better capture how extreme that position is and how frenzied his agenda is than his decision to hire William Perry Pendley to lead the Bureau of Land Management.

As we have heard today, Mr. Pendley doesn't even believe in the idea of public lands. He has argued that the Founding Fathers intended for all Federal lands to be sold. Think about what that would have meant if we had sold off the public lands of the United States.

They are the envy of the world. They are the envy of the world, and all of the work that Teddy Roosevelt and others had done to make sure that our generation would be able to benefit would have been lost if Pendley's constitutional interpretation had controlled.

Asking someone like that to manage our public lands, including 8.3 million acres in Colorado, is like asking somebody to be Secretary of Education who doesn't believe in public education. Given the track record of this administration, I guess it is not that surprising that he would put somebody in charge of public lands who believed that they are actually illegal or unconstitutional.

Mr. Pendley is by far the most extreme anti-public lands nominee in my lifetime. You have heard the Senator from New Mexico talk about his attacks on people of color. You have heard about the fact that he doesn't believe in climate change. Pendley's ideology on public lands, on climate, and on so many other issues doesn't look anything like the consensus we have worked so hard to try to establish in Colorado.

I think fundamental to this is that his extreme ideology does not perceive or conceive the economic reality in Colorado or New Mexico or Nevada or Arizona or Montana, where public lands sustain local businesses and climate change is undermining our farmers and ranchers.

Since the BLM moved to Colorado, sort of, we have had a front row seat to this extremist agenda. This spring, Pendley signed off on a resource management plan that opened up the North Fork Valley of the Gunnison—one of our most beautiful agricultural valleys in Colorado—to more oil and gas development.

Local leaders worried that his plan failed to protect the region's watershed and will threaten the area's agricultural and outdoor economy. Instead of listening to Colorado, Mr. Pendley signed off on a plan, as he so often does, written in Washington by a bunch of special interests here who want to plunder our land out there.

As Senators, we have a constitutional responsibility to ensure that the people entrusted with leading our Federal agencies are, at a minimum, qualified for the positions they hold and I would hope are within the mainstream of conventional American political ideology, but we have not been allowed to do that in this case.

Mr. Pendley was nominated by the President to lead the BLM. The response was so negative that I have to imagine there were Senators on the other side of the aisle who said: Senator MCCONNELL, please don't make us take this vote. Please. I have a tough election coming up.

Don't make me take this vote, Mr. President. I am scared to take this vote.

As a result, they withdrew his nomination because it couldn't pass the Senate. That is how the system is supposed to work. You can always put it on the floor and see whether we will support it. In this case, the response was so negative, they withdrew the nomination. That happens regularly. What is incredibly unusual in this case is they left him in his job. Having demonstrated that there was no public support in the Senate—the Senate unwilling to take a vote for fear of how unpopular it would be in the Western United States—they said: Well, you can be the Acting BLM Director.

That is a disgrace. I don't know how anybody in this Chamber could call themselves committed to the U.S. Constitution if a President can nominate somebody, see the votes aren't there, withdraw it, and make them the Acting Director of the agency. That is the work of a dictator, not the President of the United States.

Every now and then, you would expect the leader of this body to stand up for the prerogatives of this body, to stand up for the separation of powers and for the rule of law—particularly if you call yourself a constitutional conservative.

We have a choice to make: to do nothing or to do our jobs. The American people want us to do our jobs. They are sick of the dysfunction here.

From the perspective of Colorado, the decision on Mr. Pendley is simple: Someone who spent his entire career opposed to the very idea of public lands is unfit to lead a land management agency, period.

He should do the right thing if the President won't: Step down immediately and allow somebody to take on the responsibility who actually understands how important it is to preserve the legacy our parents and grandparents created for us so we can preserve it for the next generation of Americans and the generation after that.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. President, I very much appreciate the eloquent words of Senator BENNET of Colorado. Not only

does Senator BENNET speak with eloquence, but he matches it with deeds and with action. He has a major piece of legislation before the Senate to try to protect public lands in his State of Colorado. We very much appreciate Senator BENNET and his activism there.

I would also like to thank Senators HEINRICH, MANCHIN, and ROSEN for so eloquently talking about why William Pendley is unfit to continue as the de facto BLM Director.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, if I could just ask—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mr. UDALL. Yes, please.

Mr. BENNET. The Senator from New Mexico was so kind to refer to the CORE Act, the Colorado Outdoor Recreation Economy Act. Just a reminder: At the heart of that bill, which is 400,000 acres of public lands in Colorado—70,000 of which is wilderness area to protect our critical watershed—is the Camp Hale National Historic Landscape, which is the first such national historic landscape designation in the history of the United States. It memorializes the incredible work of our veterans who came to Camp Hale to train, to fight in the mountains of Northern Italy, pushed the Nazis out of Northern Italy. And that wasn't even enough for them. Then they came back, and they started our entire outdoor recreation industry, our ski resort. It was the same generation of people. That is an exact, perfect example—I am so glad Senator UDALL brought it up—a perfect example of why we need to treasure our public lands.

With that, I will yield the floor and turn it back over to Senator UDALL.

Mr. UDALL. I thank Senator BENNET once again for the good work he is doing there.

Just a couple of other words in closing, talking about the career employee scientists, the people who work at the BLM. The men and women who work at the BLM are public servants dedicated to the mission of the agency. They deserve a leader who values them and respects them and carries out that mission, not an extremist who doesn't even believe that public lands should exist.

Mr. Pendley's hostility toward our public lands resulted in his nomination as BLM Director being pulled by the President. If he is not fit to be confirmed as BLM Director by the Senate, he is not fit to exercise the authority of Director and should be immediately relieved of that authority.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ROMNEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

VOTE ON HOLCOMB NOMINATION

Mr. ROMNEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the 5:15 p.m. vote start at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Under the previous order, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Holcomb nomination?

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH), and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. MCSALLY). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 83, nays 12, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 175 Ex.]

YEAS—83

Alexander	Gardner	Portman
Baldwin	Graham	Reed
Barrasso	Grassley	Risch
Bennet	Hassan	Roberts
Blackburn	Hawley	Romney
Blunt	Hirono	Rosen
Boozman	Hoeven	Rounds
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Brown	Inhofe	Sasse
Burr	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Cardin	Jones	Scott (SC)
Carper	Kaine	Shaheen
Casey	Kennedy	Shelby
Cassidy	King	Sinema
Collins	Lankford	Smith
Cornyn	Leahy	Stabenow
Cortez Masto	Lee	Sullivan
Cotton	Loeffler	Tester
Cramer	Manchin	Thune
Crapo	McConnell	Tillis
Cruz	McSally	Toomey
Daines	Menendez	Udall
Duckworth	Moran	Van Hollen
Durbin	Murkowski	Warner
Enzi	Murphy	Whitehouse
Ernst	Paul	Wicker
Feinstein	Perdue	Young
Fischer	Peters	

NAYS—12

Blumenthal	Klobuchar	Schatz
Booker	Markey	Schumer
Cantwell	Merkley	Warren
Gillibrand	Murray	Wyden

NOT VOTING—5

Capito	Harris	Sanders
Coons	Heinrich	

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's actions.

The Senator from Tennessee.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. ALEXANDER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the provisions of rule XXII, the postcloture time with respect to the Robinson nomination expire at 11:30 a.m. tomorrow and that following the disposition of the Robinson nomination, the Senate vote on the motions to invoke cloture on the Dugan and McGlynn nominations in that order; further, that if cloture is invoked on the Dugan and McGlynn nominations, the postcloture time expire at 3:30 p.m. tomorrow and the Senate vote on confirmation of the nominations in that order; finally, that if any of the nominations are confirmed, the motions to reconsider be made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS

Mr. ALEXANDER. Madam President, this morning in the Education Committee, we had a really interesting discussion on intercollegiate athletics—specifically on the proposals that are appearing in various States to pay student athletes for their name, image, and likeness.

This is the jurisdiction of the Commerce Committee, and Senator WICKER and his committee are considering whether there should be any congressional action, but we were looking at the impact of the proposal to pay student athletes on the tradition of the intercollegiate student athlete in our country, and here is my own view.

If student athletes are paid by commercial interests for their name, image, and likeness, that money ought to go to benefit all of the student athletes at that institution. In other words, if the quarterback at the University of Tennessee is paid $500,000 by the local auto dealer to advertise the auto dealer, that money ought not go to him; it ought to go for the benefit of all the student athletes at the University of Tennessee, including the women's sports, the men's sports, the minor sports, the major sports.

Student athletes shouldn't be on the payroll and be treated as hired hands, in my opinion. I don't see a good ending to allowing a few student athletes to be paid by commercial interests while most of their teammates are not.

If young athletes want to be part of a team, enjoy the undergraduate experience, learn from coaches who are among the best teachers in the country, and be paid a full scholarship that helps them earn a degree worth $1 million during their lifetime—that is according to the college boards estimates—those earnings of that student should benefit all student athletes at the institution. If a student athlete prefers to keep the money, then that student athlete should become a professional athlete.

We had a bipartisan discussion this morning. I want to thank Senator MURRAY, the Senator from Washington State, who is the ranking Democrat on our committee. Our committee always has diverse views, but we always have good, civil discussions.

We had excellent witnesses from the University of Wisconsin and from Utah State University. We had a representative of the players association as well, and we had a track and field coach from Ohio State University who has been Coach of the Year in the Big 10 for 4 years, and they all had a point of view on this question.

The question is whether the tradition of an intercollegiate student athlete is worth preserving, and if so, how do you do it? Specifically, what would the impact be on that tradition if States pass laws allowing commercial interests to pay student athletes for the use of their name, image, or likeness?

Now, I have had two experiences that help me form my own opinion on this. Here is the first one.

In 1960, during my sophomore year in college, I was exercising at Vanderbilt University on the university's cinder track, and a man watching me had in his right hand a big stopwatch. He introduced himself as Track Coach Herc Alley, and he asked my name.

''Did you run track in high school?'' he asked me.

''No,'' I said, ''we didn't have track in high school.''

''Why don't you run 100 yards for me,'' he said.

So I did.

He examined his stopwatch and said: ''10.1 seconds. That is very good. I have three really fast boys on my 440-yard relay team. Why don't you come be the fourth one?''

So I joined the Vanderbilt track team running the mile relay, the 440-yard relay, and the 440-yard dash. My job was to carry the baton from the first fast boy to the third fast boy.

The next year, our team set a school record in the 440-yard relay. That record will never be broken for one reason—because they now measure the race in meters. So they don't run the 440-yard relay anymore.

We sometimes practiced with some really speedy athletes. They were students from what we called then Tennessee A&I across town. This is before desegregation. These were Olympians. They included Ralph Boston, Wilma Rudolph, and Wyomia Tyus. Coach Alley, our coach, had no scholarships to offer. His teams rode buses to meets. Our cinder track made it hard to establish fast times. Scraping together teams of nonscholarship athletes, he produced several Southeastern Conference track champions.

Coach Alley's enthusiasm that day gave me an experience that millions of young Americans have had—that of being an intercollegiate student athlete. Some of those athletes were good enough to win scholarships. Senator RICHARD BURR is one. He is on our committee and was at the hearing this morning. He had a football scholarship at Wake Forest University.

My experience at Vanderbilt taught me a number of lessons, including this one: When running on a relay team, be sure to choose two teammates who can run faster than you can. That is not a bad recipe for being an effective U.S. Senator either.

Now, as the college football season gets underway, even amidst COVID–19, we are reminded of how important these games are to student athletes, to their institutions, and to millions of spectators. The fascination with sporting competition is nothing new, according to the Knight Commission, which said in its 1991 report the following:

> The appeal of competitive games is boundless. In ancient times, men at war laid down their weapons to compete in the Olympic games. Today, people around the globe put aside their daily cares to follow the fortunes of their teams in the World Cup. In the United States, the Super Bowl, the World Series, college football and the NCAA basketball tournament command the attention of millions. Sports have helped break down bigotry and prejudice in American life. On the international scene, they have helped integrate East and West, socialist and capitalist. The passion for sport is universally shared across time and continents.

So said the Knight Commission 30 years ago.

But concerns with problems in sports are also nothing new. The Knight Commission was established in 1989 to address scandals in college sports that were ''shaking public confidence,'' not just of big-time collegiate athletics but the whole institution of higher education.

Well before that, in 1929, the Carnegie Foundation put out a report that said recruiting had become corrupt, professionals had replaced amateurs, education was being neglected, and commercialism reigned. Before that, in 1906, partially in response to President Teddy Roosevelt's criticism, the NCAA had been formed to protect the safety of players and deal with corruption.

My second experience forming my opinion on today's hearing was my participation and membership in that Knight Commission at the time I was president of the University of Tennessee. Our commission recommendation was that university presidents take charge of college athletics and the huge amount of television money it attracted and restore the academic and financial integrity of the program. As a result, over the next several years, academic standards became more stringent, financial support for student athletes increased, and college presidents asserted more responsibility for financial integrity.

What is especially relevant to today's hearing was that despite today's problems surrounding intercollegiate athletics and the problems then, the Knight Commission strongly endorsed keeping the student athlete tradition. What it said is worth repeating also:

> We reject the argument [the Knight Commission said] that the only realistic solution to the problem is to drop the student athlete concept, put athletes on the payroll, and reduce or even eliminate their responsibilities as students.
>
> Such a scheme has nothing to do with education, [said the Knight Commission] the purpose for which colleges and universities exist. Scholarship athletes are already paid in the most meaningful way possible: with a free education. The idea of intercollegiate athletics is that teams represent their institutions as true members of the student body, not as hired hands. Surely American higher education has the ability to devise a better solution to the problems of intercollegiate athletics than making professionals out of the players, which is no solution at all but rather an unacceptable surrender to despair.

Well, I hope those words from the Knight Commission 30 years ago will guide how Congress deals with the newest issue threatening the concept of student athletes, and that is allowing commercial interests to pay athletes for use of their name, likeness, and image.

Already four States have enacted laws sanctioning such payments in various forms. More than 30 other States are considering legislation.

Senator WICKER, as I mentioned, chairman of the Commerce Committee, is considering whether there ought to be congressional action. Our purpose was to look at the impact on the student athlete.

Who are the student athletes today? Well, it wouldn't make much sense to talk about this if we didn't say who and what we are talking about, so here it is. There are 20 million undergraduates in about 6,000 colleges and universities that exist in the United States today. Nearly 1,100 of those 6,000 colleges and universities belong to the NCAA. More than 460,000 young men and women participate in 24 different sports each year in about one-quarter of 1 million contests. About 300 of those institutions play football and basketball at the highest level. Fewer than 2 percent of athletes, student athletes, go on to play professional sports, according to the NCAA. This means we are talking about approximately 9,000 college student athletes who compete in a few sports out of the more than 460,000 college athletes across 24 sports.

So the current controversy is about an even smaller percentage of those 9,000 students who play football, baseball, or men or women's basketball and whose skills—or the institutions for which they play—make them attractive targets for recruiting offers that will combine their scholarship dollars with endorsement money. For example, an exceptional quarterback, pitcher, or running back might be offered a $500,000-a-year endorsement by a car dealer in the same town as a college with a big-time football, basketball, or even baseball program.

As the Knight Commission report said, student athletes are already paid in the most meaningful way, with a free education. Athletic scholarships are limited to tuition and fees, room and board, and required course-related books, but this can add up to a lot of money. It is $115,000 a year, estimates the University of Tennessee, per student athlete, including room, board, student stipends, academic support, meals, sports medicine, training, travel, and expenses.

Student athletes may also combine other sources of financial aid, including Federal or State need-based aid, to help pay for the full cost of attendance. These include Pell grants, for example, which could be $6,300 a year, supplemental education community grants, work-study, State grants based on need using Federal calculations, such as the Tennessee HOPE Scholarship or the GI bill. About 92,000—or 20 percent—of the student athletes receive Pell grants also.

According to the College Board, the value of a 4-year undergraduate degree is $1 million over a lifetime, and according to the NCAA, 88 percent of Division I student athletes will earn a 4-year degree.

So the question at hand is, Should Congress act, or should varying State laws govern payments for name, image, and likeness to student athletes? Is a patchwork set of regulations worth the confusion it will cause with unrestrained boosters, creative agents, the impact on title IX on men's and women's programs, on a coach's effort, and most of all on the tradition of the student athlete? That is the Commerce Committee's job. We heard some interesting testimony this morning.

Based on my experience as a student athlete, as a member of the Knight Commission, and as a university president, I offered these suggestions:

The Knight Commission is correct to say that student athletes shouldn't be on the payroll. They shouldn't be treated as hired hands.

Two, Congress should act but in a limited way—as limited as possible—to authorize an independent entity, safe from litigation, to write rules governing payments for the use of name, image, and likeness. Congress should provide aggressive oversight of that entity rather than try to write the rules ourselves.

Three, that governing entity ought to be the NCAA. I know, I know—the NCAA is controversial, but if it is not doing its job, the presidents who are supposed to be in charge of it should reform it. Giving the job to a new entity would take forever. Giving it to an existing entity like the Federal Trade Commission, without expertise and without any responsibility for higher education, would make no sense.

Now, as to the rules that I would hope the NCAA would write, here is what I believe should be the overriding principle: Money paid to student athletes for their name, image, and likeness should benefit all student athletes in that institution. Following this principle would allow the earnings to be used for additional academic support, further study or degrees, more insurance options, and more support for injured players and other needs. It would avoid the awkwardness of a center who earns nothing snapping the ball to a quarterback who earns $500,000 from the local auto dealer. It avoids the inevitable abuses that would occur with agents and boosters becoming involved with outstanding high school athletes. It would avoid the unexpected consequences to other teams in an institution because of the impact on title IX or the impact on existing student aid available to athletes.

Such a principle would preserve the right of any athlete to earn money for the use of his or her image, name, or likeness. It simply says: If you elect to be a student athlete, your earnings should benefit all student athletes at your institution. If you want to keep the money and be someone's employee, go become a professional.

This system would create the same kinds of choices that today's NCAA rules for college baseball require. A high school student must stay 3 years if he chooses to participate in a college baseball program. Take Vanderbilt's baseball program. David Price, Sonny Gray, and Dansby Swanson—Major League fans know they are all very successful professional athletes—all were drafted by Major League baseball teams while they were in high school. They could have earned a lot of money going directly into professional baseball. Instead, they chose a Vanderbilt education, 3 years of college experience, and the opportunity to be taught by Coach Tim Corbin, a great teacher. If Price, Gray, and Swanson had been permitted to sell their name, image, and likeness while at Vanderbilt, under the principle I am suggesting, their earnings would have been used for the benefit of all of Vanderbilt's sports teams, men and women.

Applying such a principle to all intercollegiate athletics might cause a few talented athletes to join professional leagues immediately after high school. That is their right. But if that young athlete prefers the college experience, the expert coaching and teaching, the free education, the other academic support, and the undergraduate degree that can earn $1 million over a lifetime, then their earnings ought to benefit all the student athletes at the institution.

While the NCAA is making new rules, I suggest it ought to assign most of the new television revenue that comes to institutions—let it go to institutions and be used for academic support for student athletes rather than continue to encourage inordinately high salaries for some coaches.

As I said at the beginning, I don't see a good ending to allowing a few student athletes to be paid by commercial interests while most of their teammates are not. If they want to be part of the team, enjoy the undergraduate experience, learn from coaches who are great teachers, and be paid a full scholarship that could help them earn $1 million during their lifetimes, their earnings should benefit all the student athletes. If they prefer to keep the money for themselves, let them become professionals.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, I begin by asking that the RECORD reflect how much I am going to miss the Senator from Tennessee when he is gone at the end of this year. It is nice to be on the floor with him.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Madam President, I am here for the 271st time to call this Chamber's attention to climate change and to two of the reports on this defining issue of our generation.

As I speak, wildfires are devouring the American West and consuming American lives: east of Salem, OR, two people dead in a scorched vehicle; in Butte County, CA, three dead, overrun by a fast-moving fire; in Ashland, a 1-year-old boy; in Malden, WA, almost the entire town burned down; half a million Oregonians evacuated due to fire. That is 1 out of 10 people in the entire State.

Over the weekend, Oregon's emergency management director said they are preparing for a ''mass fatality event.''

Paradise, CA, suffered apocalyptic destruction in the 2018 Camp Fire. It is, once again, under fire warnings, this time the North Complex fire, which has stunned firefighters with its rapid growth and ferocity.

We cannot avoid it. Climate change is here. Plenty of factors contribute to individual wildfires, but climate change is now always among them.

Last fall, I went out to the National Center for Atmospheric Research in Colorado and met leading wildfire researcher Daniel Swain. As Dr. Swain puts it:

> Climate change has not just made the extreme heat waves that coincide with fires worse. The bigger effect is the more subtle, long-term warming. That couple of degrees of (average) warming over decades . . . it's lurking in the background, sucking extra moisture out of the vegetation and the soil.

The new normal is smoke, ash, orange skies, and constant nerve-fraying vigilance.

Climate change's impacts through the West land crushing economic blows. The 2018 Camp Fire that burned Paradise cost $16.7 billion. NOAA says natural disasters—mostly hurricanes and wildfires, both highly climate-related—inflicted $91 billion worth of damage that year, 2018; and over the past 40 years, 241 climate- and weather-related disasters have cost Americans $1.6 trillion.

The first report I want to talk about warns that it is not just what is lost in floods and flames. As climate risk worsens, the harder it is for communities to rebuild, for bankers to write mortgages, for owners to find insurers willing to continue to write policies and pay out claims. That risk spreads beyond burned or flooded land and runs through the rest of the economy.

Climate risk becomes what economists call systemic risk. So one of our leading regulatory agencies, the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, has done a report on risk.

Think of the 2008 financial crisis. That home mortgage problem spread far beyond mortgage lenders into a brutal global recession. Millions of people who had no connection to a bad mortgage lost their jobs, lost their homes, or lost their retirement savings. Many are still recovering from that collapse.

Now think even worse. The Stanford Business School's Corporations and Society Initiative believes ''the financial risks from climate change are systemic''—there is that economic word again—that these risks are ''singular in nature''; and that ''[g]lobal economic losses from climate change could reach $23 trillion—three or four times the scale of the 2008 Financial Crisis.''

Those of us who were here for the 2008 financial crisis don't want to see that happen again, and we certainly don't want to see it happen at a three- or four-times scale.

Senator SCHATZ and I have been calling for financial regulators to do a better job accounting for these risks. In May, we wrote to the Commodity Futures Trading Commission Subcommittee on Climate-Related Market Risk. We had two simple requests: One, recommend a carbon price, and, two, urge our financial regulators to include climate risks in their core market risk assessments and supervisory practices.

The CFTC Subcommittee report is out, and I am happy to report that they did both. They write: ''Financial markets will only be able to channel resources efficiently to activities that reduce greenhouse gas emissions if an economy-wide price on carbon is in place at a level that reflects the true social cost of those emissions.'' That is actually kind of economics 101, but it is good to hear them say it.

They went on to say:

> Climate change poses a major risk to the stability of the U.S. financial system and to its ability to sustain the American economy. . . . U.S. financial regulators must recognize that climate change poses serious emerging risks to the U.S. financial system, and they should move urgently and decisively to measure, understand, and address these risks.

And what if we don't? Well, the CFTC report goes on: Failing to act would lead to what they called ''disorderly repricing of assets''—that is commonly known as a crash—''with cascading effects'' through the economy. Put simply, do nothing and trigger financial chaos far and wide, just like 2008, except probably worse.

The CFTC report calls for corporate America to tell the truth about climate-related risks to their business models. Investors need to know the truth for the free market to operate. The subcommittee writes that we must require ''disclosure by corporations of information on material, climate-related financial risks . . . to ensure that climate risks are measured and managed effectively.''

That is a key point. We have seen Exxon, for instance, downplay climate risks to investors, shareholders, and the general public. That mischief will stop if financial regulators require an honest accounting of climate-related risks.

The CFTC report is a big deal, but it requires Congress to act. America is among the few industrialized nations worst prepared for wide-ranging reductions in greenhouse gas emissions. Regulators will not be enough; Congress must act.

That is where another report comes in, the Senate Democrats' Special Report on the Climate Crisis. Under Chairman SCHATZ's leadership, we recently released a roadmap for fixing that problem. We propose a plan to cut emissions across our economy, to get on course to limit warming to 1.5 degrees Celsius, to create a host of well-paying jobs in clean energy and other emerging technologies, and to remedy the burdens of pollution across all sectors of the economy, including those usually overlooked.

We know we have a battle ahead. The fossil fuel industry runs a covert operation that has blocked progress in Congress. This covert op is extremely well funded and has reached its roots deeply into our politics. We need to tear up those roots. This is how.

First, our report tells the dark story of that covert op: the story of the fossil fuel industry apparatus built to obscure the industry's hands behind phony front groups, the story of capture and control of corporate trade associations, the story of lives marketed by flashy PR firms, and the story of brute-force political spending and threats to blockade climate progress.

Those tactics were a test run for the fossil fuel industry by Big Tobacco: Manufacture false doubt in science and flex your political muscle against anyone who dares to challenge you. That bullying worked pretty well, and then when the Supreme Court handed down Citizens United, the fossil fuel industry supercharged its covert campaign with dark money, almost immediately turning the ability to spend unlimited money in politics into spending unlimited dark money in politics. Then the bullying worked really well.

Citizens United was a climate watershed. After that decision unleashed its fearful weaponry, not one Republican in this body joined any comprehensive bill to reduce carbon dioxide emissions. The Senate heartbeat of bipartisan climate activity before Citizens United, which I remember and experienced in 2007, 2008, and 2009, all flat-lined under the supercharged political pressure unleashed by fossil fuel interests with Citizens United behind them.

Our Senate report tells the full rotten story because that is step 1 in fighting covert influence. Follow the money. Show the American people how corporate interests pay to block progress on climate. Show the co-opted trade associations and the phony front groups. Let the American people see the scheme, and they are less likely to fall for it.

Second is cleaning it up. Fully exposing and ending Citizens United dark money and the fossil fuel scheme will take reform. Bold transparency measures like the DISCLOSE Act are needed, and our report calls for that.

Then, we need to wake up the so-called good guys in corporate America. They need to see the mischief a few bad actors have perpetrated right under their noses. They need to see how the fossil fuel industry commandeered their corporate trade associations, like the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, which is one of the two most obstructive organizations against climate action. Why would the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, with its wide corporate membership, be one of the two most obstructive organizations against climate action unless the fossil fuel industry had co-opted it right under their noses?

The so-called good guys need to examine how their own lobbyists and their own trade associations and their own political operatives are doing on climate because with very few and very rare exceptions, the answer is that they are doing nothing on climate, not lifting a finger in Congress.

Just last week, the giant tech companies came in through their trade group TechNet, with a 13-page list of all of their lobbying priorities—13 pages and not a mention of climate. Google, Apple, Microsoft, Facebook—the Big Tech barons—a lot of big talk, and they never even mentioned climate in their shopping list for Congress.

Everyone needs to understand the two faces of corporate America and to imagine how quickly Congress would act if powerful trade associations like the chamber became actual advocates for serious climate policies or if the big interests in Congress, like Big Ag, or Big Tech, or Wall Street, or the insurance industry actually took an interest in something more than their own special interest programs and tax benefits.

What if climate had been on Big Tech's list of priorities, perhaps even on page 1 of 13? That would change the game.

A 16th century alchemist by the name of Paracelsus is credited with the phrase ''sola dosis facit venenum,'' Latin for ''the dose makes the poison.'' The dose makes the poison. The idea is that everything from a nerve agent to the water we need to drink to survive can be lethal if delivered in sufficient dosage.

Right now, in the American West, toxins in the climate wildfire smoke waft in such high concentrations that our typical measurement systems fail. The dosage is literally off the charts. In our Earth's atmosphere, the dosage of carbon dioxide is way outside the range of human experience, putting all of mankind into uncharted territory, to face unprecedented dangers.

Citizens United unleashed toxic doses of money, unprecedented doses of virulent dark money, into our American

political atmosphere. So our democracy is poisoned, stunned by secret fossil fuel money and threats, and, consequently, failing to listen to plain warnings like those of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission.

We had better act before the poison has overpowered us, and we had better get the dosages back to safe and normal levels. One good start would be to wake up to the reality of climate change.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

TRIBUTE TO COLONEL SCOTT GRANT

Mr. JONES. Madam President, one of the great privileges that I have enjoyed as a U.S. Senator and a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee has been the opportunity to get to know and support our men and women in uniform. I have been proud to represent the people of the great State of Alabama, a State where patriotism runs deep and for whom service is a way of life.

Col. Scott Grant, U.S. Air Force, is a perfect example. Colonel Grant retired this summer, and since I was not able to attend his retirement ceremony this past Saturday, I decided I would say here what I wanted to say there, in the hangar in Birmingham, AL, where he had spent the last few years of his career.

Colonel Grant retired as the commander of the 117th Air Refueling Wing, Alabama Air National Guard, Sumpter Smith Joint National Guard Base in Birmingham, AL.

The 117th was the first military installation that I visited after my election in 2017 and swearing-in, in January of 2018. I can tell you, at that first visit, Colonel Grant set a pretty high bar for the future visits I would have to the many other military installations in Alabama, and we have quite a few. He set a high bar for those I would meet later because of his dedication to his unit, to his mission, and to the men and women he commanded.

It was immediately apparent—his dedication and professionalism—and it has guided his every decision in all our interactions over the next 2½ years. Scott's unwavering commitment to excellence earned him the respect of all those who served with him, but his genuine love for the men and women who served under his command earned him their affection. In other words, Col. Scott Grant had and has his priorities in order, and everyone who knew him and met him could see that immediately.

In 2019, the 117th won STRATCOM's Omaha Trophy. The Omaha Trophy is one of the most prestigious awards in the military. It was the first time that an Air National Guard unit had received this prestigious award. Then STRATCOM Commander Gen. John Hyten said: ''The Omaha Trophy represents the best of the best in units executing strategic deterrence.''

The 117th won in the area of strategic aircraft for their many missions around the world protecting America. It was an award that the unit and Colonel Grant richly deserved. I was really honored to be present at that awards ceremony, and I can remember, as Brigadier General Stevenson said: ''To put it simply, the 117th Air Refueling Wing was the most outstanding in their Nuclear Operational Readiness Inspection and their dedication to the mission itself. As a traditional guard unit, but with a total force, they have accomplished unique tasks and in an innovative way that we absolutely need to meet future challenges that STRATCOM faces.'' True to form, in his acceptance speech, Scott gave the credit to the men and women in his command.

With 7,000 military flight hours, Scott's deployments have spanned the globe, and his awards and decorations are almost too numerous to list. Here are just a few: the Defense Meritorious Service Medal, the Meritorious Service Medal with two oakleaf clusters, Air Medal with seven oakleaf clusters, Aerial Achievement Medal with two oakleaf clusters, Air Force Outstanding Unit Award with Valor and two oakleaf clusters, Combat Readiness Medal with 10 oakleaf clusters, National Defense Service Medal with one Bronze Star, the Southwest Asia Service Medal with three Bronze Stars, the Kosovo Campaign Medal with one Bronze Star, the Afghanistan Campaign Medal with one Bronze Star, the Iraq Campaign Medal with one Bronze Star, the Humanitarian Service Medal, the Alabama National Emergency Service Medal and Service Medal with one device, the Alabama Special Service Medal—and the list just goes on and on.

We could be here all night, but I will stop there and just say that, rated as a command pilot and an instructor, Colonel Grant has been described as a pilot's pilot, one from whom you learn something every time you fly with him.

So it is good news for the Air Force. The good-news-bad-news story: The bad news is the retirement from the 117th, but the good news is, in his retirement, Colonel Grant is going to continue training airmen on the KC–135 simulators in Oklahoma.

Scott, you have served your country with honor and distinction, and you are a credit to the State of Alabama and the United States of America. It is my great honor to call you a friend. Thank you.

Congratulations on an outstanding career. Best wishes for clear skies in retirement, and although I did not serve in the military, I salute you, sir.

REMEMBERING ROBERT EDINGTON

Madam President, just a few weeks ago Alabama lost one of its most distinguished and dedicated citizens, and I lost a great friend. Robert Edington, of Mobile, AL, died peacefully on July 26 with his beloved wife of 58 years, Patricia, at his side. I rise today to honor the life and legacy of this patriot; this public servant; this devoted husband, father, grandfather, and friend.

Robert was born in Mobile on November 18, 1929, and Mobile remained in his blood until the day he died. The son of a local judge, Robert earned his undergraduate degree at Rhodes College but came back home for his law degree at the University of Alabama.

He served our Nation in the military while on Active Duty with the U.S. Navy from 1951 to 1955. During his active military career as a Navy operations officer, Robert was awarded the Korean Service Medal with two battle stars, the China Service Medal, the United Nations Service Medal, and the Korean Presidential Unit Citation.

Robert truly loved his service to this country and the U.S. Navy, prompting him to remain with the Navy Active Reserve until 1980, when he retired as commander.

Robert Edington was one of Mobile's most prominent lawyers and community leaders for over 60 years. He served three terms in the Alabama Legislature, first as a State representative from 1962 to 1970 and then in the State senate from 1970 to 1974.

As a member of the Alabama Legislature, he played a pivotal role in establishing the University of South Alabama and the university's college of medicine. He actively furthered the development of Bishop State Community College, one of Alabama's great historically Black colleges and universities, of which I am so proud.

The National Trust for Historic Preservation in Washington, DC, presented him with their national award for his role in establishing the Alabama Historical Commission.

But his love for the Navy continued on prominent display even as a legislator, authoring the legislation that created the USS Alabama Battleship Commission, bringing the USS *Alabama* home to Mobile following her retirement from Active Duty. He served on that commission from 1963 to 1972 and served as its chairman, but his passion for the battleship and all it stands for never wavered, and he was once again appointed to the battleship commission in the year 2000.

In addition, Robert served as the Alabama President and National Director of the Navy League of the United States, where he supported port visits of Navy vessels for important occasions that included some just fun occasions like the Mardi Gras in Mobile.

Back in his hometown of Mobile, Robert was an active member of the Mobile Bar Association, where at one time he served as the director of the bar's Volunteer Lawyers Program. He was a member of the Mobile Kiwanis Club and the Mobile American Legion.

As Mobile's Consul to Guatemala for 20 years, Robert organized Mobile's first trade mission to Central America, earning him the U.S. Department of Commerce's Achievement Award.

In 2007, Robert's dedication to the community and the city of Mobile was

recognized when he received the Mobilian of the Year Award. In 2008, the following year, he was named the Rhodes College Alumnus of the Year, and in 2012, he received the distinguished honor of being named the Mobile Area Veteran of the Year.

When I think of Robert's great accomplishments, of all of those that we have talked about and listed, he will tell you that his greatest honor was marrying the love of his life, Patricia, in 1962 and having son Sherard, daughter Virginia, and a granddaughter, Courtney. With all that Robert was involved in, he was first and foremost a family man.

I have been blessed to have Robert and Pat Edington as great and dear friends for many, many years. Together, we have toiled in the vineyards of Alabama politics for longer than we can all remember. Robert, at one time, even had his eyes on the U.S. Senate seat. But as devoted as Robert was to the Democratic Party, he was also a man committed to the greater good, to working with anyone to make Mobile, AL, make the State of Alabama, and make America a better place for everyone, leaving a legacy of dedication and commitment to love of God, love of country, love of community, and love of family that is an extraordinary example for others to follow.

Our world, especially in today's climate, needs more Robert Edingtons.

RACISM

Madam President, 57 years ago today, a bomb exploded outside a church in Birmingham, AL. A bomb was placed underneath the steps that led to the sanctuary of the 16th Street Baptist Church.

Four young girls were killed in that blast: Addie Mae Collins, Cynthia Wesley, Denise McNair, and Carole Robertson—killed senselessly simply because of the color of their skin. It was a tough time in America; it was a tough time in Alabama.

I am not going to recount all of what happened at that time. Many of you have heard me speak on it before because it was in 2001 and 2002 that we put the final two perpetrators into prison.

What I have spoken about this summer, though, is how 1963 and 2020 seem to align. The year 1963 in Birmingham started off with police brutality, where peaceful demonstrators who were simply trying to get civil rights for African-American people in this country were accosted with fire hoses and dogs set upon them by the police commissioner ''Bull'' Connor.

People took notice. People took notice when George Wallace stood at the schoolhouse door in June of 1963. People took notice when Medgar Evers was killed that same night. People took notice when Martin Luther King stood on the Mall in Washington, DC, and said he had a dream—he had a dream that one day we would all live in peace and harmony together. It was a dream of hope at that time. It was about a month later when that bomb exploded and destroyed the dream for so many people, but at the same time, that bomb woke the conscience of America. The horrors of Jim Crow and segregation came home to roost, came down to television sets across this country, and people stood up and made their voices known and said enough is enough—not just for Birmingham in the South, but enough is enough in this country.

We have to make the changes. It woke that conscience of this country, but it also woke a conscience of a President who began to work on the Civil Rights Act. It woke the conscience of a Congress that later passed the Civil Rights Act in 1964. The conscience was aroused again in 1965 when our friend John Lewis was beaten at the Edmund Pettus Bridge.

The similarities between that and today are striking. We cannot overlook the historic moment we are in today, when once again our conscience is getting the best of us, and we see the images of George Floyd and Breonna Taylor and Ahmaud Arbery and Jacob Blake.

We also see something else. We see the images of violence. We see looting. We see the images of two police officers in Los Angeles who were brutally—brutally—attacked while just sitting in their car.

What we are seeing is really something that America is not about. It is incumbent upon us all to do something about it—to stand together, to have the discussion, to have the dialogue, to have the frank discussions about what we know is going on in law enforcement but also the violence we see in the streets. It has to stop. We have to make sure that we talk to each other, to have these dialogues.

I have talked about this before, and I will not go on and on tonight, but it is weighing heavily on everyone in this country. I know it. You know it. It is weighing on everyone. For everyone in this country, as we approach the election, it weighs heavier and heavier. Unfortunately, it gets into political discussions and partisan divides on both sides of the aisle. We cannot let that happen.

We have to come together. We have to do what John Lewis talked about and make sure that love conquers hate, however we can do it.

In that regard, I want to display this photograph. It was taken on the morning of the bombing in Birmingham. It is of an incredible stained glass window in the church. If you look closely, you will see that the most significant damage is the face of Christ that was blown out.

That picture had such an emotional impact on people in Birmingham and around the world. To this day, when people see it, it has an emotional impact because it is as if God simply cannot look at what his children are doing to his children.

We need to remember our faith. We need to remember who we are as a country. We need to remember an image like this. No matter what faith you might believe or even if you don't have a faith, you need to remember this photograph where this stained glass window—the image of Christ—cannot bear to see what is going on. I suspect that in today's world, that image may be replicated somewhere beyond what we can touch.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

ABRAHAM ACCORDS

Mr. MORAN. Madam President, earlier today at the White House, President Trump hosted Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu and the Foreign Ministers from the United Arab Emirates and Bahrain to sign the Abraham Accords.

These historic agreements began the process of normalizing relationships between the two Gulf countries and the Jewish state. After seven decades of isolation in the region, the Abraham Accords signify Israel's existence is finally being accepted by Arab countries, opening new prospects for greater economic, security, and cultural cooperation that will benefit all—those in the region and all of us around the world.

I commend President Trump, Secretary Pompeo, and many others in this administration for facilitating this historic agreement and advancing the cause of peace and prosperity in the region. This came to many of us as a surprise, but it is a welcome surprise. I am very pleased at this development.

Over the past several years, the President and Secretary have cultivated relationships in Jerusalem, Abu Dhabi, and Manama. And for longer than that, Israel and Arab countries have cooperated on important matters but behind closed doors. Capitalizing on a changing Middle East, President Trump and his administration helped shepherd these relationships into the open.

Today's signing is just a beginning for the three countries and the region as a whole. More work, obviously, is to be done, and no agreement can be easily accomplished. But my hope is that more Arab countries will follow the path of publicly recognizing Israel. Eighteen Arab states have yet to make this move, preventing relationships that can benefit the entire region.

Israel's right to exist is unquestionable, and to refuse to recognize this is to deny reality. I, along with so many other Members of this Chamber, have worked to ensure Israel's security and prosperity. With more days like today, we can hope for a region that is secure and prosperous as well for all.

I use this opportunity to commend this accomplishment, and I hope that we are able to bring more peace and stability to this region and to the rest of the world.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MORAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to legislative session for a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO SERGEANT MAJOR THOMAS P. PAYNE

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. Madam President, today I would like to take a moment to recognize and honor SGM Thomas P. Payne of Batesburg-Leesville and Lugoff. Just last week, on September 11, the 19th anniversary of the painful attacks on American soil, Sergeant Major Payne received the Medal of Honor, the country's highest recognition of military bravery for his outstanding efforts to liberate dozens of hostages from ISIS captors during a rescue mission in Iraq.

In his 18-year career in the Army, Sergeant Major Payne has deployed 17 times in support of Operation Enduring Freedom, Operation Iraqi Freedom, Operation New Dawn, and Operation Inherent Resolve and to the U.S. Africa Command area of responsibility.

Thomas ''Patrick'' Payne enlisted in the U.S. Army shortly after graduating from Batesburg-Leesville High School in 2002, and 13 years later, his efforts have saved the lives of many. He holds several awards and decorations including the Medal of Honor, Bronze Star Medal with bronze ''V'' device, and three bronze oakleaf clusters, the Purple Heart, and many, many more.

Sergeant Major Payne is currently serving as an instructor assigned to the U.S. Army Special Operations Command and is stationed at Fort Bragg, NC. I want to thank Sergeant Major Payne for his service; South Carolina is very proud to have such a brave hero.

TRIBUTE TO SERGEANT CHASEN BROWN

Mr. ROMNEY. Madam President, I rise to recognize Sergeant Chasen Brown for his selfless demonstration of bravery while providing lifesaving first aid to victims of senseless violence on the evening of October 1, 2017, in Las Vegas, NV.

On that day, Sergeant Brown was suddenly and unexpectedly thrust into a massacre of his fellow citizens. As bullets rained down indiscriminately from above on innocent concert-goers, Sergeantt Brown immediately began delivering critical aid to dozens of wounded victims, saving countless lives while placing his own life in extraordinary danger.

Bravery, sacrifice, and service to others are not, however, novel concepts to Sergeant Brown. As a gunner for Charlie Battery, 2nd Battalion, 222nd Field Artillery, Sergeant Brown has dedicated his career to serving our country. Today, we are lucky to have his service in the Utah National Guard, and our State is safer as a result. For his heroism, Governor Herbert awarded Sergeant Brown with the Utah Medal of Valor, the highest level of recognition for distinguished service. This honor is well-deserved, but the greatest reward is the gift of life that Sergeant Brown protected for the many civilians he saved that night amid terror and evil.

The great people of the State of Utah and our fellow Americans owe Sergeant Chasen Brown a debt of gratitude for his extraordinary courage under unimaginable circumstances. Thank you, Chasen.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

10TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE HEALY FOUNDATION

• Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Madam President, today I rise to recognize the Healy Foundation as it celebrates 10 years of supporting and facilitating the quality education of remarkable students across the country.

The James P. and Debra Fitzgerald Healy Foundation was created in 2010 by Jim and Debra's 10 children in honor of their parents' lifelong devotion to education. The couple dedicated their lives to ensuring their children received an outstanding education. Both Jim, who passed away last year, and Debra unfailingly demonstrated the importance of a strong work ethic through their tireless efforts on behalf of their family at work and at home.

Based in Naugatuck, CT, the foundation provides assistance to high-achieving college students who encounter unexpected hardships and subsequently need financial help to continue their education. This support has been essential for countless students who deserve to finish their degrees, regardless of any obstacles they have encountered.

Now, as COVID–19 poses unprecedented health and financial challenges in Connecticut and across the globe, the Healy Foundation's work is more necessary than ever. It is critical that education remains equitable and accessible to everyone, and the foundation continues to uphold that mission, awarding scholarships to 11 new students this year.

Committed to furthering a family legacy by bolstering bright, deserving young scholars, the Healy Foundation sets a positive example of encouraging and advancing well-earned education. I applaud their accomplishments and hope my colleagues will join me in congratulating the Healy Foundation on 10 years of helping others achieve their academic dreams.•

RECOGNIZING FRESCO FOODS, INC.

• Mr. RUBIO. Madam President, as chairman of the Senate Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, each week I recognize a small business that exemplifies the American entrepreneurial spirit at the heart of our country. Today, I am delighted to recognize a small business that provides healthy prepackaged meals and fosters community development. This week, it is my privilege to honor Fresco Foods, Inc., of Tampa, FL, as the Senate Small Business of the Week.

In 2014, Rob and Tracy Povolny founded Fresco Foods in Tampa, FL. When Rob was laid off by a corporate food seller, he chose to pursue his goal of establishing a high-quality packaged food company. Using their savings, retirement, and some loans from friends and family, they rented space in an industrial kitchen to create their recipes. That December, they began selling their ''Eat Fresco'' meals at local mom-and-pop grocery stores. Their healthy, satisfying meals were an instant hit.

Six years later, Fresco Foods has grown into a thriving company with more than 120 employees. In 2017, a U.S. Small Business Administration 7(a) loan enabled Rob and Tracy to establish their own 12,000 square foot production facility, creating more than 100 jobs. Their ingredients are sourced from a local distributor, and their product packaging is eco-friendly. In 2018, Fresco Foods reached a major milestone when they began selling their products in a handful of Publix stores. Today, Fresco Foods stock their ''Eat Fresco'' prepared meals in all 1,252 Publix locations across seven States. Additionally, they are working to launch a prepackaged breakfast line later this year.

Together, Rob and Tracy have prioritized business mentorship and ensures Fresco Foods supports the community. Through podcasts and by conducting workshops, Rob and Tracy have shared their experiences, teaching entrepreneurship to future small business owners. Fresco Foods regularly donates to local organizations like Feeding Tampa Bay. They also work with Metropolitan Ministries to employ graduates of its culinary technical training program. For its success and innovation, Fresco Foods has been recognized by local media and business outlets, including the Tampa Bay Business Journal.

Like many Floridian small business, Fresco Foods jumped in to help their community during the coronavirus pandemic. As Florida went into lockdown, philanthropic organizations experienced a drop in donations as demand for their resources surged. Rob and Tracy donated hundreds of ''Eat Fresco'' meals to homeless shelters and domestic violence shelters in the Tampa area.

In April 2020, the U.S. Small Business Administration launched the Paycheck Protection Program, a small business relief program that I was proud to author. The PPP provides forgivable loans to impacted small businesses and

nonprofits who maintain their payroll during the COVID–19 pandemic. Rob and Tracy used their PPP loan, which Fresco Foods received in April, to keep all of their employees on payroll until Florida reopened.

Fresco Foods, Inc., is a notable example of how small businesses can achieve commercial success, and remain committed to investing in their communities. Congratulations to Rob, Tracy, and the entire team at Fresco Foods. I look forward to watching your continued growth in Florida and beyond.●

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 11:27 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, without amendment:

S. 2193. An act to require the Administrator of General Services to issue guidance to clarify that Federal agencies may pay by charge card for the charging of Federal electric motor vehicles, and for other purposes.

S. 3105. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 456 North Meridian Street in Indianapolis, Indiana, as the ''Richard G. Lugar Post Office''.

The message also announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1668. An act to establish minimum security standards for Internet of Things devices owned or controlled by the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2246. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 201 West Cherokee Street in Brookhaven, Mississippi, as the ''Deputy Donald William Durr, Corporal Zach Moak, and Patrolman James White Memorial Post Office Building''.

H.R. 2575. An act to authorize an AI Center of Excellence within the General Services Administration, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2969. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1401 1st Street North in Winter Haven, Florida, as the ''Althea Margaret Daily Mills Post Office Building''.

H.R. 3275. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 340 Wetmore Avenue in Grand River, Ohio, as the ''Lance Corporal Andy 'Ace' Nowacki Post Office''.

H.R. 3847. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 117 West Poythress Street in Hopewell, Virginia, as the ''Reverend Curtis West Harris Post Office Building''.

H.R. 3870. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 511 West 165th Street in New York, New York, as the ''Normandia Maldonado Post Office Building''.

H.R. 4034. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 602 Pacific Avenue in Bremerton, Washington, as the ''John Henry Turpin Post Office Building''.

H.R. 4200. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 321 South 1st Street in Montrose, Colorado, as the ''Sergeant David Kinterknecht Post Office''.

H.R. 4672. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 21701 Stevens Creek Boulevard in Cupertino, California, as the ''Petty Officer 2nd Class (SEAL) Matthew G. Axelson Post Office Building''.

H.R. 4734. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 171 South Maple Street in Dana, Indiana, as the ''Ernest 'Ernie' T. Pyle Post Office''.

H.R. 4785. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1305 U.S. Highway 90 West in Castroville, Texas, as the ''Lance Corporal Rhonald Dain Rairdan Post Office''.

H.R. 4894. An act to amend the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006, to require the budget justifications and appropriation requests of agencies be made publicly available.

H.R. 4975. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1201 Sycamore Square Drive in Midlothian, Virginia, as the ''Dorothy Braden Bruce Post Office Building''.

H.R. 5062. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 9930 Conroy Windermere Road in Windermere, Florida, as the ''Officer Robert German Post Office Building''.

H.R. 5317. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 315 Addicks Howell Road in Houston, Texas, as the ''Deputy Sandeep Singh Dhaliwal Post Office Building''.

H.R. 5384. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 100 Crosby Street in Mansfield, Louisiana, as the ''Dr. C.O. Simpkins, Sr., Post Office''.

H.R. 5597. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 305 Northwest 5th Street in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, as the ''Clara Luper Post Office Building''.

H.R. 6021. An act to amend the Small Business Act to ensure that the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands is eligible for certain Small Business Administration programs, and for other purposes.

H.R. 6078. An act to amend the Small Business Act to increase transparency and to enhance the use of microloans in rural areas, and for other purposes.

H.R. 6079. An act to amend the Small Business Act to optimize the operations of the microloan program, lower costs for small business concerns and intermediary participants in the program, and for other purposes.

H.R. 6133. An act to reauthorize the State Trade Expansion Program of the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 2246. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 201 West Cherokee Street in Brookhaven, Mississippi, as the ''Deputy Donald William Durr, Corporal Zach Moak, and Patrolman James White Memorial Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 2969. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1401 1st Street North in Winter Haven, Florida, as the ''Althea Margaret Daily Mills Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 3275. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 340 Wetmore Avenue in Grand River, Ohio, as the ''Lance Corporal Andy 'Ace' Nowacki Post Office''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 3847. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 117 West Poythress Street in Hopewell, Virginia, as the ''Reverend Curtis West Harris Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 3870. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 511 West 165th Street in New York, New York, as the ''Normandia Maldonado Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 4034. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 602 Pacific Avenue in Bremerton, Washington, as the ''John Henry Turpin Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 4200. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 321 South 1st Street in Montrose, Colorado, as the ''Sergeant David Kinterknecht Post Office''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 4672. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 21701 Stevens Creek Boulevard in Cupertino, California, as the ''Petty Officer 2nd Class (SEAL) Matthew G. Axelson Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 4785. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1305 U.S. Highway 90 West in Castroville, Texas, as the ''Lance Corporal Rhonald Dain Rairdan Post Office''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 4975. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1201 Sycamore Square Drive in Midlothian, Virginia, as the ''Dorothy Braden Bruce Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 5062. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 9930 Conroy Windermere Road in Windermere, Florida, as the ''Officer Robert German Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 5317. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 315 Addicks Howell Road in Houston, Texas, as the ''Deputy Sandeep Singh Dhaliwal Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 5597. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 305 Northwest 5th Street in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, as the ''Clara Luper Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 6021. An act to amend the Small Business Act to ensure that the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands is eligible for certain Small Business Administration programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

H.R. 6078. An act to amend the Small Business Act to increase transparency and to enhance the use of microloans in rural areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

H.R. 6079. An act to amend the Small Business Act to optimize the operations of the microloan program, lower costs for small business concerns and intermediary participants in the program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

H.R. 6133. An act to reauthorize the State Trade Expansion Program of the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes;

to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bills were read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and placed on the calendar:

H.R. 2575. An act to authorize an AI Center of Excellence within the General Services Administration, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4734. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 171 South Maple Street in Dana, Indiana, as the ''Ernest 'Ernie' T. Pyle Post Office''.

H.R. 4894. An act to amend the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006, to require the budget justifications and appropriation requests of agencies be made publicly available.

H.R. 5384. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 100 Crosby Street in Mansfield, Louisiana, as the ''Dr. C.O. Simpkins, Sr., Post Office''.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

S. 4582. A bill to extend, temporarily, daylight saving time, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC–5347. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Final Rule for Petition IN–11062, Deoxyribonucleic Acids (CAS Reg. No. 9007–49–2) for an Exemption Under 40 CFR 180.910'' (FRL No. 1013–43–OCSPP) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 4, 2020; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–5348. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Pydiflumetofen; Pesticide Tolerance'' (FRL No. 1012–18–OCSPP) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 24, 2020; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–5349. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Tiafenacil; Pesticide Tolerances'' (FRL No. 10013–02–OCSPP) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 4, 2020; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–5350. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''1-Octanamine, N, N-dimethyl-, N-oxide; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance'' (FRL No. 10003–75–OCSPP) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 4, 2020; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–5351. A communication from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, notification of the President's intent to exempt all military personnel accounts from sequestration for fiscal year 2021, if a sequestration is necessary; to the Committees on Appropriations; Armed Services; and the Budget.

EC–5352. A communication from the Chairman of the Federal Maritime Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to Antideficiency Act (ADA) Violations; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EC–5353. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of an officer authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of lieutenant general in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777a, this will not cause the Department to exceed the number of frocked officers authorized; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–5354. A communication from the Congressional Assistant, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Regulatory Capital Rule: Paycheck Protection Program Lending Facility and Paycheck Protection Program Loans'' (RIN7100–AF86) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 24, 2020; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–5355. A communication from the Program Specialist, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Collective Investment Funds: Prior Notice Period for Withdrawals'' (RIN1557–AE99) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 24, 2020; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–5356. A communication from the Congressional Assistant, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Rules Regarding Availability of Information'' (RIN7100–AF51) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 24, 2020; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–5357. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for Regulations and Legislation, Office of Housing, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Housing Counseling Program: Revision of the Certification Timeline'' (RIN2502–ZA34) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 24, 2020; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–5358. A communication from the Program Specialist, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Joint Statement on Enforcement of Bank Secrecy Act / Anti Money Laundering Requirements'' received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 24, 2020; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–5359. A communication from the Director of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Joint Statement on Enforcement of Bank Secrecy Act / Anti Money Laundering Requirements'' received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 28, 2020; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–5360. A communication from the Director of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Final Rule - Covered Broker-Dealer Provisions Under Title II of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act'' (RIN3064–AE39) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2020; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–5361. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Ukraine that was originally declared in Executive Order 13660 of March 6, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–5362. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Zimbabwe that was declared in Executive Order 13288 of March 6, 2003; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–5363. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Venezuela that was declared in Executive Order 13692 of March 8, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–5364. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a legislative proposal entitled ''National Flood Insurance Program Affordability Proposal''; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–5365. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Air Plan Approval; Missouri; Control of Emissions from Industrial Surface Coating Operations'' (FRL No. 10014–32–Region 7) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 4, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–5366. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Air Plan Approval; Missouri; Restriction of Emission of Lead From Specific Lead Smelter-Refinery Installations'' (FRL No. 10014–22–Region 7) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 4, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–5367. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Finding of Failure to Attain the 2006 24-Hour Fine Particulate Matter Standards; California; Los Angeles-South Coast Air Basin'' (FRL No. 10014–44–Region 9) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 4, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–5368. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Air Plan Approval; South Carolina and Tennessee: Minimum Reporting Requirements in SIPs'' (FRL No. 10014–35–Region 4) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 4, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–5369. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Definition of Chemical Process

Plants Under State Prevention of Significant Deterioration Regulations'' (FRL No. 10014–28–Region 4) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 4, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–5370. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Air Plan Approval; Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes; Indiana; Redesignation of the Morgan County Sulfur Dioxide Nonattainment Area'' (FRL No. 10014–25–Region 5) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 4, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–5371. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval of Air Quality Implementation Plans; California; Coachella Valley; 2008 8-Hour Ozone Nonattainment Area Requirements'' (FRL No. 10014–24–Region 9) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 4, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–5372. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Air Plan Approval; Pennsylvania; Reasonably Available Control Technology (RACT) for Volatile Organic Compounds (VOC) Under the 2008 Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS)'' (FRL No. 10014–11–Region 3) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 4, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–5373. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Air Plan Approval; New Mexico; Repeal of State Regulations for Particulate Matter for Lime Manufacturing Plants'' (FRL No. 10014–08–Region 6) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 4, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–5374. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Air Plan Approval; Georgia; Emission Reduction Credits'' (FRL No. 10013–73–Region 4) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 4, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–5375. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Accidental Release Prevention Requirements: Risk Management Programs Under the Clean Air Act; Final Action on Petitions for Reconsideration'' (FRL No. 10013–31–OLEM) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 4, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–5376. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''National Priorities List - List Sites'' (FRL No. 10012–71–OLEM) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 4, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–5377. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Air Plan Approval; Idaho; Infrastructure Requirements for the 2015 Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards'' (FRL No. 10014–32–Region 7) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 4, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–5378. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Air Plan Approval; Missouri; Control of Emissions from Industrial Surface Coating Operations'' (FRL No. 10013–51–Region 7) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 24, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–5379. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of State Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants; Oregon Department of Environmental Quality; Control of Emissions from Existing Municipal Solid Waste Landfills'' (FRL No. 10011–40–Region 10) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–5380. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Effluent Limitations Guidelines and Standards for the Steam Electric Power Generating Point Source Category - Reconsideration'' (FRL No. 10014–41–OW) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–5381. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Saflufenacil; Pesticide Tolerances'' (FRL No. 10013–77–OCSPP) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2020; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–5382. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Kasugamycin; Pesticide Tolerances for Emergency Exemptions'' (FRL No. 10013–94–OCSPP) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2020; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–5383. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Colorado; Revisions to Air Pollution Emission Notice Rules'' (FRL No. 10013–30–Region 8) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 24, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–5384. A communication from the Supervisor of the Regulations and Dissemination Team, Employment and Training Administration, Department of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Trade Adjustment Assistance for Workers'' (RIN1205–AB78) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 26, 2020; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–5385. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Report to Congress: State Submission of Annual Progress and Services Reports, Health Care Oversight and Coordination Plans Following Enactment of Pub. L. 115–123, the Family First Prevention Services Act''; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–5386. A communication from the Regulation Coordinator, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Medicare Program; Prospective Payment System and Consolidated Billing for Skilled Nursing Facilities; Updates to the Value-Based Purchasing Program for Federal Fiscal Year 2021'' ((RIN0938–AU13) (CMS–1737–F)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 20, 2020; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–5387. A communication from the Regulations Coordinator, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fiscal Year 2021 Inpatient Psychiatric Facilities Prospective Payment System - Rate Update (CMS–1731–F and CMS–1744–IFC)'' (RIN0938–AU07) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 20, 2020; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–5388. A communication from the Chairman of the United States International Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Andean Trade Preference Act (ATPA): Impact on U.S. Industries and Consumers and on Drug Crop Eradication and Crop Substitution, 2019''; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–5389. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary of State, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Convention on Cultural Property Implementation Act, a report relative to extending and amending the agreement between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Nicaragua Concerning the Imposition of Import Restrictions on Archaeological Material from the Pre-Hispanic Cultures of the Republic of Nicaragua; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–5390. A communication from the Regulations Coordinator, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Medicare and Medicaid Programs, Clinical Laboratory Improvement Amendments (CLIA), and Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; Additional Policy and Regulatory Revisions in Response to the COVID–19 Public Health Emergency (CMS–3401–IFC)'' (RIN0938–AU33) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 2, 2020; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–5391. A communication from the Director of Regulations and Policy Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Postmarketing Safety Reports for Approved New Animal Drugs; Electronic Submission Requirements'' (RIN0910–AH51) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 24, 2020; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–5392. A communication from the Director of Regulations and Policy Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services,

transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Food Additives Permitted in Feed and Drinking Water of Animals; Chromium Propionate'' (Docket No. FDA–2018–F–3347) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 24, 2020; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–5393. A communication from the Regulations Coordinator, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Basic Health Program; Federal Funding Methodology for Program Year 2021'' (RIN0938–ZB56) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 2, 2020; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–5394. A communication from the Director of Regulations and Policy Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Medical Devices; Petition for an Administrative Stay of Action: Electrical Stimulation Devices for Self-Injurious or Aggressive Behavior'' (Docket No. FDA–2016–N–1111) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 24, 2020; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–5395. A communication from the Chief Privacy Officer and Chief FOIA Officer, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the implementation of the recommendations of the 9/11 Commission for the period from October 1, 2019, through March 31, 2020; to the Committees on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs; Select Committee on Intelligence; and the Judiciary.

EC–5396. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Scheduling of Annual Leave for Employees Necessary to Respond to Certain National Emergencies'' (RIN3206–AO04) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 18, 2020; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5397. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 23–350, ''New Hospital at St. Elizabeths Amendment Act of 2020''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5398. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 23–386, ''Window Blind and Drape Cord Safety Notification Act of 2020''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5399. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 23–387, ''Access to Biosimilars Amendment Act of 2020''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5400. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 23–388, ''Hearing Aid Sales Amendment Act of 2020''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5401. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 23–389, ''Pregnancy as a Qualifying Event Act of 2020''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5402. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 23–390, ''Postpartum Coverage Expansion Amendment Act of 2020''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5403. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 23–349, ''Connected Transport Network Temporary Act of 2020''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5404. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 23–391, ''Black Lives Matter Plaza Designation Temporary Act of 2020''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5405. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 23–392, ''Appraisal Management Company Regulation Temporary Act of 2020''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5406. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 23–394, ''Investigating Maternal Mortalities Temporary Amendment Act of 2020''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5407. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 23–395, ''Concealed Pistol Licensing Review Board Membership Temporary Amendment Act of 2020''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5408. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 23–396, ''Commercial Insurance Claim Tolling Temporary Act of 2020''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5409. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 23–397, ''Adams Morgan BID Tax Temporary Amendment Act of 2020''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5410. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 23–398, ''Standby Guardian Temporary Amendment Act of 2020''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5411. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 23–400, ''Reunion Square Tax Increment Financing Temporary Amendment Act of 2020''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5412. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 23–401, ''Business Support Grants Temporary Amendment Act of 2020''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5413. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 23–402, ''Performing Arts Promotion Temporary Amendment Act of 2020''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5414. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 23–393, ''Criminal Justice Coordinating Council Information Sharing Temporary Amendment Act 2020''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5415. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 23–399, ''Comprehensive Policing and Justice Reform Second Temporary Amendment Act of 2020''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5416. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 23–408, ''Fiscal Year 2021 Local Budget Act of 2020''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5417. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 23–407, ''Fiscal Year 2021 Budget Support Act of 2020''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5418. A communication from the Chief of the Regulatory Coordination Division, Citizenship and Immigration Services, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Temporary Changes to Requirements Affecting H–2A Nonimmigrants due to the COVID–19 National Emergency Partial Extension of Certain Flexibilities'' (RIN1615–AC55) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 24, 2020; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–5419. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulation Policy and Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Provider-Based Requirements'' (RIN2900–AQ68) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 3, 2020; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC–5420. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulation Policy and Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Specialty Education Loan Repayment Program'' (RIN2900–AQ63) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 3, 2020; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC–5421. A communication from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Uniformed Services Employment and Reemployment Rights Act of 1994 (USERRA) Quarterly Report to Congress; Third Quarter of fiscal year 2020''; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC–5422. A communication from the Program Analyst, Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Telecommunications Relay Services and Speech-to-Speech Services for Individuals with Hearing and Speech Disabilities, Report and Order'' ((CG Docket No. 03–123) (FCC 20–105)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 24, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5423. A communication from the Deputy Chief, Public Safety and Homeland Security Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Wireless E911 Location Accuracy Requirements 9.10, 911 Service'' ((FCC 20–98) (PS Docket No. 07–114)) received during adjournment of the Senate in

the Office of the President of the Senate on August 24, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5424. A communication from the Attorney Advisor, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Establishing the Digital Opportunity Data Collection, Second Report and Third Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking'' ((WC Docket No. 19–195) (FCC 20–94)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 24, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5425. A communication from the Attorney Advisor, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Rates for Inmate Calling Services'' ((WC Docket No. 12–375) (FCC 20–111)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 24, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5426. A communication from the Chairman of the Office of Proceedings, Surface Transportation Board, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Regulations Governing Fees for Services Performed in Connection with Licensing and Related Services - 2020 Update'' (Docket No. EP 542) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 24, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5427. A communication from the Chairman of the Office of Proceedings, Surface Transportation Board, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Market Dominance Streamlined Approach'' (Docket No. EP 756) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 24, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSON, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 2502. A bill to ban the Federal procurement of certain drones and other unmanned aircraft systems, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 116–268).

By Mr. MORAN, from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute and an amendment to the title:

S. 332. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to remove the manifestation period required for the presumptions of service connection for chloracne, porphyria cutanea tarda, and acute and subacute peripheral neuropathy associated with exposure to certain herbicide agents, and for other purposes.

By Mr. MORAN, from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 514. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the benefits and services provided by the Department of Veterans Affairs to women veterans, and for other purposes.

S. 629. A bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to review the processes and requirements of the Department of Veterans Affairs for scheduling appointments for health care and conducting consultations under the laws administered by the Secretary, and for other purposes.

By Mr. MORAN, from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, without amendment:

S. 711. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to expand eligibility for mental health services from the Department of Veterans Affairs to include members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

By Mr. MORAN, from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 805. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the processing of veterans benefits by the Department of Veterans Affairs, to limit the authority of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to recover overpayments made by the Department and other amounts owed by veterans to the United States, to improve the due process accorded veterans with respect to such recovery, and for other purposes.

By Mr. MORAN, from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute and an amendment to the title:

S. 2216. A bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to formally recognize caregivers of veterans, notify veterans and caregivers of clinical determinations relating to eligibility for caregiver programs, and temporarily extend benefits for veterans who are determined ineligible for the family caregiver program, and for other purposes.

By Mr. MORAN, from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, without amendment:

S. 2558. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to make certain grants to assist nursing homes for veterans located on tribal lands.

By Mr. MORAN, from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 2950. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to concede exposure to airborne hazards and toxins from burn pits under certain circumstances, and for other purposes.

S. 3235. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to conduct a pilot program on posttraumatic growth, and for other purposes.

By Mr. MORAN, from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, without amendment:

S. 3282. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the oversight of contracts awarded by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to small business concerns owned and controlled by veterans, and for other purposes.

S. 3643. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize certain postgraduate health care employees and health professions trainees of the Department of Veterans Affairs to provide treatment via telemedicine, and for other purposes.

S. 4384. A bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to address exposure by members of the Armed Forces to toxic substances at Karshi-Khanabad Air Base, Uzbekistan, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. INHOFE for the Committee on Armed Services.

*Shon J. Manasco, of Texas, to be Under Secretary of the Air Force.

*Michele A. Pearce, of Virginia, to be General Counsel of the Department of the Army.

*John E. Whitley, of Virginia, to be Director of Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation, Department of Defense.

*Liam P. Hardy, of Virginia, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces for the term of fifteen years to expire on the date prescribed by law.

*Lucas N. Polakowski, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

*Bradley D. Hansell, of Virginia, to be a Deputy Under Secretary of Defense.

Army nomination of Lt. Gen. Christopher G. Cavoli, to be General.

Space Force nomination of Lt. Gen. David D. Thompson, to be General.

Space Force nomination of Lt. Gen. David D. Thompson, to be Major General.

Air Force nomination of Lt. Gen. David W. Allvin, to be General.

Army nomination of Lt. Gen. Andrew P. Poppas, to be Lieutenant General.

Army nomination of Maj. Gen. James J. Mingus, to be Lieutenant General.

Navy nomination of Lisa M. Franchetti, to be Vice Admiral.

Army nomination of Col. William F. McClintock, to be Brigadier General.

Marine Corps nomination of Maj. Gen. Michael S. Groen, to be Lieutenant General.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, for the Committee on Armed Services I report favorably the following nomination lists which were printed in the RECORDS on the dates indicated, and ask unanimous consent, to save the expense of reprinting on the Executive Calendar that these nominations lie at the Secretary's desk for the information of Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Air Force nominations beginning with Brian H. Adams and ending with Mary Jean Wood, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 4, 2020.

Air Force nomination of James E. Key III, to be Colonel.

Air Force nominations beginning with Paul Jeffrey Affleck and ending with Joseph F. Zingaro, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 10, 2020.

Air Force nomination of Michael B. Parks, to be Colonel.

Air Force nomination of Brian P. O'Connor, to be Major.

Air Force nomination of Samuel P. Baxter, to be Colonel.

Air Force nomination of Ryan M. Vanartsdalen, to be Major.

Army nomination of Mark J. Richardson, to be Major.

Army nomination of Luis O. Rodriguez, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Kyle C. Furfari, to be Major.

Army nominations beginning with Edward J. Coleman and ending with Michael E. Kelly, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on August 13, 2020.

Army nomination of Renn D. Polk, to be Colonel.

Army nominations beginning with William R. Brown and ending with Paul S. Winterton, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on August 13, 2020.

Army nominations beginning with Jonathan Bender and ending with Christopher J. Vitale, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on August 13, 2020.

Army nominations beginning with Raymond Colston, Jr. and ending with Matthew J. Rivas, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on August 13, 2020.

Army nominations beginning with James O. Bowen and ending with Philip A. Winn, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on August 13, 2020.

Army nominations beginning with Andrew T. Conant and ending with Ravindra V. Wagh, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on August 13, 2020.

Army nomination of Fred J. Grospin, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Matthew E. Tullia, to be Major.

Marine Corps nomination of Anthony J. Bertoglio, to be Major.

Marine Corps nomination of John Stephens, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Marine Corps nomination of Angela M. Nelson, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Marine Corps nomination of Luke D. Zumbusch, to be Major.

Marine Corps nomination of Richard M. Rusnok, to be Colonel.

Marine Corps nomination of Damon K. Burrows, to be Colonel.

Navy nomination of Brian F. O'Bannon, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Inaraquel Mirandavargas, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Kristen L. Kinner, to be Captain.

Navy nomination of Jeffrey B. Parks, to be Commander.

Navy nomination of William F. Blanton, to be Commander.

Navy nomination of Michael J. Armstrong, to be Commander.

Navy nomination of Chadwick G. Shroy, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Terrance L. Leighton III, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Todd D. Strong, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Nathan D. Huffaker, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Emily M. Benzer, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of David M. Lalanne, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Jean E. Knowles, to be Captain.

Navy nomination of Kevin M. Ray, to be Commander.

Space Force nominations beginning with David L. Ransom and ending with James C. Kundert, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on August 6, 2020.

Space Force nominations beginning with David R. Anderson and ending with Devin L. Zufelt, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on August 6, 2020.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Ms. MCSALLY (for herself and Ms. SINEMA):

S. 4569. A bill to modify the boundary of the Sunset Crater Volcano National Monument in the State of Arizona, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. PETERS):

S. 4570. A bill to amend title 14, United States Code, to require the Coast Guard to conduct icebreaking operations in the Great Lakes to minimize commercial disruption in the winter months, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. SCHATZ (for himself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, and Mr. SULLIVAN):

S. 4571. A bill to extend certain deadlines for the 2020 decennial census; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND:

S. 4572. 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, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. MCSALLY:

S. 4573. A bill to support remediation of illicit cross-border tunnels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNG (for himself and Ms. SINEMA):

S. 4574. 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 Finance.

By Mr. GARDNER:

S. 4575. A bill to ensure that the United States Government advocates for a free internet; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. WICKER (for himself and Ms. CANTWELL):

S. 4576. A bill to amend the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act to make a technical correction to ensure that the extended lease protections for servicemembers under stop movement orders in response to a local, national, or global emergency applies to members of the Coast Guard when the Coast Guard is operating in the service of the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN (for herself and Mr. THUNE):

S. 4577. A bill to require online enrollment for the PreCheck Program of the Transportation Security Administration; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. PORTMAN (for himself and Mr. PETERS):

S. 4578. A bill to provide for domestic sourcing of personal protective equipment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. MORAN (for himself, Mr. TESTER, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. BROWN, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. SULLIVAN, Ms. SINEMA, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. CRAMER, Mrs. LOEFFLER, and Ms. HIRONO):

S. 4579. A bill to increase, effective as of December 1, 2020, the rates of compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for the survivors of certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. LOEFFLER (for herself and Mr. COTTON):

S. 4580. A bill to reauthorize the Act entitled ''An Act to authorize funding to conduct a national training program for State and local prosecutors''; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TESTER:

S. 4581. A bill to ensure the availability of mail collections boxes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself and Mr. SCOTT of Florida):

S. 4582. A bill to extend, temporarily, daylight saving time, and for other purposes; read the first time.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Mr. MURPHY):

S. 4583. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the expansion, intensification, and coordination of the programs and activities of the National Institutes of Health with respect to Tourette syndrome; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. KING, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. COONS, Mr. BOOKER, and Mr. HAWLEY):

S. Res. 692. A resolution designating September 2020 as ''National Prostate Cancer Awareness Month''; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. WARREN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. UDALL, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. MERKLEY, and Mr. HEINRICH):

S. Res. 693. A resolution recognizing the duty of the Federal Government to implement an agenda to Transform, Heal, and Renew by Investing in a Vibrant Economy (''THRIVE''); to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. WICKER (for himself and Ms. CANTWELL):

S. Res. 694. A resolution recognizing 100 years of service by chief petty officers in the United States Coast Guard; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. KAINE, Mr. JONES, Mr. BENNET, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. CARPER, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. HIRONO, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. UDALL, Mr. REED, Mr. KING, and Ms. DUCKWORTH):

S. Res. 695. A resolution designating September 2020 as ''National Voting Rights Month''; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLUNT (for himself and Mr. CARDIN):

S. Res. 696. A resolution designating September 4, 2020, as ''National Polycystic Kidney Disease Awareness Day'', and raising awareness and understanding of polycystic kidney disease; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. SCHUMER (for Mr. COONS (for himself, Mr. CASSIDY, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. JONES, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. REED, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. KING, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BENNET, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. KAINE, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. CARPER, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. YOUNG, Ms. COLLINS, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. STABENOW, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. BOOZMAN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. WICKER, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. ROSEN,

Mr. CRAMER, Ms. HIRONO, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, and Mrs. MURRAY)):

S. Con. Res. 44. A concurrent resolution recognizing September 11, 2020, as ''National Day of Service and Remembrance''; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 463

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 463, a bill to provide paid family and medical leave benefits to certain individuals, and for other purposes.

S. 624

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 624, a bill to amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to require States to provide for same day registration.

S. 633

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the names of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) were added as cosponsors of S. 633, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the members of the Women's Army Corps who were assigned to the 6888th Central Postal Directory Battalion, known as the ''Six Triple Eight''.

S. 739

At the request of Mr. UDALL, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 739, a bill to protect the voting rights of Native American and Alaska Native voters.

S. 861

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the names of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE), the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) and the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) were added as cosponsors of S. 861, a bill to establish in the Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor of the Department of State a Special Envoy for the Human Rights of LGBTI Peoples, and for other purposes.

S. 892

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the names of the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN) and the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) were added as cosponsors of S. 892, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the women in the United States who joined the workforce during World War II, providing the aircraft, vehicles, weaponry, ammunition, and other materials to win the war, that were referred to as ''Rosie the Riveter'', in recognition of their contributions to the United States and the inspiration they have provided to ensuing generations.

S. 1267

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1267, a bill to establish within the Smithsonian Institution the National Museum of the American Latino, and for other purposes.

S. 1508

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the names of the Senator from Georgia (Mrs. LOEFFLER) and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) were added as cosponsors of S. 1508, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide enhanced penalties for convicted murderers who kill or target America's public safety officers.

S. 1687

At the request of Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1687, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a special rule for certain casualty losses of uncut timber.

At the request of Mrs. LOEFFLER, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1687, supra.

S. 1791

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1791, a bill to prohibit discrimination on the basis of religion, sex (including sexual orientation and gender identity), and marital status in the administration and provision of child welfare services, to improve safety, well-being, and permanency for lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer or questioning foster youth, and for other purposes.

S. 1902

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1902, a bill to require the Consumer Product Safety Commission to promulgate a consumer product safety rule for free-standing clothing storage units to protect children from tip-over related death or injury, and for other purposes.

S. 2001

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2001, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to Willie O'Ree, in recognition of his extraordinary contributions and commitment to hockey, inclusion, and recreational opportunity.

S. 2054

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the names of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE), the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG) and the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) were added as cosponsors of S. 2054, a bill to posthumously award the Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to Glen Doherty, Tyrone Woods, J. Christopher Stevens, and Sean Smith, in recognition of their contributions to the Nation.

S. 2226

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2226, a bill to require States to carry out congressional redistricting in accordance with plans developed and enacted into law by independent redistricting commissions, and for other purposes.

S. 2539

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2539, a bill to modify and reauthorize the Tibetan Policy Act of 2002, and for other purposes.

S. 2548

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the names of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES) were added as cosponsors of S. 2548, a bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to address and take action to prevent bullying and harassment of students.

S. 2669

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2669, a bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to clarify the obligation to report acts of foreign election influence and require implementation of compliance and reporting systems by Federal campaigns to detect and report such acts, and for other purposes.

S. 3004

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the names of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) were added as cosponsors of S. 3004, a bill to protect human rights and enhance opportunities for LGBTI people around the world, and for other purposes.

S. 3013

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3013, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to allow for the offering of additional prescription drug plans under Medicare part D.

S. 3419

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3419, a bill to amend the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921, to provide for the establishment of a trust for the benefit of all unpaid cash sellers of livestock, and for other purposes.

S. 3485

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) were

added as cosponsors of S. 3485, a bill to expand the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to expand revenue sharing for offshore wind, to reauthorize the National Oceans and Coastal Security Act, and for other purposes.

S. 3547

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3547, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to waive limitations on expansion of facility capacity under rural provider and hospital exception to ownership or investment prohibition during coronavirus 2020 emergency period.

S. 3599

At the request of Mr. PERDUE, the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN), the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) and the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) were added as cosponsors of S. 3599, a bill to enhance our Nation's nurse and physician workforce during the COVID–19 crisis by recapturing unused immigrant visas.

S. 3690

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3690, a bill to provide for E–Rate support for Wi-Fi hotspots, modems, routers, and connected devices during emergency periods relating to COVID–19, and for other purposes.

S. 3797

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3797, a bill to provide overtime and holiday fee relief for small meat, poultry, and egg processing plants, and for other purposes.

S. 3812

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3812, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to expand eligibility for hospital care, medical services, and nursing home care from the Department of Veterans Affairs to include veterans of World War II.

S. 3900

At the request of Ms. ROSEN, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3900, a bill to direct the Secretary of Defense to carry out a grant program to support science, technology, engineering, and mathematics education in the Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps and for other purposes.

S. 3923

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3923, a bill to provide emergency relief to youth, children, and families experiencing homelessness, in light of the health and economic consequences of COVID–19.

S. 3986

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the names of the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) were added as cosponsors of S. 3986, a bill to approve certain advanced biofuel registrations, to require the consideration of certain advanced biofuel pathways, and to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and for other purposes.

S. 4012

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the names of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) and the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY) were added as cosponsors of S. 4012, a bill to establish a $120,000,000,000 Restaurant Revitalization Fund to provide structured relief to food service or drinking establishments through December 31, 2020, and for other purposes.

S. 4032

At the request of Mr. LANKFORD, the names of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) and the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) were added as cosponsors of S. 4032, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow above-the-line deductions for charitable contributions for individuals not itemizing deductions.

S. 4150

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4150, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to provide assistance to certain providers of transportation services affected by the novel coronavirus.

S. 4166

At the request of Ms. SINEMA, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4166, a bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to secure medical opinions for veterans with service-connected disabilities who die from COVID–19 to determine whether their service-connected disabilities were the principal or contributory cases of death, and for other purposes.

S. 4227

At the request of Ms. ROSEN, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4227, a bill to improve access to economic injury disaster loans and emergency advances under the CARES Act, and for other purposes.

S. 4303

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4303, a bill to improve State short-term compensation programs, and for other purposes.

S. 4345

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4345, a bill to amend section 212 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to ensure that efforts to engage in espionage or technology transfer are considered in visa issuance, and for other purposes.

S. 4404

At the request of Mr. BOOZMAN, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4404, a bill to amend the National Trails System Act to designate the Butterfield Overland National Historic Trail, and for other purposes.

S. 4458

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4458, a bill to grant the authority for States to enter into interstate compacts or agreements for the purpose of procuring COVID–19 tests.

S. 4565

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the names of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) were added as cosponsors of S. 4565, a bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to rename the Aviation Safety Whistleblower Investigation Office and to establish an Office of Professional Responsibility and an Office of the Ombudsman in the Federal Aviation Administration, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 578

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 578, a resolution condemning the Government of Iran's state-sponsored persecution of its Baha'i minority and its continued violation of the International Covenants on Human Rights.

S. RES. 673

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 673, a resolution affirming that the New START Treaty extension will cover new deployed Russian nuclear delivery systems, and supporting additional initiatives to engage China that advance the goal of concluding an arms control treaty or agreement.

S. RES. 684

At the request of Mr. RISCH, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 684, a resolution calling on the Government of Cameroon and separatist armed groups from the English-speaking Northwest and Southwest regions to end all violence, respect the human rights of all Cameroonians, and pursue a genuinely inclusive dialogue toward resolving the ongoing civil conflict in Anglophone Cameroon.

AMENDMENT NO. 1551

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the names of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) and the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1551 intended to be proposed to S. 2657, a bill to support innovation in advanced geothermal research and development, and for other purposes.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 692—DESIGNATING SEPTEMBER 2020 AS ''NATIONAL PROSTATE CANCER AWARENESS MONTH''

Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. KING, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. COONS, Mr. BOOKER, and Mr. HAWLEY) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 692

Whereas more than 3,100,000 men in the United States are living with prostate cancer;

Whereas 1 in 9 men in the United States will be diagnosed with prostate cancer in their lifetimes and 1 in 41 men in the United States will die from prostate cancer;

Whereas prostate cancer is the most commonly diagnosed non-skin cancer and the second-leading cause of cancer-related deaths among men in the United States;

Whereas the American Cancer Society estimates that, in 2020, 191,930 men will be diagnosed with, and more than 33,330 men will die of, prostate cancer;

Whereas 40.9 percent of newly diagnosed prostate cancer cases occur in men under the age of 65;

Whereas the odds of developing prostate cancer rise rapidly after age 50;

Whereas African-American men suffer from a prostate cancer incidence rate that is significantly higher than that of White men and have more than double the prostate cancer mortality rate than that of White men;

Whereas having a father or brother with prostate cancer more than doubles the risk of a man developing prostate cancer, with a higher risk for men who have a brother with the disease and the highest risk for men with several affected relatives;

Whereas screening by a digital rectal examination and a prostate-specific antigen blood test can detect the disease at the earlier, more treatable stages, which could increase the chances of survival for more than 5 years to nearly 100 percent;

Whereas only 31 percent of men survive more than 5 years if diagnosed with prostate cancer after the cancer has metastasized;

Whereas there are typically no noticeable symptoms of prostate cancer in the early stages, making appropriate screening critical;

Whereas, in fiscal year 2020, the Director of the National Institutes of Health will support approximately $287,000,000 in research projects focused specifically on prostate cancer;

Whereas, in fiscal year 2020, Congress appropriated $110,000,000 for the Prostate Cancer Research Program of the Department of Defense;

Whereas ongoing research promises further improvements in prostate cancer prevention, early detection, and treatment; and

Whereas educating people in the United States, including health care providers, about prostate cancer and early detection strategies is crucial to saving the lives of men and preserving and protecting families: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates September 2020 as ''National Prostate Cancer Awareness Month'';

(2) declares that steps should be taken—

(A) to raise awareness about the importance of screening methods for, and treatment of, prostate cancer;

(B) to encourage research—

(i) to improve screening and treatment for prostate cancer;

(ii) to discover the causes of prostate cancer; and

(iii) to develop a cure for prostate cancer; and

(C) to continue to consider ways to improve access to, and the quality of, health care services for detecting and treating prostate cancer; and

(3) calls on the people of the United States, interest groups, and affected persons—

(A) to promote awareness of prostate cancer;

(B) to take an active role in the fight to end the devastating effects of prostate cancer on individuals, families, and the economy; and

(C) to observe National Prostate Cancer Awareness Month with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

SENATE RESOLUTION 693—RECOGNIZING THE DUTY OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT TO IMPLEMENT AN AGENDA TO TRANSFORM, HEAL, AND RENEW BY INVESTING IN A VIBRANT ECONOMY (''THRIVE'')

Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. WARREN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. UDALL, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. MERKLEY, and Mr. HEINRICH) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. RES. 693

Whereas families and communities throughout the United States share similar hopes and dreams of a good life that is free from worry about meeting basic needs, with reliable and fulfilling work, a dignified and healthy standard of living, and the ability to enjoy time with loved ones;

Whereas the United States faces the stress of multiple, overlapping crises—old and new—that prevent the achievement of these fundamental human rights and needs, in which the COVID–19 pandemic has killed over 180,000 United States residents; tens of millions of United States workers remain unemployed; rising economic inequality has made working families vulnerable; tens of millions of individuals do not get the health care they need; and intensifying climate change increases the threats to our health, economy, and livelihoods;

Whereas these health, economic, and climate crises have magnified centuries-old injustices, causing high rates of death and hardship among Black, Brown, and Indigenous communities due to long-standing systemic racism—a fact spotlighted by an emerging, multiracial movement to end violence against Black people;

Whereas these crises are causing the inequitable workloads of women—particularly women of color—to grow, especially as women of color overwhelmingly make up the essential workforce, bearing the weight of the increased care needs of children, the elderly, and the sick;

Whereas, even before the COVID–19 crisis, many rural communities and independent family farmers suffered from poverty, declining economic opportunity, and alarming rates of farm bankruptcy, including loss of land from Black farmers and the exploitation of Black, Brown, and Indigenous farmers caused by predatory and racist public, private, and governmental institutions and policies;

Whereas the root of our interlocking economic and environmental crises is society's historical willingness to treat some communities and workers as disposable;

Whereas it is necessary to counteract systemic injustice and value the dignity of all individuals in order to address unemployment, pandemics, or climate change and ensure the survival of the Nation and the planet;

Whereas the choices made in response to these crises will shape the United States' direction for the 21st century and beyond, offering an opportunity to reshape our society to provide a good life for each of us and for our children and grandchildren; and

Whereas the United States has the means to support fulfilling livelihoods for millions of people—Black, Indigenous, Brown, Latinx, Asian/Pacific Islander, White, immigrant, urban and rural, old and young, of many faiths, genders, abilities, and talents—while working to heal harms, protect communities, and invest in a future that fosters justice, not crisis: Now therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) it is the duty of the Federal Government to respond to the crises of racial injustice, mass unemployment, a pandemic, and climate change with a bold and holistic national mobilization, an Agenda to Transform, Heal, and Renew by Investing in a Vibrant Economy (''THRIVE'') (referred to in this resolving clause as the ''Agenda''), to build a society that enables—

(A) greater racial, economic, and gender justice;

(B) dignified work;

(C) healthy communities; and

(D) a stable climate; and

(2) such Agenda shall be assessed upon its ability to uphold its foundational pillars, including—

(A) creating millions of good, safe jobs with access to unions by—

(i) investing in projects including—

(I) upgrading our broken infrastructure to expand access to clean and affordable energy, transportation, high-speed broadband, and water, particularly for public systems;

(II) modernizing and retrofitting millions of homes, schools, offices, and industrial buildings to cut pollution and costs;

(III) investing in public health and care work, including by increasing jobs, protections, wages, and benefits for the historically unpaid and undervalued work of caring for children, the elderly, and the sick;

(IV) protecting and restoring wetlands, forests, and public lands, and cleaning up pollution in our communities;

(V) creating opportunities for family farmers and rural communities, including by untangling the hyper-consolidated food supply chain, bolstering regenerative agriculture, and investing in local and regional food systems that support farmers, agricultural workers, healthy soil, and climate resilience; and

(VI) developing and transforming the industrial base of the United States, while creating high-skill, high-wage manufacturing jobs across the country, including by expanding manufacturing of clean technologies, reducing industrial pollution, and prioritizing clean, domestic manufacturing for the aforementioned investments;

(ii) prioritizing the mobilization of direct public investments, while excluding false solutions that—

(I) increase inequality;

(II) privatize public lands, water, or nature;

(III) violate human rights;

(IV) expedite the destruction of ecosystems; or

(V) decrease union density or membership;

(iii) driving investment toward real full employment, where every individual who

wishes to work has a viable pathway to a meaningful and dignified job with the right to form a union, including by establishing new public employment programs, as necessary; and

(iv) subjecting each job created under this Agenda to high-road labor standards that—

(I) require family-sustaining wages and benefits, including child care support;

(II) ensure safe workplaces;

(III) protect the rights of workers to organize; and

(IV) prioritize the hiring of local workers to ensure wages stay within communities to stimulate economic activity;

(B) building the power of workers to fight inequality by—

(i) reversing the corporate erosion of workers' organizing rights and bargaining power so that millions of new clean energy jobs, as well as millions of existing low-wage jobs across the economy, become the family-supporting union jobs that everyone deserves, including by—

(I) passing the bipartisan Protecting the Right to Organize Act;

(II) repealing the ban on secondary boycotts;

(III) requiring employer neutrality with regard to union organizing;

(IV) ensuring that ''franchising'' and other corporate structures may not be used to hinder collective bargaining on a company-wide, regional, or national basis;

(V) advancing sectoral bargaining in certain economic sectors; and

(VI) ensuring that no workers are misclassified as ''independent contractors;''

(ii) expanding union representation for all workers; and

(iii) creating ladders of opportunity, particularly for women and people of color, to access registered apprenticeship and pre-apprenticeship programs in communities of all sizes across the country;

(C) investing in Black, Brown, and Indigenous communities to build power and counteract racial and gender injustice by—

(i) directing at least 40 percent of investments to communities that have been excluded, oppressed, and harmed by racist and unjust practices, including—

(I) communities of color;

(II) low-income communities;

(III) deindustrialized communities; and

(IV) communities facing environmental injustice;

(ii) ensuring that investments in these communities enable—

(I) the creation of good jobs with family-sustaining wages;

(II) economic ownership opportunities that close the racial wealth gap;

(III) pollution reduction;

(IV) climate resilience;

(V) small business support;

(VI) economic opportunities for independent family farmers and ranchers; and

(VII) the expansion of public services;

(iii) ensuring that affected communities have the power to democratically plan, implement, and administer these projects;

(iv) prioritizing local and equitable hiring and contracting that creates opportunities for—

(I) people of color;

(II) immigrants, regardless of immigration status;

(III) formerly incarcerated individuals;

(IV) women;

(V) LGBTQIAP+ individuals;

(VI) disabled and chronically ill individuals; and

(VII) marginalized communities; and

(v) providing access to quality workforce training, including through registered apprenticeships and pre-apprenticeships to ensure real pathways to good careers, including those that have historically been inaccessible;

(D) strengthening and healing the nation-to-nation relationship with sovereign Native Nations, including by—

(i) making systemic changes in Federal policies to honor the environmental and social trust responsibilities to Native Nations and their Peoples, which are essential to tackling society's economic, environmental, and health crises;

(ii) strengthening Tribal sovereignty and enforcing Indian treaty rights by moving towards greater recognition and support of the inherent self-governance and sovereignty of these nations and their members; and

(iii) promulgating specific initiatives that reflect the nuanced relationships between the Native Nations, including—

(I) the confirmation by Congress that Tribal nations can exercise their full and inherent civil regulatory and adjudicatory authority over their own citizens, lands, and resources, and over activities within their Tribal lands;

(II) the codification of Free, Prior, and Informed Consent as it relates to Tribal consultation; and

(III) the implementation of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, without qualification;

(E) combating environmental injustice and ensuring healthy lives for all, including by—

(i) curtailing air, water, and land pollution from all sources;

(ii) removing health hazards from communities;

(iii) replacing lead pipes to ensure clean water is available to all;

(iv) remediating the cumulative health and environmental impacts of toxic pollution and climate change;

(v) ensuring that affected communities have equitable access to public health resources that have been systemically denied, which includes—

(I) upgrading unhealthy and overcrowded homes, public schools, and public hospitals;

(II) ensuring access to healthy food, mental health support, and restorative justice; and

(III) investing in universal childcare, care for individuals with disabilities, senior care, and a robust care workforce; and

(vi) focusing these initiatives in Black, Brown, and Indigenous communities that have endured disproportionately high death rates from COVID–19 due to higher exposure to air pollution and other cumulative health hazards as a result of decades of environmental racism;

(F) averting climate and environmental catastrophe, including by—

(i) contributing to a livable climate and environment for today and for future generations, including by—

(I) staying below 1.5 degrees Celsius of global warming;

(II) building climate resilience to keep communities safe; and

(III) ensuring sustainable resource use;

(ii) deploying investments and standards in the electricity, transportation, buildings, manufacturing, lands, and agricultural sectors to spur the largest expansion in history of clean, renewable energy, emissions reductions, climate resilience, and sustainable resource use;

(iii) transforming the power sector in order to move the country, by not later than 2035, to carbon pollution-free electricity that passes an environmental justice screen to prevent concentrating pollution in Black, Brown, and Indigenous communities;

(iv) prioritizing materials and parts that meet high labor, environmental, and human rights standards throughout the supply chain;

(v) supporting sustainable, domestic production of healthy, nutritious food that pays independent farmers and ranchers a fair price for their land stewardship; and

(vi) ensuring that funding under this Agenda goes to workers and communities affected by the economic and environmental crises, not to corporate fossil fuel polluters;

(G) ensuring fairness for workers and communities affected by economic transitions by—

(i) guaranteeing that workers and communities in industries and regions in economic transition due to COVID–19, climate change, and other economic shocks receive—

(I) stable wages and benefits, including full pension and healthcare;

(II) early retirement offerings;

(III) crisis and trauma support; and

(IV) equitable job placement; and

(ii) investing in transitioning areas to support—

(I) economic diversification;

(II) high quality job creation;

(III) community reinvestment;

(IV) retooling and conversion;

(V) reclamation and remediation of closed and abandoned facilities and sites;

(VI) child and adult care infrastructure; and

(VII) funding to shore up budget shortfalls in local and State governments; and

(H) reinvesting in public sector institutions that enable workers and communities to thrive by—

(i) rebuilding vital public services and strengthening social infrastructure in cities and counties, healthcare systems, schools, the postal service, and other services;

(ii) investing in equitable public education opportunities, including career and technical education pathways that prepare youth—especially girls; Black, Brown, and Indigenous students; students with disabilities; students from low-income families; and other students from marginalized groups—for high-quality jobs of the future, and state of the art technology and schools, so that from the beginning students are prepared to transform society and preserve democracy;

(iii) investing in the workers who provide care to children, the elderly, and communities burdened by neglect;

(iv) creating new public institutions, inspired by and improving upon New Deal-era institutions, to ensure universal access to critical resources and to strategically and coherently mobilize and channel investments, in line with the above priorities, at the scale and pace that these times require; and

(v) coupling this institutional renewal with democratic governance and accountability to correct the systemic misallocation of resources and representation that prevents families and communities from meeting fundamental human needs and pursuing fulfilling lives.

SENATE RESOLUTION 694—RECOGNIZING 100 YEARS OF SERVICE BY CHIEF PETTY OFFICERS IN THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

Mr. WICKER (for himself and Ms. CANTWELL) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation:

S. RES. 694

Whereas, on May 18, 1920—

(1) Congress passed the Act of May 18, 1920 (41 Stat. 601; chapter 190), which blended the enlisted personnel of the Life-Saving Service

and the Revenue Cutter Service, the 2 precursors to the modern United States Coast Guard; and

(2) the United States Coast Guard issued General Order 43, which amended article 817 of the United States Coast Guard Headquarters Regulations to establish the noncommissioned United States Coast Guard rank of chief petty officer;

Whereas May 18, 2020, marked 100 years since the date of the establishment of the rank of chief petty officer in the United States Coast Guard;

Whereas individuals who are selected to serve in the esteemed position of chief petty officer in the United States Coast Guard must possess the highest standards of professionalism, technical expertise, and personal integrity;

Whereas chief petty officers in the United States Coast Guard provide advice and assistance in matters affecting the enlisted members of the United States Coast Guard and their families; and

Whereas, for 100 years, chief petty officers in the United States Coast Guard have—

(1) been examples of leadership, honor, and selfless service;

(2) freely accepted responsibility beyond the call of printed assignments; and

(3) through their actions, and the performance of their duties, gained the respect and admiration of their seniors and juniors: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes 100 years of service by chief petty officers in the United States Coast Guard; and

(2) honors past and present chief petty officers in the United States Coast Guard, who have served in support of the safety, security, and stewardship of the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 695—DESIGNATING SEPTEMBER 2020 AS ''NATIONAL VOTING RIGHTS MONTH''

Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. KAINE, Mr. JONES, Mr. BENNET, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. CARPER, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. HIRONO, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. UDALL, Mr. REED, Mr. KING, and Ms. DUCKWORTH) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 695

Whereas voting is one of the single most important rights that can be exercised in a democracy;

Whereas, over the course of history, various voter suppression laws in the United States have hindered, and even prohibited, certain individuals and groups from exercising the right to vote;

Whereas, during the 19th and early 20th centuries, Native Americans and people who were born to United States citizens abroad, people who spoke a language other than English, and people who were formerly subjected to slavery were denied full citizenship and prevented from voting by English literacy tests;

Whereas, since the 1870s, minority groups such as African Americans in the South have suffered from the oppressive effects of Jim Crow laws that were designed to prevent political, economic, and social mobility;

Whereas African Americans, Latinos, Asian Americans, Native Americans, and other underrepresented voters were subject to violence, poll taxes, literacy tests, all-White primaries, property ownership tests, and grandfather clauses that were designed to suppress the right of those individuals to vote;

Whereas members of the aforementioned groups and others are currently, in some cases, subject to intimidation, voter roll purges, bans on former prisoners from voting, and financial barriers that act effectively as modern-day poll taxes;

Whereas, in 1965, Congress passed the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (52 U.S.C. 10301 et seq.) to protect the right of African Americans and other traditionally disenfranchised groups to vote, among other reasons;

Whereas, in 2013, in the landmark case of Shelby County v. Holder, 570 U.S. 529 (2013), the Supreme Court of the United States invalidated section 4 of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, dismantling the preclearance formula provision in that Act that protected voters in States and localities that historically have suppressed the right of minorities to vote;

Whereas, since the invalidation of the preclearance formula provision of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, gerrymandered districts in many States have gone unchallenged and have become less likely to be invalidated by the courts;

Whereas these gerrymandered districts have been found to have discriminatory impacts on traditionally disenfranchised minorities through tactics that include ''cracking'', diluting the voting power of minorities across many districts, and ''packing'' or concentrating minority voters' power in one district to reduce their voting power in other districts;

Whereas the courts have found the congressional and, in some cases, State legislative district maps, in Texas, North Carolina, Florida, Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Wisconsin to be gerrymandered districts that were created to favor some groups over others;

Whereas the decision of the Supreme Court in Shelby County v. Holder, 570 U.S. 529 (2013), calls on Congress to update the formula in the Voting Rights Act of 1965;

Whereas some form of a restrictive voting law has been instituted in at least 23 States since 2013;

Whereas these restrictive voting laws encompass cutbacks in early voting, voter roll purges, placement of faulty equipment in minority communities, requirement of photo identification, and the elimination of same-day registration;

Whereas these policies could outright disenfranchise or make voting much more difficult for more than 80,000,000 minority, elderly, poor, and disabled voters, among other groups;

Whereas, in 2016, discriminatory laws in North Carolina, Wisconsin, North Dakota, and Texas were ruled to violate voters' rights and overturned by the courts;

Whereas the Coronavirus Disease 2019 (referred to in this preamble as ''COVID–19'') public health emergency has only exacerbated the state of elections and the difficulties voters face in obtaining access to the ballot;

Whereas a lack of fair and safe election policies threatens minority communities, which have been disproportionately impacted and disenfranchised due to the COVID–19 pandemic, and their access to the ballot;

Whereas addressing the challenges of administering upcoming elections in 2020 and beyond requires increasing the accessibility of vote-by-mail and other limited-contact options to ensure the protection of voters' health and safety amid a global pandemic;

Whereas, as voting by mail becomes a safer and more accessible option for voters to exercise their constitutional right to vote during the unprecedented times caused by the COVID–19 pandemic, the work of the United States Postal Service will be of paramount importance in successfully conducting elections;

Whereas Congress must work to combat any attempts to dismantle or underfund the United States Postal Service or obstruct the passage of the mail as blatant tactics of voter suppression and election interference;

Whereas there is much more work to be done to ensure all citizens of the United States have the right to vote through free, fair, and accessible elections;

Whereas National Voter Registration Day is September 22; and

Whereas September 2020 would be an appropriate month to designate as ''National Voting Rights Month'' and to ensure that, through the registration of voters and awareness of elections, the democracy of the United States includes all citizens of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates September 2020 as ''National Voting Rights Month'';

(2) encourages all people in the United States to uphold the right of every citizen to exercise the sacred and fundamental right to vote;

(3) commemorates—

(A) the 100th anniversary of Senate passage of the 19th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which guarantees women the right to vote; and

(B) the legacy of generations of suffragists who fought to protect women's rights at the ballot;

(4) encourages Congress to pass—

(A) the For the People Act of 2019 (S. 949 and H.R. 1 of the 116th Congress), to increase voters' access to the ballot, prohibit the use of deceptive practices to intimidate voters, end gerrymandering, create automatic voter registration, limit the power of restrictive voter identification laws, make critical investments in election infrastructure and technology, and address corruption in campaign finance and ethics;

(B) the John R. Lewis Voting Rights Advancement Act of 2020 (H.R. 4 of the 116th Congress) (introduced in the Senate as the Voting Rights Advancement Act of 2019 (S. 561 of the 116th Congress)), to restore the protections of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (52 U.S.C. 10301 et seq.) that prohibit discriminatory voting practices, remove barriers to voting, and provide protections for minority voters in States with a history of voting discrimination;

(C) the Natural Disaster and Emergency Ballot Act of 2020 (S. 4033 of the 116th Congress), to ensure that every eligible voter in the United States is able to exercise the right to vote safely and securely during a declared state of emergency by, among other things—

(i) guaranteeing no-excuse absentee voting;

(ii) expanding early voting;

(iii) providing self-sealing return envelopes with prepaid postage for—

(I) voter registration applications;

(II) absentee-ballot applications; and

(III) absentee ballots; and

(iv) providing accommodations for voters on Indian lands;

(D) the Delivering for America Act (S. 4527 and H.R. 8015 in the 116th Congress), to prohibit the United States Postal Service from making changes to operations or levels of service that would reduce those operations or levels of service relative to those that were in effect on January 1, 2020, establish requirements for the processing of election mail, and provide additional funding for the Postal Service Fund;

(E) the Securing America's Federal Elections Act, or the SAFE Act (S. 2238 of the 116th Congress), to provide funding for States to improve the administration of elections, including by enhancing technology and election security, replacing antiquated voting systems, and meeting new standards for administering elections; and

(F) other voting rights legislation that seeks to advance voting rights and protect elections in the United States;

(5) recommends that public schools and universities in the United States develop an academic curriculum that educates students about—

(A) the importance of voting, how to register to vote, where to vote, and the different forms of voting;

(B) the history of voter suppression in the United States before and after passage of the Voting Rights Act of 1965; and

(C) current measures that have been taken to restrict the vote;

(6) encourages the United States Postal Service to issue a special John R. Lewis stamp during the month of September—

(A) to honor the life and legacy of John R. Lewis in supporting voting rights; and

(B) to remind people in the United States that ordinary citizens risked their lives, marched, and participated in the great democracy of the United States so that all citizens would have the fundamental right to vote; and

(7) invites Congress to allocate the requisite funds for public service announcements on television, radio, newspapers, magazines, social media, billboards, buses, and other forms of media—

(A) to remind people in the United States when elections are being held;

(B) to share important registration deadlines; and

(C) to urge people to get out and vote.

SENATE RESOLUTION 696—DESIGNATING SEPTEMBER 4, 2020, AS ''NATIONAL POLYCYSTIC KIDNEY DISEASE AWARENESS DAY'', AND RAISING AWARENESS AND UNDERSTANDING OF POLYCYSTIC KIDNEY DISEASE

Mr. BLUNT (for himself and Mr. CARDIN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 696

Whereas designating September 4, 2020, as ''National Polycystic Kidney Disease Awareness Day'' will raise public awareness and understanding of polycystic kidney disease, one of the most prevalent genetic kidney disorders, which affects approximately 500,000 people in the United States;

Whereas National Polycystic Kidney Disease Awareness Day will help to foster an understanding of the impact polycystic kidney disease has on individuals and their families;

Whereas polycystic kidney disease is a progressive, genetic disorder of the kidneys that causes damage to the kidneys and the cardiovascular, endocrine, hepatic, and gastrointestinal organ systems;

Whereas polycystic kidney disease affects the health and finances of individuals, and equally affects individuals of all ages, races, ethnicities, and sexes;

Whereas, of the individuals diagnosed with polycystic kidney disease, approximately 10 percent have no family history of the disease, with the disease developing as a spontaneous mutation;

Whereas there are very few treatments and no cure for polycystic kidney disease, which is 1 of the 4 leading causes of kidney failure in the United States;

Whereas almost 50 percent of individuals with polycystic kidney disease experience kidney failure by age 60;

Whereas friends, loved ones, spouses, and caregivers of individuals with polycystic kidney disease can assist with the challenges created by polycystic kidney disease, including by helping such individuals maintain a healthy lifestyle and make regular visits to their health care providers;

Whereas the severity of the symptoms of polycystic kidney disease and limited public awareness of the disease may cause individuals to forego regular visits to their physicians or avoid following the health recommendations of their doctors, which experts suggest could help prevent further complications should kidney failure occur;

Whereas individuals who have chronic, life-threatening diseases like polycystic kidney disease may experience depression;

Whereas the PKD Foundation and its more than 35,000 patient and family advocates around the United States are dedicated to—

(1) conducting research to find treatments and a cure for polycystic kidney disease;

(2) fostering public awareness and understanding of polycystic kidney disease;

(3) educating individuals and their families about the disease to improve their treatment and care; and

(4) providing support, including by sponsoring the annual ''Walk for PKD'', to raise funds for polycystic kidney disease research, education, advocacy, and awareness; and

Whereas, on September 4, 2020, the PKD Foundation is partnering with sister organizations in Canada, Australia, and other countries to increase international awareness of polycystic kidney disease: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates September 4, 2020, as ''National Polycystic Kidney Disease Awareness Day'';

(2) supports the goals and ideals of National Polycystic Kidney Disease Awareness Day to raise public awareness and understanding of polycystic kidney disease;

(3) recognizes the need for additional research to find a cure for polycystic kidney disease; and

(4) encourages all people in the United States and interested groups to support National Polycystic Kidney Awareness Day through appropriate ceremonies and activities to promote public awareness of polycystic kidney disease and to foster an understanding of the impact of the disease on individuals and their families.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 44—RECOGNIZING SEPTEMBER 11, 2020, AS ''NATIONAL DAY OF SERVICE AND REMEMBRANCE''

Mr. SCHUMER (for Mr. COONS (for himself, Mr. CASSIDY, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. JONES, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. REED, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. KING, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BENNET, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. KAINE, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. CARPER, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. YOUNG, Ms. COLLINS, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. STABENOW, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. BOOZMAN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. WICKER, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. CRAMER, Ms. HIRONO, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, and Mrs. MURRAY)) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. CON. RES. 44

Whereas, on September 11, 2001, the United States endured violent terrorist attacks and events (referred to in this preamble as the ''attacks'') in New York City, Washington, DC, and Shanksville, Pennsylvania, leading to the tragic deaths and injuries of thousands of innocent United States citizens and others from more than 90 different countries and territories;

Whereas, in response to the attacks, firefighters, uniformed officers, emergency medical technicians, physicians, nurses, military personnel, and other first responders immediately rose to service in the heroic attempt to save the lives of the individuals in danger;

Whereas, in the immediate aftermath of the attacks, thousands of recovery workers, including trades personnel, iron workers, equipment operators, and many others, joined with uniformed officers and military personnel to help search for and recover victims lost in the attacks;

Whereas, in the days, weeks, and months following the attacks, thousands of individuals in the United States spontaneously volunteered to help support rescue and recovery efforts, braving both physical and emotional hardship;

Whereas many first responders, rescue and recovery workers, volunteers, and survivors of the attacks continue to suffer from serious medical illnesses and emotional distress related to the physical and mental trauma of the attacks;

Whereas hundreds of thousands of brave individuals continue to serve every day, answering the call to duty as members of the Armed Forces, with some having given their lives or suffered injury—

(1) to defend the security of the United States; and

(2) to prevent further terrorist attacks;

Whereas people of the United States witnessed and endured the tragedy of September 11, 2001, and, in the immediate aftermath of the attacks, became unified under a remarkable spirit of service and compassion that inspired the people of the United States;

Whereas, in the years immediately following the attacks, there was a marked increase in volunteerism and national service among the people of the United States, which continues to this day;

Whereas, in 2009, Congress passed, and President Barack Obama signed, the bipartisan Serve America Act (Public Law 111–13; 123 Stat. 1460), which—

(1) established, at the request of the 9/11 community, Federal recognition of September 11 as a ''National Day of Service and Remembrance'' (commonly referred to as ''9/11 Day''); and

(2) charged the Corporation for National and Community Service with leading that annual day of service;

Whereas, during the period beginning on the date of establishment of September 11 as a National Day of Service and Remembrance, millions of individuals in the United States observe that date by engaging in a wide range of service activities and private forms of prayer and remembrance;

Whereas, during the Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID–19) national emergency—

(1) Americans have once again rallied together to rise to the challenge by caring for the sick, providing essential services, and volunteering in their communities; and

(2) there have been robust calls to strengthen, expand, and participate in all forms of national and community service; and

Whereas the trends described in the preceding clause are the continuation of an

American tradition of individuals and communities coming together to serve each other in times of need: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That Congress—

(1) recognizes, commends, and honors the selfless dedication to fellow citizens displayed through the heroic actions of first responders and other citizens in New York City, Washington, DC, and Shanksville, Pennsylvania;

(2) calls on the Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives, and all people of the United States, to observe September 11, 2020, as a ''National Day of Service and Remembrance'', with appropriate and personal expressions of service and reflection, which may include performing good deeds, displaying the United States flag, participating in memorial and remembrance services, and safely engaging in volunteer service or other charitable activities—

(A) in honor of the individuals who lost their lives or were injured in the attacks of September 11, 2001; and

(B) in tribute to the individuals who rose to service—

(i) to come to the aid of those individuals in need; and

(ii) in defense of the United States; and

(3) urges all people of the United States to continue to live their lives throughout the year with the same spirit of unity, service, and compassion that was exhibited throughout the United States following the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I have 4 requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, September 15, 2020, at time to be determined. to conduct a hearing on nominations.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

The Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, September 15, 2020, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, September 15, 2020, at 10 a.m., to conduct a closed hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ANTITRUST, COMPETITION POLICY AND CONSUMER RIGHTS

The Subcommittee on Antitrust, Competition Policy and Consumer Rights of the Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, September 15, 2020, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—S. 4582

Mr. MORAN. Madam President, I understand that there is a bill at the desk, and I ask for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the title of the bill for first time.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 4582) to extend, temporarily, daylight saving time, and for other purposes.

Mr. MORAN. Madam President, I now ask for a second reading, but in order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bill will receive a second reading on the next legislative day.

AUTHORIZING THE PRINTING OF A REVISED AND UPDATED VERSION OF THE HOUSE DOCUMENT ENTITLED ''WOMEN IN CONGRESS, 1917–2006''

Mr. MORAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to immediate consideration of H. Con. Res. 92, which was received from the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the concurrent resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 92) authorizing the printing of a revised and updated version of the House document entitled ''Women in Congress, 1917–2006''.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. MORAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 92) was agreed to.

NATIONAL POLYCYSTIC KIDNEY DISEASE AWARENESS DAY

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 696, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 696) designating September 4, 2020, as ''National Polycystic Kidney Disease Awareness Day'', and raising awareness and understanding of polycystic kidney disease.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 696) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 16, 2020

Mr. MORAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m., Wednesday, September 16; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day and morning business be closed; finally, that following leader remarks, the Senate proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the Robinson nomination under the previous order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MORAN. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:57 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, September 16, 2020, at 10 a.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate September 15, 2020:

THE JUDICIARY

MARK C. SCARSI, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA.

STANLEY BLUMENFELD, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA.

JOHN W. HOLCOMB, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

RECOGNIZING NANCY W. SCHULZE

HON. GREGORY F. MURPHY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 15, 2020

Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I rise to pay a heart-felt tribute to speaker, singer, activist, servant leader, forward thinker, and prayer warrior Nancy Schulze. Mrs. Schulze is an incredibly gifted individual who has spent her life using those gifts in service to others. Nancy's achievements and accomplishments are too numerous to catalog, but among them are performing in the Capitol Rotunda, as well as at Galas honoring First Ladies Barbara Bush, and Laura Bush. In 2008, she founded the Republican Congressional Wives Speakers in Washington and holds annual seminars for this group featuring top experts in the fields of speaking, media, training and thought leadership. She is cofounder of the American Prayer Initiative. She has spoken at the Global Pastors Wives Conference, the National Republican Women's Summit in Washington, the Christian Women in Media Association and the Inaugural Prayer Breakfast for the Governor of New York. She is a Colson Center Centurion, having completed a year-long intensive master's level course on world view in 2010. Nancy has spoken at the National Prayer Breakfast as well as events for Members of the U.S. Senate, House and Presidency. She is currently involved in many endeavors including Physicians for Reform to repair our broken healthcare system.

Given her list of accomplishments, the most astounding thing about Nancy Schulze is her seemingly unending energy and passion to work for the good of this nation. Her efforts would not be possible without her compassion and extraordinary commitment to excellence. Madam Speaker, please join me in honoring this patriot, public servant, faithful Christian, and my friend, Nancy Schulze.

CELEBRATING THE ONE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF KNX

HON. ADAM B. SCHIFF

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 15, 2020

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor KNX News Radio (KNX) upon its one-hundredth anniversary.

KNX began humbly in the back bedroom of the home of founder Fred Christian, a former wireless operator and manager at one of the first radio supply stores in Los Angeles. On September 10, 1920, with parts from his store, Mr. Christian set up an amateur radio station with the call letters 6ADZ. At the time, the station was one of only two stations broadcasting music in Southern California. In 1922, Mr. Christian built a new 100-watt transmitter and was given the call letters KNX, still used today. That year, the radio station started broadcasting a nightly newscast, one of the first heard in Los Angeles. The Los Angeles Times called the broadcast ''one of the best in the land.''

KNX quickly became known as ''The Voice of Hollywood,'' an invaluable news resource for the community and the nation. KNX has a long and illustrious history in Southern California, predating the Hollywood Sign and the Rose Bowl stadium. In 1925, KNX provided what is thought to be the first accurate news coverage of the Santa Barbara earthquake. Five years later, in 1930, KNX became the first station to broadcast the Academy Awards. That timely, accurate reporting became its hallmark.

Over the last century, KNX has provided unwavering coverage of local and national news stories. In 1938, the station aired Orson Welles' infamous adaptation of ''The War of the Worlds'' from its new Columbia Square studio complex. That studio went on to host and record precedent-setting broadcasts, including performances by Lucille Ball, Frank Sinatra, and Bing Crosby. In 1968, a landmark year for KNX, the station provided comprehensive coverage of the Vietnam War protests and the assassination of Martin Luther King. The same year, KNX provided critical breaking news coverage of the assassination of Robert F. Kennedy, with live on-the-ground coverage from the Ambassador Hotel and Central Receiving Hospital.

Today, KNX, a national Edward R. Murrow award-winner for ''Breaking News,'' continues its steadfast commitment to the community by providing instrumental coverage of local and national news stories, and in depth reporting and analysis on biggest issues facing all Southern Californians. That's why millions across Southern California tune in every day, whether they are just waking up or heading home from work, and everywhere in between.

The staff, from the producers to the reporters and anchors, who have worked tirelessly over the last century to serve their community deserve our thanks for their dedication and service for our community. KNX Radio Station is a pillar of Southern California, and I ask all Members to join me in congratulating KNX on the hundred-year anniversary of its founding.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE LIFESAVING SERVICE OF DR. LAURENT DUVERNAY-TARDIF, C.Q.

HON. EMANUEL CLEAVER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 15, 2020

Mr. CLEAVER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the lifesaving service of Dr. Laurent Duvernay-Tardif. From his youth in Montreal to his football career in Kansas City, Dr. Duvernay-Tardif has proven himself to be a hero in more ways than one. His story is timely; it is instructive; and it is extraordinary.

When Dr. Duvernay-Tardif helped bring the Lombardi Trophy back home to Kansas City after fifty long years, I did not think I could gain a deeper sense of admiration or gratitude for the Chiefs. Since then, however, that same sense of gratitude has grown even more profound. Today, it is my honor to join his teammates, Coach Andy Reid, and our great city in saying *Merci, Docteur Duvernay-Tardif*, for your vital and noble work fighting the deadly coronavirus pandemic on the frontlines.

From watching college lectures at half-speed with an English dictionary in hand, to working as an NFL lineman while earning a medical degree, Dr. Duvernay-Tardif has spent his whole life defying expectations. When he graduated from McGill University Faculty of Medicine in May 2018 with a doctorate in medicine and master's in surgery, it had already been four years since he was drafted into the NFL just after assisting an emergency C-section. Since joining the NFL, he has worked overnights at the hospital, slept in the locker room wearing his scrubs, and never stopped putting forth the utmost effort for his team—whether under stadium lights or fluorescent medical lamps. Moreover, he has stepped up to make football a safer sport with his presence on the NFL's Health and Safety Committee and given back to his community through the LDT Foundation. And, of course, he also helped deliver a historic win to a grateful city. As I consider Dr. Duvernay-Tardif's remarkable story, I see an athlete in the O.R. and a surgeon on the field. In both, I see an indomitable spirit.

And when the world called upon a new breed of soldier to fight an invisible threat, Dr. Duvernay-Tardif answered that call without hesitation. Even before securing a position at a healthcare facility, he was using his platform and expertise to inform and educate. Now, as an orderly at a long-term care facility, he is doing the unglamorous, lifesaving work of caring for and protecting those most vulnerable to this virus. Recently, in order to continue this critical work, he became the first professional football player to opt-out of the upcoming season. Like him, I support every player's personal decision on the matter. However, I must say that I see in his decision the same young man who, on a year-long sailing expedition, used to be summoned at midnight to take the helm while his family slept. He knows what it means to sail in the darkness of night, when there is nothing to guide you but your own radar.

As a Chiefs super-fan, as a citizen, as one of millions across the globe staring down this specter, it is my honor to express in this forum how proud Dr. Duvernay-Tardif continues to make all of us in Kansas City. He guarded Patrick Mahomes, and now, he is guarding all of us. Madam Speaker, please join me and my constituents in Missouri's 5th District in wishing Dr. Duvernay-Tardif safety, health, and good fortune as he serves his community during this pandemic. I also want to assure

him and his colleagues across the country that I will do everything I can to be a voice for the urgent needs of the medical community in the halls of Congress. In fact, let us all join in that pledge. Heroes like Dr. Duvernay-Tardif are on the line, helmet-to-helmet with this threat, standing between us and total catastrophe. They are guarding us so that we can do our jobs. It is the end of the fourth quarter, we have no more time-outs, and our team has come to a standstill. We have had a play on the books since May, and it is time to put it in the field because time is running out. Dr. Duvernay-Tardif is fighting for our lives. It is time we had his back.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MICHAEL K. SIMPSON

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 15, 2020

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Speaker, for personal reasons, I was unable to vote on September 14, 2020.

Had I been present, I would have voted yea on Roll Call No. 183, and yea on Roll Call No. 184.

HONORING MR. ROBERT REILLY

HON. MAX ROSE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 15, 2020

Mr. ROSE of New York. Madam Speaker, I would like to acknowledge today the efforts of Robert Reilly, who throughout this turbulent year has gone out of his way to support his workforce at RTR Financial on Staten Island. It is well known within RTR Financial that when you work for Mr. Reilly you become part of the family; he often says that ''family comes first.''

During the early months of pandemic, Mr. Reilly exemplified these values by ensuring that every single employee had their needs met. He became an early adopter of remote-work to keep his employees safe, and invested in his employees to make sure they were properly equipped for this new environment. Mr. Reilly's kindness did not stop there, for he continues to support his workplace family through the transition back to the office. Robert has consistently reassured his employees as well as keeping them informed about local testing initiatives.

Packages of sanitizer and other safety equipment are given to employees weekly, and Mr. Reilly has allowed many to continue their remote-work indefinitely. I want to thank him for setting a positive example and for proving that the best way for businesses to navigate these tough times is by investing in the safety and well-being of their employees.

HONORING THE SERVICE AND SACRIFICE OF SOUTH FLORIDA'S FIRST RESPONDERS

HON. THEODORE E. DEUTCH

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 15, 2020

Mr. DEUTCH. Madam Speaker, today, I rise to honor South Florida's first responders, as they continue to serve our communities through these unprecedented times.

As we all know too well, the World Health Organization declared COVID–19 a global pandemic on March 11, 2020. In response, many states and municipalities imposed restrictions and closures on business and individual activities to reduce the spread of the virus. Despite taking these drastic, yet necessary, steps, the virus struck South Florida much harder than other areas of the state.

Putting themselves at great personal risk, our first responders have been the first line of defense for our communities during the COVID health crisis; even as they continued to fight fires, handle emergency health situations, and keep our communities safe.

That is why I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring our first responders, and their service and sacrifice to our communities. We owe them all a great debt of gratitude.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. TOM O' HALLERAN

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 15, 2020

Mr. O'HALLERAN. Madam Speaker, on September 14, 2020, I did not have a chance to cast my vote for two bills on the floor of the House of Representatives. I would have voted in favor of H.R. 4894, the Congressional Budget Justification Transparency Act of 2020, and S. 2193, the CHARGE Act.

CELEBRATING MR. ARLIN PATTERSON'S 95TH BIRTHDAY

HON. MO BROOKS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 15, 2020

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Arlin Patterson on the occasion of his 95th birthday.

Arlin Patterson, or Pat, as he is lovingly called, was born on November 28, 1925 in Memphis, Tennessee. At eighteen, he graduated from Messick High School and enrolled at Memphis State College. Shortly after, World War II interrupted his education and on January 7, 1944, Pat was drafted into the U.S. Navy.

Pat began his training as a signalman in Samson, New York. He went on to serve as the personal signalman to two Commodores on the USS *Flint* and served on the maiden voyage of the USS *Amsterdam*. While serving on the USS *Amsterdam*, he participated in the shelling of Tokyo, Honshu, Muroran, and Hokkaido. Finally, on September 2, 1945, the USS *Amsterdam* arrived in Tokyo Bay and was moored next to the USS *Missouri*, where the surrender of Japan took place just the day before.

After the war, Pat returned to Memphis State College and, in 1950, graduated with honors in Business Administration. While there, Pat also served as the President to the Phi Kappa Alpha Fraternity and was nominated to Who's Who in American Colleges and Universities—the highest honor that can be bestowed on a Memphis State College student.

After college, Pat worked as a salesman and actively served in The Exchange Club, Memphis Sales Managers Club, and the Children's Health Center. He went on to receive the Distinguished Service Award in 1951 and 1953. Later in his life, Pat opened his own business, Business Products, Incorporated, and in 2011, the Memphis City Council proclaimed April 16th the Mr. Pat Patterson Day in honor of his exemplary service during World War II.

Pat and his wife, Joyce, have always been active in their local church, where Pat served as an usher, Sunday School teacher, and financial leader of the church. In 2018, Pat and Joyce, moved to Huntsville, Alabama and became involved with Honored Legacies for Veterans. As a result, the Madison, Alabama Rotary Club presented Pat with the Veteran of the Week honor in the newspaper.

Madam Speaker, Pat Patterson's work ethic, mental and physical stamina, and passion for service embody the ''greatest generation.''

I wish Pat and his entire family the very best as they celebrate Pat's 95th birthday.

IN RECOGNITION OF GEORGE CATHEY

HON. VICKY HARTZLER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 15, 2020

Mrs. HARTZLER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and commend George Cathey for his distinguishing and exemplar service during the Revolutionary War. George Cathey was a volunteer soldier that, like many of our soldiers today, embodied the courage and bravery that is reflected in our American spirit.

George Cathey served three times in the Revolutionary War; first as a Private, and later as both a Lieutenant and Captain. He fought in the skirmishes at Big Bear Town, Silver Creek and Ransoms Ford, and later in the battle of Cowpens.

When this Nation's freedom was secure, George Cathey was later granted a pension in 1833 while living in Cooper County, Missouri, with his wife Margaret and their ten children. George Cathey later died on December 14, 1840, at age 85. However, his legacy lives on through our enduring freedoms that we still maintain today.

As we approach our Nation's 250th Birthday, it is only fitting that we honor those who fought for our freedom. George Cathey is one of those soldiers and today, we honor his legacy of freedom we all enjoy.

COMMEMORATING THE LIFE OF BEN JONES

HON. BILL HUIZENGA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 15, 2020

Mr. HUIZENGA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the life of Ben Jones, a beloved high school football coach at Cranbrook Kingswood High School, who recently passed away at the age of 30 in a traffic accident.

Ben went to Muskegon Catholic Central High School, where he played football, basketball, baseball and track. He led his football team to a state championship as a senior in 2008. While at Central Catholic, Ben found his favorite motto, ''Get To.'' Every day, Ben would tell his teammates how they 'get to' play football today. Ben went on to play football at Hillsdale College. His teammates remember him as the hardest worker on the field, a great teammate and an even better friend.

Not surprisingly, Ben was also a great football coach. His players knew him as not only someone who understood the game, but someone who knew how to lead and loved his players. The players know that Coach Jones cared about their lives at home, how they were doing in school, and how they were developing as men.

''Get To'' wasn't just a motto to Ben. It was how he lived his life. He attacked each day with enthusiasm, hope and excitement. The Muskegon Catholic Central, Hillsdale College, and Cranbrook communities have lost a dear friend and mentor. He will be greatly missed.

My Prayers go out to Ben's parents, Theresa and Bruce Jones, his sister Alissa, his brother Nate, his extended family, his friends, and the countless others who will mourn for him.

Madam Speaker, I join with those throughout Michigan in remembering the extraordinary life and legacy that Coach Jones has left behind.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 100TH BIRTHDAY OF MRS. BERNICE TODD

HON. EMANUEL CLEAVER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 15, 2020

Mr. CLEAVER. Madam Speaker, I rise today with profound joy, deep admiration, and endless blessings to recognize the 100th birthday of Mrs. Bernice Todd. One cannot tell the story of America without telling the story of Kansas City Jazz, and one cannot tell the story of Kansas City Jazz without telling the story of Bernice Todd.

Mrs. Bernice Todd was born September 8, 1920, and has made significant contributions to the Jazz music and culture of the 18th and Vine District of Kansas City. She performed with many of the big bands and Jazz greats of her day, both as a stellar singer and as a skilled dancer. However, Jazz was not only a career for Mrs. Todd. It was also a family affair. Her husband, Oliver Todd, was a trumpet player and bandleader who would go on to become a fixture of the burgeoning Jazz scene in Kansas City, playing with everyone from Count Basie to Duke Ellington. And when a certain young virtuoso named Charlie Parker still carried his makeshift horn in a cloth sack, he would often come over to the Todds' home to eat lunch and play some music. Mrs. Todd was actually just one week younger than the Bird, and the three of them became close friends. Often, Parker would leave his horn in their living room and ask them to bring it to his performance the next night. Needless to say, the horn bought them free admission.

Mrs. Todd is a mother, a grandmother, and a friend to many. She has also been a loyal member of the St. James United Methodist Church, where I was a pastor for thirty-seven years. From personal experience, I can attest that Mrs. Todd keeps us all laughing. Mrs. Todd is also a caretaker of our Jazz history, as well as our Jazz musicians, through her involvement with the Coda Jazz Fund, which pays funeral and burial expenses for area Jazz musicians whose families cannot afford them. As I have said before, a gift is never truly received until you acknowledge the giver. Mrs. Todd has honored so many determined artists with that sacred acknowledgement as they enter the coda of their life. It is an honor to be able to acknowledge Mrs. Todd's legacy while her chorus is in full swing.

Since I began thinking about this momentous occasion, there's a song that's been stuck in my head. It is from an old compilation of Jazz standards released December of 1945, just a little over a year after I was born. The album sleeve must have weighed ten tons with heft of the names which graced it: Jay McShann, Nat ''King'' Cole, and of course, Oliver Todd. The song, by McShann, with Mrs. Todd's late husband on trumpet, is an instrumental version of an old standard. Nevertheless, I remember the lyrics well: ''I used to walk in the shade,'' it went, ''With those blues on parade / But I'm not afraid / This rover crossed over / If I never have a cent / I'd be rich as Rockefeller / Gold dust at my feet / On the sunny side of the street.''

Now, as we stand not only at Mrs. Todd's centennial, but Charlie Parker's as well, I cannot help but reflect on our collective good fortune. We lost the Bird in '55, but God has generously allowed us a full century of Bernice. For that, I am immensely grateful. Madam Speaker, please join me, the world of Jazz, and everyone in Missouri's Fifth Congressional District in wishing Mrs. Bernice Todd a happy 100th birthday. Here's to many more years, Mrs. Todd, ''on the sunny side of the street.''

PEG FITZGERALD

HON. JOE COURTNEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 15, 2020

Mr. COURTNEY. Madam Speaker, I rise to provide my warmest congratulations and thanks to Peg Fitzgerald, a long-time resident and public servant in the State of Connecticut, who is retiring on October 1st after more than 42 years of service to our state. Like so many other citizens of our great state, I had the privilege to interact with Peg in government and had a front-row seat to watch her skillful use of shrewd intelligence, empathy and humor to advance the public interest in whatever role she took on. I first met Peg when I was an intern at the State Capitol for then-State Representative Sam Gejdenson in 1978 when Peg first went to work at the State Budget Office under Governors Ella Grasso and William O'Neill. Despite being a young woman given the weighty task of securing legislative support for the Governor's budget, she did not back down and could go toe-to-toe with the crustiest older male legislators and yet still make them laugh at her sharp Irish wit. When she would walk into Sam's committee room, he would yell, ''Hey Irish, what's going on?'' and the two of them would start busting each other, leaving all of us in stitches. It was like watching a sitcom.

Seriously though, during her twelve years at the State Capitol, Peg worked with legislative leaders on both sides of the aisle, crafting compromises and ultimately promoting bills that would advance the health and welfare of citizens of the State of Connecticut. She provided training, guidance, and supervision to dozens of state agencies and their staff at the state Capitol in their own advocacy efforts for the Executive Branch.

In 1990, Peg joined the Connecticut Housing Finance Authority, bringing with her outstanding expertise in the legislative process and a passion for affordable housing. In her thirty years at CHFA, Peg has continuously fought for the underserved, and taught dozens of employees what it means to be a true public servant.

For Peg, service to others never stopped at the office. When Peg wasn't at the Capitol, she often dedicated her time to organizing food drives or donations for local hunger relief organizations or finding homes for animals in need of adoption, including her own, many times over.

Peg Fitzgerald—through four decades—has been the embodiment of public service, showing a uncompromising commitment to the public good, a passion for the democratic process and a dogged determination to help those most in need.

I thank Peg for her service to the State of Connecticut and offer best wishes to her on her well-deserved retirement.

IN RECOGNITION OF KAROLE HONAS SERVICE TO IDAHO

HON. MICHAEL K. SIMPSON

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 15, 2020

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate my friend Karole Honas on a well-earned retirement after an extraordinary broadcasting career.

Karole grew up in Gooding, Idaho and graduated from the University of Idaho with a degree in radio-TV, communications. Shortly after graduation she married her husband, Ken. They have been happily married for forty years.

Karole started her career at KPVI in Pocatello. After seven years, she left KPVI to raise her three sons. In 1990 Jay Hildebrandt called and asked her to fill in as an anchor for 6 weeks while another anchor was on maternity leave. Those 6 weeks turned into thirty years of co-anchoring with Jay Hildebrandt. Together

they were an iconic news team that the community trusted.

In addition to her role at KIFI with Jay, Karole mentored new journalists who were getting started in the industry. She also spent fourteen years as an adjunct instructor at Idaho State University. She has served as a member of the advisory board for the School of Journalism and Mass Media in the College of Letters, Arts and Social Sciences at the University of Idaho. She continues to reach out to students interested in television news, informing them of internship opportunities and job openings at her station and elsewhere.

Karole has served on several community boards and committees. As an active member of her community, Karole is committed to leaving this area better than she found it.

It has been my privilege to be interviewed by Karole throughout my political career. Even though we were friends she didn't hold back the tough questions. I have always appreciated her honesty and fairness.

Madam Speaker, Karole Honas has provided an immeasurable service to Eastern Idaho for the last thirty years. I want to thank her for that service and wish her well in a well-earned retirement.

IN APPRECIATION OF MAJOR ANDREW CROWE FOR HIS SERVICE TO THE UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

HON. MICHAEL WALTZ

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 15, 2020

Mr. WALTZ. Madam Speaker, today I recognize Major Andrew Joseph Crowe of the United States Army for his extraordinary dedication to duty and service to our Nation. Major Crowe recently transitioned from his assignment as an Army Congressional Liaison in the House of Representatives to attend Army Command and General Staff College with follow on assignment at Fort Belvoir.

MAJ Crowe, having grown up in a non-military family, joined the Reserve Officers Training Corps through Western Michigan University and commissioned as a 2nd Lieutenant in 2006. He has held numerous leadership positions in a variety of units, highlighted by combat service in Iraq and Afghanistan with the 25th Infantry Division and the 75th Ranger Regiment. During his time in Washington, MAJ Crowe attended The George Washington University earning his Masters Degree in Legislative Affairs and served as a Congressional Fellow for Congressman JOE WILSON of South Carolina.

In the winter of 2017, MAJ Crowe was selected to serve as a Congressional Liaison in the United States Army House Liaison Division. As the primary liaison between Members of the House of Representatives, their Staffs, Committees, and the Army, he provided insight and understanding of Army policies, actions, operations, and requirements. His first-hand knowledge of the military, its culture, and traditions has been a tremendous benefit to Congressional offices. His wit and humor kept everyone around him in good spirits and keep me on my toes. As a busy freshman office with great ambition, our legislative successes would not have been possible without him.

In 2019, I had traveled with MAJ Crowe to Normandy France for the 75th Anniversary of D-Day. It was a historically significant event in which MAJ Crowe planned and executed the largest overseas CODEL in history.

Madam Speaker, it has been a pleasure to work with MAJ Crowe during his time as an Army Congressional Liaison Officer in the House of Representatives. On behalf of a grateful Nation, it is my honor to recognize the selfless service and sacrifice of Major Andrew Crowe, his wife, Michelle, and their children, Charlie and Samantha. I wish them the very best as they continue their journey in the United States Army. They have dedicated their lives to the service of our Nation.

Rangers Lead The Way.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MIKE QUIGLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 15, 2020

Mr. QUIGLEY. Madam Speaker, I was unable to attend votes on September 14, 2020 due to a medical procedure a family member underwent in Chicago. Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 183 and YEA on Roll Call No. 184.

REMEMBERING JACK L. LOVEALL

HON. JOHN GARAMENDI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 15, 2020

Mr. GARAMENDI. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of Jack L. Loveall. Affectionately known as ''Captain Jack'', he led a life best defined as that of a loving family man, mentor, humanitarian, and labor leader of over 60 years. Jack embodied the American dream and will be remembered as a legendary figure in the cause of justice and fairness for working people and their families.

Born on Leap Day, February 29, 1936, Jack earned his first job at the age of 13 when he was hired by Wrigley Markets in Detroit as a grocery clerk. In 1958 Jack became a Union Representative for Local 876, beginning his storied work as an advocate for the American worker. His dedication to that mission led his colleagues to repeatedly select him as their representative in the upper echelons of the International Union. As an international vice president of the United Food and Commercial Workers, he served working families throughout the United States, Canada, Asia, and Europe.

In 1984, Jack was elected president of UFCW 588-Northern California, where he continued his passionate and highly effective advocacy for the members of his Union, including those who work in supermarkets, drug stores, pharmacies, food processing plants, wineries, distilleries, medical offices, and more. Jack lived in the spirit of ''Solidarity Works,'' which he established as the motto of his Union and continues as the motto of UFCW 8–Golden State, now led by his son, Jacques Loveall.

Captain Jack was married to his first mate, Patricia, whom he adored for 67 years. He was the father of seven, a grandfather, a great-grandfather, and a beloved mentor and teacher to countless others. His memory and legacy will be kept alive by those who use his lessons and beliefs as guideposts to building better families, better communities, and a better world while always being kind to one another.

CELEBRATING MR. WILLIAM BOSHART'S 100TH BIRTHDAY

HON. MO BROOKS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 15, 2020

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. William Harvey Boshart on the occasion of his 100th birthday.

Mr. Boshart was born in Marshall County, Alabama on September 24, 1920. As a child during the Great Depression, Harvey is thankful he was able to finish his 1933 academic year. The local school system lacked funding to keep schools open but Harvey's teacher, Dr. Collins, finished the school year without pay. Later, in 1934, Harvey worked to support his family at only 14 years old.

In 1941, Harvey married Nina Hodges, which he considers to be ''the best thing that ever happened to him.'' As newlyweds, Mr. and Mrs. Boshart lived on a family member's farm in Woodville. Alabama. Then in 1944, Harvey received notice he was drafted to serve in World War II. Thankfully, Harvey was able to spend Christmas with his family, but in January of 1945, Mr. Boshart was officially sworn into the U.S. Navy and began training in California.

Harvey was first assigned to the USS *Menard* (APA–201), a Haskell-class attack transport, on which he sailed to Pearl Harbor to train for the invasion of Okinawa, Japan. After months of training and active evasion of Japanese submarine screens, on March 16, Seaman First Class Boshart and the crew reached the Leyte Gulf in the Philippines to begin the campaign to retake Okinawa.

Later in his career, Harvey was assigned to the second USS *San Jacinto* (CVLS–30), on which President George H.W. Bush served. Once the war and his service were over, Harvey came home to Nina, and in 1947, they bought a farm in Rainsville, Alabama. From 1951 to 1980, Harvey served in a different capacity on Redstone Arsenal. Today, Harvey still lives in the same home he and Nina purchased in 1955, where he takes great pride in cooking and tending to his garden.

Madam Speaker, the Tennessee valley is fortunate to have such an exemplary citizen for 100 years. Harvey Boshart's bright spirit and servants' heart are a blessing to us all.

I wish Harvey and his entire family the very best as they celebrate Harvey's centennial birthday.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. SALUD O. CARBAJAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 15, 2020

Mr. CARBAJAL. Madam Speaker, on September 14, 2020, I regrettably missed votes in

the House of Representatives due to severe weather flight delays.

Had I been present, I would have voted: AYE on Roll Call No. 184—the CHARGE Act (S. 2193), and AYE on Roll Call No. 183—the Congressional Budget Justification Transparency Act (H.R. 4894).

HONORING THE LIFE OF DANIEL C. HOLLOWAY

HON. GRACE F. NAPOLITANO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 15, 2020

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Madam Speaker, I rise with great sorrow to honor the life and long career of public service of City Council Member Daniel C. Holloway of La Puente, CA.

Dan was an outstanding leader for his community of La Puente, where he served in many capacities over the years. He was a local activist fighting to keep Workman High School open and was a writer of community news with his column in the Highlander Newspaper called, ''The La Puente Lookout.'' Dan was on the planning commission, where he served as Chairman twice, and he had been on the City Council for the past 13 years receiving the highest vote total of any council member multiple times. He served as Mayor three times and Mayor Pro Tern four times. Dan was a staunch advocate for his city serving on many regional boards and commissions, including the San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments and the National League of Cities.

Dan was a hero to our country having served in the Navy. He would later join the American Legion, and he designed the La Puente Veterans Memorial at La Puente City Hall.

Dan was a mentor to many and a great champion of our students. Most recently, Dan participated in the Life Experiences About Democracy (LEAD) program which teaches community and civic engagement by giving students real life experiences participating in government meetings, interacting with public officials, and working on volunteer projects in La Puente.

Dan was a great friend to me and so many who knew and respected him. I met Dan before he ran for office when he was a constituent advocating for improvements to our schools, healthcare system, and public services on behalf of his children, including his late daughter Kimberly, and all of our children. He was known for his kindness, honesty, and integrity, and that is why he was beloved by so many.

Madam Speaker, I extend my deepest sympathies to Dan's wife of over 50 years Hilda, his children Jennifer, Christopher, and Shannon, his family and friends, and his colleagues. The City of La Puente has lost one of its greatest leaders and champions. And we have all lost a great friend.

IN RECOGNITION OF KAREN HARBIN

HON. BRETT GUTHRIE

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 15, 2020

Mr. GUTHRIE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Karen Harbin on her recent election to the Board of Directors of the National Association of Federally-Insured Credit Unions (NAFCU).

Karen is the President/CEO of Commonwealth Credit Union, which has branches in Kentucky's Second District. A Certified Public Accountant, Karen is a past chair of the Kentucky Credit Union League's Board of Directors and is the current Treasurer. She is currently serving a 3rd term as the Governor's appointee to the Kentucky Department of Financial Institutions Board. Karen has served on the Federal Reserve Bank's Community Depository Institutions Advisory Council and VolCorp's Asset Liability Management Committee. Passionate about health, Karen chairs her local American Heart Association's Heart Walk and is a member of the Corporate Council of the Shriners Hospital Lexington.

Karen's vision and decision-making skills will be a valuable addition to the NAFCU Board and credit unions for years to come. I wish her the best of luck in her new role on the NAFCU Board of Directors, and I look forward to working with her.

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S5577–S5616

Measures Introduced: Fifteen bills and six resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 4569–4583, S. Res. 692–696, and S. Con. Res. 44. **Pages S5609–10**

Measures Reported:

S. 2502, to ban the Federal procurement of certain drones and other unmanned aircraft systems, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. (S. Rept. No. 116–268)

S. 332, to amend title 38, United States Code, to remove the manifestation period required for the presumptions of service connection for chloracne, porphyria cutanea tarda, and acute and subacute peripheral neuropathy associated with exposure to certain herbicide agents, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

S. 514, to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the benefits and services provided by the Department of Veterans Affairs to women veterans, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

S. 629, to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to review the processes and requirements of the Department of Veterans Affairs for scheduling appointments for health care and conducting consultations under the laws administered by the Secretary, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

S. 711, to amend title 38, United States Code, to expand eligibility for mental health services from the Department of Veterans Affairs to include members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces.

S. 805, to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the processing of veterans benefits by the Department of Veterans Affairs, to limit the authority of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to recover overpayments made by the Department and other amounts owed by veterans to the United States, to improve the due process accorded veterans with respect to such recovery, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

S. 2216, to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to formally recognize caregivers of veterans, notify veterans and caregivers of clinical determinations relating to eligibility for caregiver programs, and temporarily extend benefits for veterans who are determined ineligible for the family caregiver program, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

S. 2558, to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to make certain grants to assist nursing homes for veterans located on tribal lands.

S. 2950, to amend title 38, United States Code, to concede exposure to airborne hazards and toxins from burn pits under certain circumstances, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

S. 3235, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to conduct a pilot program on posttraumatic growth, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

S. 3282, to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the oversight of contracts awarded by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to small business concerns owned and controlled by veterans.

S. 3643, to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize certain postgraduate health care employees and health professions trainees of the Department of Veterans Affairs to provide treatment via telemedicine.

S. 4384, to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to address exposure by members of the Armed Forces to toxic substances at Karshi-Khanabad Air Base, Uzbekistan. **Page S5608**

Measures Passed:

Printing authorization: Senate agreed to H. Con. Res. 92, authorizing the printing of a revised and updated version of the House document entitled "Women in Congress, 1917–2006". **Page S5616**

National Polycystic Kidney Disease Awareness Day: Senate agreed to S. Res. 696, designating September 4, 2020, as "National Polycystic Kidney Disease Awareness Day", and raising awareness and understanding of polycystic kidney disease. **Page S5616**

Robinson Nomination—Agreement: Senate resumed consideration of the nomination of Todd Wallace Robinson, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of California.

Pages S5589–S5602

During consideration of this nomination today, Senate also took the following action:

By 83 yeas to 13 nays (Vote No. EX. 174), Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on the nomination. **Page S5589**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that notwithstanding the provisions of Rule XXII, the post-cloture time with respect to the nomination of Todd Wallace Robinson expire at 11:30 a.m. on Wednesday, September 16, 2020; that following disposition of the nomination, Senate vote on the motions to invoke cloture on the nominations of David W. Dugan, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Illinois, and Stephen P. McGlynn, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Illinois, in that order; and that if cloture is invoked on the nominations, the post-cloture time expire at 3:30 p.m. on Wednesday, September 16, 2020, and Senate vote on confirmation of the nominations in that order. **Page S5597**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the nomination of Todd Wallace Robinson, post-cloture, at approximately 10 a.m. on Wednesday, September 16, 2020. **Page S5616**

Nominations Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nominations:

By 83 yeas to 12 nays (Vote No. EX. 170), Mark C. Scarsi, of California, to be United States District Judge for the Central District of California. **Pages S5578–80, S5616**

By 92 yeas to 4 nays (Vote No. EX. 172), Stanley Blumenfeld, of California, to be United States District Judge for the Central District of California. **Pages S5580–88, S5588–89, S5616**

During consideration of this nomination today, Senate also took the following action:

By 89 yeas to 6 nays (Vote No. EX. 171), Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on the nomination. **Page S5580**

By 83 yeas to 12 nays (Vote No. EX. 175), John W. Holcomb, of California, to be United States District Judge for the Central District of California. **Pages S5589, S5597, S5616**

During consideration of this nomination today, Senate also took the following action:

By 83 yeas to 13 nays (Vote No. EX. 173), Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on the nomination. **Page S5589**

Messages from the House: **Page S5604**

Measures Referred: **Pages S5604–05**

Measures Placed on the Calendar: **Page S5605**

Measures Read the First Time: **Pages S5605, S5616**

Executive Communications: **Pages S5605–08**

Executive Reports of Committees: **Pages S5608–09**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S5610–11**

Additional Statements: **Pages S5603–04**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Page S5616**

Record Votes: Six record votes were taken today. (Total—175) **Pages S5580, S5588–89, S5597**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 6:57 p.m., until 10 a.m. on Wednesday, September 16, 2020. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on page S5616.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Armed Services: Committee ordered favorably reported the nominations of John E. Whitley, of Virginia, to be Director of Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation, Bradley D. Hansell, of Virginia, to be a Deputy Under Secretary, Lucas N. Polakowski, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary, Shon J. Manasco, of Texas, to be Under Secretary of the Air Force, and Michele A. Pearce, of Virginia, to be General Counsel of the Department of the Army, all of the Department of Defense, Liam P. Hardy, of Virginia, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces, and 893 nominations in the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, and Space Force.

COMPENSATING COLLEGE ATHLETES

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: Committee concluded a hearing to examine compensating college athletes, focusing on the potential impact on athletes and institutions, after receiving testimony from Rebecca M. Blank, University of Wisconsin, Madison; Karen Dennis, The Ohio State University, Columbus; John Hartwell, Utah State University, Logan; and Ramogi Huma, National College Players Association, Norco, California.

COMPETITION IN ONLINE ADVERTISING

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Antitrust, Competition Policy and Consumer Rights concluded a hearing to examine whether Google harmed competition in online advertising, after receiving testimony from Donald Harrison, Google, Mountain View, California; Adam Heimlich, Chalice Custom Algorithms, New York, New York; and David C. Dinielli, Omidyar Network, and Carl Szabo, NetChoice, both of Washington, D.C.

INTELLIGENCE

Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee held closed hearings on intelligence matters, receiving testimony from officials of the intelligence community.

Committee recessed subject to the call.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 13 public bills, H.R. 8251–8263; and 6 resolutions, H. Res. 1109–1114, were introduced. **Pages H4427–28**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H4428–29**

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

H.R. 4447, to establish an energy storage and microgrid grant and technical assistance program, with an amendment (H. Rept. 116–504, Part 1); and

H.R. 895. A bill to allow tribal grant schools to participate in the Federal Employee Health Benefits program (H. Rept. 116–505, Part 1). **Page H4427**

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein she appointed Representative McGovern to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H4385**

Recess: The House recessed at 9:35 a.m. and reconvened at 10 a.m. **Page H4389**

Recess: The House recessed at 12:13 p.m. and reconvened at 12:21 p.m. **Page H4399**

Recess: The House recessed at 3:53 p.m. and reconvened at 4:01 p.m. **Page H4414**

Strength in Diversity Act: The House passed H.R. 2639, to establish the Strength in Diversity Program, by a yea-and-nay vote of 248 yeas to 167 nays, Roll No. 189. **Pages H4400–14, H4414–16**

Pursuant to the Rule, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116–62 shall be considered as adopted, in lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Education and Labor now printed in the bill. **Pages H4400–01**

Agreed to:

Torres (CA) amendment (No. 1 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–502) that adds new criteria for evaluating grant applications, factoring in the impact of the likelihood the grant will lead to a meaningful reduction in racial and economic isolation for children in schools; also prioritizes entities that coordinate with local housing agencies to integrate schools that serve a disproportionately low number of low-income students; **Pages H4407–08**

Fudge en bloc amendment No. 1 consisting of the following amendments printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–502: Brown (MD) (No. 3) that allows eligible entities to use grant funds to recruit, hire, and train school counselors; Brown (MD) (No. 4) that includes, in the annual report, a description of how eligible entities will continue to make improvements toward increasing diversity and decreasing racial or socioeconomic isolation in covered schools and sustain inclusion; Cooper (No. 5) that gives school districts that had previously submitted an application under the Obama-era program before it was terminated priority to reapply to this new program; Escobar (No. 7) that modifies the application section to require information on how eligible entities propose to use grant funds to support interventions to increase student diversity; additionally, in the case of the consortium agencies, an eligible entity will be required to establish the lead applicant and how grant funds will be divided among school districts to address racial and socioeconomic segregation in schools; Green (TX) (No. 8) that recommends replacing entrance exams and competitive application procedures with other methods to promote racial and socioeconomic diversity; Moulton (No. 10) that adds access to mental health resources and socialemotional learning as a performance measure for the grant program; students attending racially isolated, high-poverty schools have less access to resources, and school integration will help foster equitable access to resources; Mucarsel-Powell (No. 11) that ensures that planning grants to address racial and socioeconomic isolation in schools can be used to increase teacher diversity; and Tlaib (No. 12) that includes a requirement that an eligible entity that receives a grant must include in its annual report information on the progress of regional programs on reducing racial and socioeconomic isolation in covered schools; **Pages H4409–11**

Dean amendment (No. 6 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–502) that ensures that State Education

Agencies have procedures in place to assess and prevent the redrawing of school district lines in a manner that increases racial or socioeconomic isolation; and **Pages H4411–12**

Moulton amendment (No. 9 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–502) that expands the allowable uses of implementation grants to include creating or improving a one-stop enrollment process for students with multiple public school options, including making school information and data more accessible and easier to understand (by a yea-and-nay vote of 379 yeas to 34 nays, Roll No. 188). **Pages H4412–13, H4414–15**

Rejected:

Allen amendment (No. 2 printed in part B of H. Rept. 116–502) that sought to provide school districts flexibility with their funds under the Student Support and Academic Enrichment Grants to carry out integration activities (by a yea-and-nay vote of 171 yeas to 243 nays, Roll No. 187). **Pages H4408–09, H4413–14**

Res. 1107, the rule providing for consideration of the bills (H.R. 2574), (H.R. 2639), (H.R. 2694), and the resolution (H. Res. 908) was agreed to by a yea-and-nay vote of 216 yeas to 157 nays, Roll No. 186, after the previous question was ordered by a yea-and-nay vote of 219 yeas to 170 nays, Roll No. 185. **Pages H4391–99, H4399–H4400**

Quorum Calls—Votes: Five yea-and-nay votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H4398–99, H4399–H4400, H4413–14, H4414–15, and H4415–16.

Adjournment: The House met at 9 a.m. and adjourned at 7:15 p.m.

Committee Meetings

ADDRESSING THE LEGACY OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE USE OF PFAS: PROTECTING OUR COMMUNITIES AND IMPLEMENTING REFORM

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Readiness held a hearing entitled ''Addressing the Legacy of Department of Defense use of PFAS: Protecting Our Communities and Implementing Reform''. Testimony was heard from Maureen Sullivan, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense, Acquisition and Sustainment, Department of Defense; and a public witness.

THE HEALTH, ECONOMIC, AND POLITICAL CHALLENGES FACING LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere, Civilian Security, and Trade held a hearing entitled ''The Health, Economic, and Political Challenges Facing Latin America and the Caribbean''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on the Judiciary: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 5309, the ''CROWN Act of 2019''; H.R. 7718, the ''Protecting the Health and Wellness of Babies and Pregnant Women in Custody Act''; H.R. 8161, the ''One-Stop Shop Community Reentry Program Act of 2020''; H.R. 6813, the ''Promoting Alzheimer's Awareness to Prevent Elder Abuse Act''; H.R. 8169, the ''Elder Abuse Protection Act of 2020''; H.R. 8225, the ''Fight Notario Fraud Act of 2020''; H.R. 7636, the ''Custodial Interrogation Recording Act''; H.R. 8235, the ''Open Courts Act of 2020''; H.R. 7370, the ''Protecting Employees and Retirees in Business Bankruptcies Act of 2020''; and H.R. 2648, the ''Student Borrower Bankruptcy Relief Act of 2019''.

SBA MANAGEMENT REVIEW: OFFICE OF GOVERNMENT CONTRACTING AND BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT

Committee on Small Business: Subcommittee on Contracting and Infrastructure held a hearing entitled ''SBA Management Review: Office of Government Contracting and Business Development''. Testimony was heard from Francis Spampinato, Associate Administrator, Office of Government Contracting and Business Development, Small Business Administration.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 16, 2020

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies, to hold hearings to examine the Department of Health and Human Services' Coronavirus response, focusing on a review of efforts to date and next steps, 10 a.m., SD–G50.

Committee on the Budget: to hold hearings to examine Federal housing assistance programs, 2:30 p.m., SD–608.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: business meeting to consider S. 804, to amend the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 to protect the cultural practices and livelihoods of producers of Alaska Native handicrafts and fossilized ivory products, S. 1626, to require the National Telecommunications and Information Administration to estimate the value of electromagnetic

spectrum assigned or otherwise allocated to Federal entities, S. 3831, to authorize the position of Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Travel and Tourism, to statutorily establish the United States Travel and Tourism Advisory Board, S. 3969, to amend title 49, United States Code, to reform the Federal Aviation Administration's aircraft certification process, S. 4159, to amend the Electronic Signatures in Global and National Commerce Act to accommodate emerging technologies, S. 4286, to authorize appropriations for offsetting the costs related to reductions in research productivity resulting from the coronavirus pandemic, S. 4462, to establish a national integrated flood information system within the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, an original bill entitled, ''Forensic Science Research and Standards Act'', and the nominations of Eric J. Soskin, of Virginia, to be Inspector General, Department of Transportation, Robert E. Primus, of New Jersey, to be a Member of the Surface Transportation Board, and Theodore Rokita, of Indiana, Sarah E. Feinberg, of West Virginia, and Chris Koos, of Illinois, each to be a Director of the Amtrak Board of Directors, 9:45 a.m., SR–325.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: to hold hearings to examine the nominations of Allison Clements, of Ohio, and Mark C. Christie, of Virginia, both to be a Member of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 10 a.m., SD–366.

Subcommittee on Public Lands, Forests, and Mining, to hold hearings to examine S. 180, to streamline the oil and gas permitting process and to recognize fee ownership for certain oil and gas drilling or spacing units, S. 1295, to require the Secretary of the Interior to develop and maintain a cadastre of Federal real property, S. 1765, to sustain economic development and recreational use of National Forest System land in the State of Montana, to add certain land to the National Wilderness Preservation System, to designate new areas for recreation, S. 1870 and H.R. 722, bills to designate a mountain in the State of Utah as ''Miracle Mountain'', S. 2533, to amend the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act to exclude certain payments to Alaska Native elders for determining eligibility for certain programs, S. 2828, to require the Secretary of the Interior to prepare a programmatic environmental impact statement allowing for adaptive management of certain Federal land in Malheur County, Oregon, S. 2890, to promote conservation, improve public land, and provide for sensible development in Douglas County, Nevada, S. 3241, to amend the John D. Dingell, Jr. Conservation, Management, and Recreation Act to establish the Cerro de la Olla Wilderness in the Rio Grande del Norte National Monument, New Mexico, S. 3366, to amend the Federal Lands Recreation Enhancement Act to make the National Parks and Federal Recreational Lands Pass available at no cost to members of Gold Star Families, S. 3427, to require the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works to digitize and make publicly available geographic information system mapping data relating to public access to Federal land and waters for outdoor recreation, S. 3485, to expand the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to expand revenue sharing for offshore wind, to reauthorize the National Oceans and Coastal Security Act, S. 3670, to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate certain segments of the Gila River System in the State of New Mexico as components of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, to provide for the transfer of administrative jurisdiction over certain Federal land in the State of New Mexico, S. 4431, to increase wildfire preparedness and response throughout the United States, S. 4475, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land to La Paz County, Arizona, and H.R. 255, to provide for an exchange of lands with San Bernardino County, California, to enhance management of lands within the San Bernardino National Forest, 2:30 p.m., SD–366.

Committee on Environment and Public Works: to hold hearings to examine the Navigable Waters Protection Rule under the Clean Water Act, focusing on the stakeholder reaction, 10 a.m., SD–106.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: business meeting to consider a motion to authorize the Chairman to issue notices for taking depositions, subpoenas for records, and subpoenas for testimony, to individuals relating to the Federal Bureau of Investigation's Crossfire Hurricane Investigation; the DOJ Inspector General's review of that investigation; and the ''unmasking'' of U.S. persons affiliated with the Trump campaign, transition team, and Trump administration, as described in Schedule A (Items 1–3), and the nominations of John Gibbs, of Michigan, to be Director of the Office of Personnel Management, and John M. Barger, of California, Christopher Bancroft Burnham, of Connecticut, and Frank Dunlevy, of California, each to be a Member of the Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board, 10:15 a.m., SD–342.

Committee on Judiciary: Subcommittee on Intellectual Property, to hold hearings to examine whether the reforms to Section 1201 are needed and warranted, 2:30 p.m., SD–226.

Select Committee on Intelligence: to receive a closed briefing on certain intelligence matters, 1:30 p.m., SVC–217.

House

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Subcommittee on Environment and Climate Change, hearing entitled ''Building a 100 Percent Clean Economy: Opportunities for an Equitable, Low-Carbon Recovery'', 10 a.m., Webex.

Committee on Financial Services, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''Prioritizing Fannie's and Freddie's Capital over America's Homeowners and Renters? A Review of the Federal Housing Finance Agency's Response to the COVID–19 Pandemic'', 12 p.m., Webex.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''Why did the Trump Administration Fire the State Department Inspector General?'', 10 a.m., 2172 Rayburn and Webex.

Committee on Oversight and Reform, Full Committee, markup on H.R. 4774, the ''Internet of Things Cybersecurity Training for Federal Employees Act''; H.R. 5901, the ''Technology Modernization Centers of Excellence Program''; H.R. 7496, the ''COVID PREPARE Act''; H.R. 4382, the ''Integrity Committee Transparency Act'';

H.R. 7107, the ''Plum Act''; H.R. 7340, the ''Chai Suthammanont Remembrance Act''; H.R. 7548, the ''PPE Buy America Act''; H.R. 7936, the ''Federal Employee Access to Information Act''; H.R. 8109, the ''Nonpartisan Postmaster General Act''; legislation on the GAO Report Elimination Act; H.R. 2277, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1715 Linnerud Drive in Sun Prairie, Wisconsin, as the ''Fire Captain Cory Barr Post Office Building''; H.R. 5562, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4650 East Rosedale Street in Fort Worth, Texas, as the ''Dionne Phillips Bagsby Post Office Building''; H.R. 5972, the ''Mary Ann Shadd Cary Post Office Dedication Act''; H.R. 5983, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4150 Chicago Avenue in Riverside, California, as the ''Woodie Rucker-Hughes Post Office Building''; H.R. 7502, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 101 South 16th Street in Clarinda, Iowa, as the ''Jessie Field Shambaugh Post Office Building''; H.R. 5451, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 599 East Genesse Street in Fayetteville, New York, as the ''George H. Bacel Post Office Building''; H.R. 6016, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 14955 West Bell Road in Surprise, Arizona, as the ''Marc Lee Memorial Post Office Building''; H.R. 6418, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 509 Fairhope Avenue in Fairhope, Alabama, as the ''William 'Jack' Jackson Edwards III Post Office Building''; H.R. 7088, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 111 James Street in Reidsville, Georgia, as the ''Senator Jack Hill Post Office Building''; and H.R. 7810, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3519 East Walnut Street in Pearland, Texas, as the ''Tom Reid Post Office Building'', 10 a.m., 2154 Rayburn and Webex.

Committee on Small Business, September 16, Full Committee, markup on H.R. 7903, to amend the Small Business Act to establish the Community Advantage Loan Program; H.R. 8211, the ''504 Modernization and Small Manufacturer Enhancement Act of 2020''; H.R. 8199, the ''504 Credit Risk Management Improvement Act of 2020''; and H.R. 8229, the ''Parity for HUBZone Appeals Act of 2020'', 10:30 a.m., 2175 Rayburn and Webex.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs, Subcommittee on Technology Modernization; and Subcommittee on Economic Opportunity, joint hearing entitled ''Moving Beyond Patchwork Systems: The Future of Education Services IT'', 10 a.m., HVC–210 and Webex.

Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing entitled ''Modernizing VA's Medical Supply Chain: Lessons Learned from the Pandemic'', 2 p.m., HVC–210 and Webex.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

10 a.m., Wednesday, September 16

Senate Chamber

Program for Wednesday: Senate will continue consideration of the nomination of Todd Wallace Robinson, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of California, post-cloture.

At 11:30 a.m., Senate will vote on confirmation of the nomination of Todd Wallace Robinson, and on the motions to invoke cloture on the nominations of David W. Dugan, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Illinois, and Stephen P. McGlynn, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Illinois.

If cloture is invoked on the nominations of David W. Dugan and Stephen P. McGlynn, Senate will vote on confirmation thereon at 3:30 p.m., followed by a vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the nomination of Iain D. Johnston, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Illinois.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

9 a.m., Wednesday, September 16

House Chamber

Program for Wednesday: Consideration of H.R. 2574—Equity and Inclusion Enforcement Act. Consideration of measures under suspension of the Rules.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Brooks, Mo, Ala., E842, E844
Carbajal, Salud O., Calif., E844
Cleaver, Emanuel, Mo., E841, E843
Courtney, Joe, Conn., E843
Deutch, Theodore E., Fla., E842
Garamendi, John, Calif., E844
Guthrie, Brett, Ky., E845
Hartzler, Vicky, Mo., E842
Huizenga, Bill, Mich., E843
Murphy, Gregory F., N.C., E841
Napolitano, Grace F., Calif., E845
O'Halleran, Tom, Ariz., E842
Quigley, Mike, Ill., E844
Rose, Max, N.Y., E842
Schiff, Adam B., Calif., E841
Simpson, Michael K., Idaho, E842, E843
Waltz, Michael, Fla., E844

Congressional Record

The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087–390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Publishing Office, at *www.govinfo.gov*, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Publishing Office. Phone 202–512–1800, or 866–512–1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, *contactcenter@gpo.gov*. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197–9000, or phone orders to 866–512–1800 (toll-free), 202–512–1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202–512–2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Publishing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.