THE UNITED STATES SUPPORTS INDIA

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

Mr. BURCHETT. Madam Speaker, it is in the best interests of the United States of America to build and maintain strong partnerships with our allies across the globe.

In that spirit, I rise today in recognition of our important relationship with one of those allies, the Republic of India.

India, the world's largest democracy, is under constant threat from the Chinese Communist Party. The Chinese Communist Party has been acting aggressively towards India in recent years and infringing on Indian territory.

India is an effective counterweight to the Chinese Communist Party's desire for dominance in southeast Asia, Madam Speaker, and a strong India is critical to preventing expansion of the Chinese Communist Party's global influence.

I am proud to stand on the floor of the House of Representatives today with a strong, clear message for our friends in India: The United States supports you in your struggle against Chinese aggressors. Together, our two democratic, free nations will stand against the communism that only seeks to rob citizens of their individuality and beliefs.

HONORING JONATHAN ''J.T.'' TENNANT

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor 20-year veteran harbor pilot Jonathan ''J.T.'' Tennant of Brunswick, Georgia, who played a pivotal role in ensuring the safety of all crew members aboard the Golden Ray carrier when it shipwrecked over a year ago on September 8, 2019.

If you visit St. Simons Island in Georgia's First Congressional District, it is hard to miss the Golden Ray, which is a 656-foot-long car carrier that remains capsized in the St. Simons Sound.

As the investigation into the incident by the U.S. Coast Guard and the National Transportation Safety Board continues, we have been able to gain valuable insight from crew members and others involved.

Although he had steered a city-block-sized cargo ship from the Brunswick River to the St. Simons Sound several thousand times, nothing could have prepared J.T. for what happened the morning of September 8.

The Golden Ray was sailing normally, but the rudder and the propeller came up out of the water to where J.T. had no operational control of the vessel, and it started capsizing rapidly.

He endured flames melting the steel and smoke emanating from airboxes the entire length of the ship.

As testament to his extensive experience piloting more than 5,000 ships in and out of the Port of Brunswick, J.T. drove the Golden Ray as far up on the Sound as possible that day to ensure all 23 mariners aboard were safe and rescued.

When you see the giant cargo ship in the Sound and realize there was no loss of life, it is nothing short of a miracle and a testament to the hardworking crew, including J.T.

Although it is an unfortunate situation, I am thankful for the courage and determination J.T. and the entire crew displayed that day.

A DOMESTIC MINERAL SUPPLY CHAIN IS ESSENTIAL FOR OUR NATIONAL SECURITY

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Speaker, for decades, America's mining industry has suffered at the hands of foreign competition from China.

Yesterday, President Trump signed an executive order to expand the domestic mining industry, supporting thousands of American mining jobs and reducing our dependence on China for critical minerals.

A domestic mineral supply chain is essential for our national security, because they are used for military, infrastructure, and energy projects.

America certainly should not be depending on China for precious materials that are critical to our national defense. This should rest solely in our hands.

By streamlining development of critical minerals at home and creating jobs for American workers along the way, this executive order is a win-win.

With all the push for renewable energy in this country and electric vehicles, we certainly need to have this supply chain come from our country and not somewhere else.

Madam Speaker, I am grateful for President Trump's bold action to continue our economic growth while also taking bold action against a foreign adversary.

□ 1130

CHILDHOOD CANCER HEARING LOSS

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

Mr. BUDD. Madam Speaker, over 15,000 American children are diagnosed with cancer every year. Having the most innocent among us receive such a gut-wrenching diagnosis is devastating.

Thankfully, incredible progress has been made in treating cancer among children. As more kids become survivors, we need to make a concerted effort to improve their lives and to strive to develop treatments that do not carry permanent side effects.

For example, I have constituents whose children have experienced permanent hearing loss, which can occur when young patients undergo chemotherapy. That is why I recently sent a letter to the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality asking them to identify any research efforts to reverse this loss of hearing.

We owe it to our young survivors to help them thrive and maintain a high quality of life. I encourage Federal researchers to keep producing the medical miracles that will help our kids prevail in the fight against cancer.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. RES. 1153, CONDEMNING UNWANTED, UNNECESSARY MEDICAL PROCEDURES ON INDIVIDUALS WITHOUT THEIR FULL, INFORMED CONSENT, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. RES. 1154, CONDEMNING QANON AND REJECTING THE CONSPIRACY THEORIES IT PROMOTES

Ms. SCANLON, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 116–557) on the resolution (H. Res. 1164) providing for consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 1153) condemning unwanted, unnecessary medical procedures on individuals without their full, informed consent, and providing for consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 1154) condemning QAnon and rejecting the conspiracy theories it promotes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. DEAN). Pursuant to clause 4 of rule I, the following enrolled bill was signed by the Speaker on Wednesday, September 30, 2020:

H.R. 8337, making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2021, and for other purposes.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. RES. 1153, CONDEMNING UNWANTED, UNNECESSARY MEDICAL PROCEDURES ON INDIVIDUALS WITHOUT THEIR FULL, INFORMED CONSENT, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. RES. 1154, CONDEMNING QANON AND REJECTING THE CONSPIRACY THEORIES IT PROMOTES

Ms. SCANLON. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I

call up House Resolution 1164 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1164

Resolved, That 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. 1153) condemning unwanted, unnecessary medical procedures on individuals without their full, informed consent. The amendment to the resolution printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted. The resolution, as amended, shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and preamble, as amended, 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. 2. 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. 1154) condemning QAnon and rejecting the conspiracy theories it promotes. 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.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. SCANLON. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. LESKO), 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. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. SCANLON. Madam Speaker, on Wednesday, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule, House Resolution 1164, providing for consideration of H. Res. 1153, condemning unwanted, unnecessary medical procedures on individuals without their full, informed consent, under a closed rule.

The rule self-executes a manager's amendment offered by Chairman NADLER, which clarifies the last statement in the resolved clause. The rule provides 1 hour of debate, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Judiciary Committee.

The rule also provides for consideration of H. Res. 1154, condemning QAnon and rejecting the conspiracy theories it promotes, under a closed rule. The rule provides 1 hour of debate, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Judiciary Committee.

Madam Speaker, I am proud to offer the rule for two timely and necessary resolutions, one that addresses allegations of gross human rights violations conducted under the watch of the United States Government and the other a long-overdue resolution that forcefully condemns QAnon, an anti-Semitic, racist, and, frankly, unhinged conspiracy theory that has infiltrated the internet and infected the rightwing of our Nation's politics.

Let's start with H. Res. 1153, offered by my colleague, Congresswoman JAYAPAL of the House Judiciary Committee, in response to some of most repulsive and inhumane allegations ever directed at a U.S. Federal agency.

In mid-September, just a couple of weeks ago, a whistleblower came forward to disclose that women who have been detained for immigration offenses at Irwin County Detention Center in Georgia, operated by a private prison company, LaSalle Corrections, have been subjected to a pattern of nonconsensual and inappropriate medical treatment, including forced partial and full sterilization.

This complaint was submitted to the Office of Inspector General at the Department of Homeland Security and outlined concerns raised by a nurse at the facility and numerous immigrant detainees at the facility.

While the IG's investigation is just beginning, many of the central allegations in the complaint have already been confirmed in reporting by The New York Times and by a delegation of a dozen of my colleagues who visited the detention center last weekend, interviewed women who had suffered through these procedures, and consulted with medical professionals who have reviewed the women's medical records relating to those incidents.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD The New York Times article from yesterday entitled ''Immigrants Say They Were Pressured Into Unneeded Surgeries.''

[From the New York Times, Sept. 29, 2020]

IMMIGRANTS SAY THEY WERE PRESSURED INTO UNNEEDED SURGERIES

(By Caitlin Dickerson, Seth Freed Wessler, and Miriam Jordan)

IMMIGRANTS DETAINED AT AN ICE-CONTRACTED CENTER IN GEORGIA SAID THEY HAD INVASIVE GYNECOLOGY PROCEDURES THAT THEY LATER LEARNED MIGHT HAVE BEEN UNNECESSARY

Wendy Dowe was startled awake early one morning in January 2019, when guards called her out of her cellblock in the Irwin County immigration detention center in rural Georgia, where she had been held for four months. She would be having surgery that day, they said.

Still groggy, the 48-year-old immigrant from Jamaica, who had been living without legal status in the United States for two decades before she was picked up by immigration authorities, felt a swell of dread come over her. An outside gynecologist who saw patients in immigration custody told her that the menstrual cramping she had was caused by large cysts and masses that needed to be removed, but she was skeptical. The doctor insisted, she said, and as a detainee—brought to the hospital in handcuffs and shackles—she felt pressured to consent.

It was only after she was deported to Jamaica and had her medical files reviewed by several other doctors that she knew she had been right to raise questions.

A radiologist's report, based on images of her internal organs from her time at Irwin, described her uterus as being a healthy size, not swollen with enlarged masses and cysts, as the doctor had written in his notes. The cysts she had were small, and the kind that occur naturally and do not usually require surgical intervention.

''I didn't have to do any of it,'' Ms. Dowe said.

The Irwin County Detention Center in Ocilla, Ga., drew national attention this month after a nurse, Dawn Wooten, filed a whistle-blower complaint claiming that detainees had told her they had had their uteruses removed without their full understanding or consent.

Since then, both ICE and the hospital in Irwin County have released data that show that two full hysterectomies have been performed on women detained at Irwin in the past three years. But firsthand accounts are now emerging from detainees, including Ms. Dowe, who underwent other invasive gynecological procedures that they did not fully understand and, in some cases, may not have been medically necessary.

At least one lawyer brought the complaints about gynecological care to the attention of the center's top officials in 2018, according to emails obtained by The New York Times, but the outside referrals continued.

The Times interviewed 16 women who were concerned about the gynecological care they received while at the center, and conducted a detailed review of the medical files of seven women who were able to obtain their records. All 16 were treated by Dr. Mahendra Amin, who practices gynecology in the nearby town of Douglas and has been described by ICE officials as the detention center's ''primary gynecologist.''

The cases were reviewed by five gynecologists—four of them board-certified and all with medical school affiliations—who found that Dr. Amin consistently overstated the size or risks associated with cysts or masses attached to his patients' reproductive organs. Small or benign cysts do not typically call for surgical intervention, where large or otherwise troubling ones sometimes do, the experts said.

The doctors stressed that in some cases the medical files might not have been complete and that additional information could potentially shift their analyses. But they noted that Dr. Amin seemed to consistently recommend surgical intervention, even when it did not seem medically necessary at the time and nonsurgical treatment options were available.

In almost every woman's chart, Dr. Amin listed symptoms such as heavy bleeding with clots and chronic pelvic pain, which could justify surgery. But some of the women said they never experienced or reported those symptoms to him.

Both the reviewing doctors and all of the women interviewed by The Times raised concerns about whether Dr. Amin had adequately explained the procedures he performed or provided his patients with less invasive alternatives. Spanish-speaking women said a nurse who spoke Spanish was only sporadically present during their exams.

The diagnoses and procedures are ''poorly supported'' and ''not well documented,'' said Dr. Sara Imershein, a clinical professor at George Washington University and the Washington, D.C., chair of the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists.

Even if the patients had reported the symptoms recorded by Dr. Amin, ''there

would have been many avenues to pursue before rushing to surgery,'' she said. ''Advil for one.''

''He is overly aggressive in his treatment and does not explore appropriate medical management before turning to procedures or surgical intervention,'' said Dr. Deborah Ottenheimer, a forensic evaluator and instructor at the Weill Cornell Medical School Human Rights Clinic.

But the doctors who reviewed the cases noted that aggressive overtreatment is all too common among doctors—especially with patients who do not have the resources to seek a second opinion.

Dr. Ada Rivera, medical director of the ICE Health Service Corps, said in a statement that the whistle-blower's allegations ''raise some very serious concerns that deserve to be investigated quickly and thoroughly.'' She added, ''If there is any truth to these allegations, it is my commitment to make the corrections necessary to ensure we continue to prioritize the health, welfare and safety of ICE detainees.''

Dr. Amin's lawyer, Scott Grubman, said in a statement that the physician ''strongly disputes any allegations that he treated any patient with anything other than the utmost care and respect.''

''Dr. Amin also strongly disputes that any patient was treated without full informed consent,'' the statement continued. Mr. Grubman said that patient privacy laws prevented him from discussing any specific patient's treatment, but in each case it ''was medically necessary, performed within the standard of care, and done only after obtaining full informed consent.''

The statement added that Dr. Amin always uses an interpreter when treating patients who do not speak English and ''always attempts to treat his patients with more conservative treatment, including medicine and less invasive procedures, before even recommending surgery,'' which he views as a last resort.

Independent doctors that provide treatment for ICE detainees are paid for the procedures they perform with Department of Homeland Security funds. Procedures like the ones that Dr. Amin performed are normally billed at thousands of dollars each.

Dr. Amin's billings had previously come to the attention of federal authorities. In 2013, the Justice Department named him in a civil case alleging that he and several other doctors had overbilled Medicare and Medicaid by, among other things, performing unnecessary procedures on terminal patients and leaving the emergency room staffed by nurses while billing for diagnoses and treatments as if they had been performed by doctors. The case was settled for $520,000 with no admission of fault on the part of the defendants.

I COULD NOT ASK ANY QUESTIONS

In many cases, Dr. Amin's patients said they were confused about why they ended up being sent to his office in the first place—some after raising medical issues that had nothing to do with gynecology.

Yuridia, a 36-year-old immigrant from Mexico, sought out a nurse at the center soon after she arrived because she was having pain in her rib after a fight with her abusive ex-partner just before she was picked up by ICE. She asked to be identified by her first name because she feared for her safety.

She was sent for a medical exam at Dr. Amin's office, where she said he began to prepare an ultrasound machine. ''I was assuming they were going to check my rib,'' she said. ''The next thing I know, he's doing a vaginal exam.''

Dr. Amin recorded in his notes that Yuridia had cysts in her ovaries and scheduled a surgery to remove them. He also wrote that she had complained of heavy menstruation and pelvic pain. She said that she never experienced or reported those conditions and that she had not asked to see a gynecologist.

Weeks later, she underwent surgery. Pathology reports show that she did not have dangerous cysts, but small ones of the kind that occur naturally in most women and do not call for surgical intervention.

Yuridia said she had expected only a minor procedure that would be performed vaginally, but she was surprised when she woke up to find three incisions on her abdomen and a piece of skin missing from her genital area.

''I woke up and I was alone, and I was in pain and everyone spoke English so I could not ask any questions,'' Yuridia said. Three days later, still sore and recovering, she was deported.

Yuridia's case bears striking similarities to others that the panel of doctors reviewed. Many of them led to two surgical procedures performed simultaneously: ''dilation and curettage,'' often referred to as a ''D & C,'' which involves inserting tools into a woman's vagina and scraping tissue from the uterus, and laparoscopy, in which three incisions are made to insert a camera into the abdominal cavity to examine or perform procedures on the reproductive organs.

The cases suggest a pattern of ''excessively aggressive surgical intervention without adequate trial of medical remedies,'' Dr. Ottenheimer said.

A REPORT REVEALS LONGSTANDING COMPLAINTS

It was the Irwin County center's handling of the coronavirus pandemic that inspired Ms. Wooten, the nurse whose whistle-blower complaint was first reported by The Intercept, to come forward about another issue that troubled her: Dr. Amin's surgeries. She said in an interview that she had for years noticed that an inordinate number of women were being referred to Dr. Amin. She said she would hear reports that they had undergone surgeries but that they had no idea why the surgeries were performed.

''After they get up from general anesthesia,'' Ms. Wooten said, the women would ask, ''Why'd I have this surgery?''

''And I don't have an answer for why,'' she said. ''I am just as shocked as they are. Nobody explained it to them.''

Data from ICE inspection reports show that the center, which is operated by a private prison company, Lasalle Corrections, refers more than 1,000 detainees a year for outside medical care, far more than most other immigration detention centers of the same size. It is not clear how many of these referrals are for gynecological care. Lasalle Corrections did not respond to requests for comment.

Concerns from women detained at Irwin emerged long before Ms. Wooten came forward.

Ms. Dowe, after being told by Dr. Amin that she had a mass the size of a ''cantaloupe'' on her uterus, had reached out in early 2019 to Donald Anthonyson, an immigrant advocate she had met through a fellow detainee. She was asking for help, Mr. Anthonyson said.

''She expressed real concerns about going to that doctor,'' he said. ''She was concerned about what was happening to her and what she was hearing from other women.''

Unlike some of the women who had no gynecological complaints, Ms. Dowe was experiencing intense menstrual cramping, which the doctors who reviewed her case said could sometimes justify the procedure she underwent—but only if the patient understands the options and elects to move forward. Even then, the doctors raised questions about several seemingly healthy and naturally occurring cysts that Dr. Amin might have removed unnecessarily while he was operating on her.

After the procedure, Dr. Amin wrote in his notes that Ms. Dowe requested a second surgery—a full abdominal hysterectomy and removal of her ovaries.

But Ms. Dowe insists she never made any such request. A note in her medical records from the detention center appears to corroborate her denial. ''Detainee is requesting a second opinion to have a hysterectomy,'' it reads, ''OB/GYN scheduled hysterectomy and patient refused.''

Complaints about Dr. Amin had also been raised with senior officials long before Ms. Dowe's case.

In November 2018, a woman named Nancy Gonzalez Hidalgo was left shaken after several visits with the physician, during which she said he performed rough vaginal ultrasounds and ignored her when she cried out in pain. Ms. Gonzalez Hidalgo's lawyers sent an email to the warden of the center, David Paulk.

In the email, Erin Argueta, a lawyer at the Southern Poverty Law Center, explained that Ms. Gonzalez Hidalgo's health was worsening because of complications she was experiencing from an earlier miscarriage.

''Nancy hesitated to seek medical attention because her last experience with Dr. Amin was so painful and traumatic that she did not want to be sent back to him,'' Ms. Argueta wrote.

She referred in her email to several previous verbal complaints about Dr. Amin that lawyers had taken to the center's inmates services director, Marteka George. ''Ms. George stated that this was not the first time someone complained about Dr. Amin, and she said that she would look into whether Nancy could see a different provider,'' the lawyer wrote.

The warden responded twice, stating on Nov. 30 that Ms. Gonzalez Hidalgo had been scheduled for an appointment with an outside provider ''that is unassociated with Dr. Amin.'' The other doctor, Warden Paulk said, was ''reportedly well thought of by his patients.''

Warden Paulk did not respond to requests for comment.

Other women who questioned Dr. Amin's care in the past said they had also faced challenges when they tried to seek answers.

On the morning of Aug. 14, Mileidy Cardentey Fernandez said, there was no interpreter present at the Irwin County Hospital when she was presented with consent forms in English to sign for a procedure she was undergoing that day.

She asked the technician, ''Spanish, please? Little English.'' The woman urged her to sign the forms—and so she did.

Afterward, she said, she filled out a form on numerous occasions at the detention center requesting her medical records but got no response.

''I wanted to know everything they had done,'' she said. ''I made requests for the biopsy, analyses, and they don't want to give them to me. They said they don't have the results. How can they not have the results?''

When she was released from detention on Sept. 21, she called her daughter in Virginia and then headed straight to Dr. Amin's clinic with her lawyer to demand her records, which she received.

Some women said they had managed to avoid surgeries by Dr. Amin but not without facing resistance.

Enna Perez Santos said she objected when Dr. Amin suggested that she undergo a procedure similar to the ones that other women had complained about. Dr. Amin, she said,

counseled her that it was a mistake to forgo the treatment and he wrote in his notes that she had asked to speak to a mental health care provider.

Back at the detention center on the same day, Ms. Perez Santos was given a psychiatric evaluation. ''I am nervous about my upcoming procedure,'' Ms. Perez Santos told the examiner, according to the practitioner's notes. ''I am worried because I saw someone else after they had surgery, and what I saw scared me.''

Ms. Perez Santos was brought three more times to Dr. Amin's office over the next several months, she recalled. Each time, she said, Dr. Amin raised the prospect of a surgery. She felt ''pressured'' to agree, she said, but each time she told him she did not consent.

Three board certified gynecologists who reviewed Ms. Perez Santos's medical files say that her instincts appear to have been correct. ''Based on what I see here, Amin was inappropriately suggesting a D & C scope,'' Dr. Ottenheimer said. ''There is nothing at all there to support the procedure.''

Ms. SCANLON. Madam Speaker, the whistleblower complaint raises multiple serious questions which should concern every Member of this body and the administration.

First, these women were apparently subjected to unnecessary and inappropriate medical care without their consent, which, in many cases, has rendered them unable to have children, one of the most precious decisions a family can make.

Second, think about the circumstances. Many of these women did not speak English and had no access to interpreters to explain the procedures to which they were subjected. They were being held in detention, awaiting adjudication of their legal applications to stay in this country, not for any crime. But they had no access to family members, their family doctors, or legal counsel.

Many report that they went to the doctor for unrelated medical conditions and only learned that they had been subjected to surgery after the fact.

Finally, we must determine how such outrageous and inhumane treatment of human beings in the custody of a U.S. agency could be allowed to occur, and we must hold that agency, as well as the detention center, the facility, the private prison operator, and the medical personnel, accountable.

I cannot even begin to express how appalling these allegations are and the stain that, if found to be accurate in their entirety, they will leave on this country.

I am sure there is not a single Member of this body who doesn't want to see a full independent investigation into these claims, and that is exactly why we are offering this resolution today.

This resolution expresses the sense of Congress that this investigation must begin immediately. Any delay is simply unacceptable.

Members of this body have already been forced to intervene in ICE's attempts to deport witnesses central to the investigation since the complaint was filed. This further affirms the necessity for the investigation and that the very nature of how Federal agencies like ICE and DHS are operating under this administration, in violation of the rule of law and without accountability, that this is unacceptable.

Our current administration is aware of the structural flaws in our immigration system and exploits them to great political effect. What we are left with is a leader and a party that vilify immigrants as a tool for political gain. Then they systematically round up and detain immigrants in some of the most horrific ways possible, using private detention centers, separating children from their parents, denying basic medical treatment such as flu shots or COVID prevention, and inflicting lifelong trauma on our fellow humans, creatures of God.

The allegations from the Irwin County detention facility are repugnant, but they are consistent with a pattern of inhumane and similar injustices that have been perpetrated by this administration. ICE and DHS operate with impunity under a President who is using them as a secret police force.

I hope all of my colleagues will join me in passing this necessary resolution, but more than that, I hope that we can come together to reform our broken immigration system.

Our current system harms significantly more than it helps, inflicting physical and emotional pain without protecting our borders. We are long overdue for serious changes that will better reflect our values and interests as a country.

Next, Madam Speaker, we have H. Res. 1154, a resolution condemning the rightwing conspiracy theory QAnon.

I am not entirely sure where to start with QAnon, but basic research tells us it is a rightwing conspiracy theory concocted in some of the darkest corners of the internet that purports to hail President Trump as a savior of the country by combating shadowy members of a deep state who kidnap children in order to drink their blood.

This is a theory so ludicrous that it could be considered absurd if not for the thousands of Americans who have fully bought into these premises and the rash of violence, hatred, and criminal activity that these wild theories have encouraged.

In August 2020, a woman in Colorado was arrested and charged with attempted kidnapping of her daughter, who had been placed in foster care as her mother was deemed unfit to care for her. The woman is a fervent QAnon follower and was even found to have consulted other QAnon believers in a plot to kidnap her son, also in the foster care system.

Then there is the case of an Arizona man who was a QAnon follower. He was charged with aggravated assault and making terroristic threats after he was inspired by QAnon theories to use an armored van to block a bridge over the Hoover Dam and demand release of a report he believed existed that would expose the deep state, whatever that is.

The court ultimately blocked his guilty plea as the judge determined that the sentencing would have been too lenient for the crimes he had committed.

One of the most high-profile QAnon incidents came after an alleged leader of the Gambino crime family in New York was murdered by a QAnon supporter who, according to his testimony, believed that the murder would assist President Trump.

While my colleagues on the other side of the aisle continue to flirt with these fringe conspiracy theories, including riling up their base with allegations of invasions by antifa, which have been debunked by the administration's own FBI, QAnon and those who have bought into it are genuine threats to our democracy.

We are talking about a coordinated, sophisticated cult that is poisoning the brains of more and more Americans each day.

In our Rules Committee meeting last night, many of my colleagues claim to have never even heard of this deadly cult. I cannot possibly believe that these skilled political operatives are so clueless, but that is beside the point.

President Trump is certainly aware, and his tacit support and encouragement of these dangerous narratives are a threat to the law and order he so noisily embraces.

I hope that every single one of my Republican colleagues joins us in condemning QAnon today for the sanity of this country. It is particularly important that we do so now because the Republican Caucus may not be united on this front in the next Congress.

Madam Speaker, with more than 15 QAnon believers on the ballot this November across the country, it appears likely that at least one or two of them may be taking seats in Congress next term.

In the meantime, every single Member on both sides of the aisle must take their share of blame if these Hallowed Halls are going to be contaminated by Representatives of a deranged conspiracy theory.

In any case, I look forward to seeing how Minority Leader MCCARTHY will find a spot for this kind of expertise next Congress.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1145

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I thank Representative SCANLON for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Madam Speaker, this rule consists of two nonbinding resolutions, H. Res. 1153, regarding allegations made against the Irwin County Detention Center, and H. Res. 1154, condemning QAnon and rejecting the conspiracy theories it promotes.

First, H. Res. 1153 is a complete disregard to our Nation's due process system. If the accusations from the

women at Irwin County Detention Center are true, they are obviously horrific, and this resolution would be, obviously, an appropriate response.

However, we don't know anything for certain yet. In fact, the Office of the Inspector General and the Department of Homeland Security are currently conducting investigations.

We could open up a committee investigation, too. We could go through a normal committee oversight process where we have a hearing and bring in witnesses to get to the truth. That would be appropriate, not this.

Guess what. ICE agrees with us. Acting ICE Director Tony Pham issued a statement on September 18, 2020, saying: ''The recent allegations by the independent contracted employee raise some very serious concerns that deserve to be investigated quickly and thoroughly. ICE welcomes the efforts of both the Office of the Inspector General as well as the Department of Homeland Security's parallel review.

''As a former prosecutor, individuals found to have violated our policies and procedures should be held accountable. If there is any truth to these allegations, it is my commitment to make the corrections necessary to ensure we continue to prioritize the health, welfare, and safety of ICE detainees.''

In fact, I, along with my colleague from New Jersey, Representative CHRIS SMITH, sent a letter to DHS last week to state that the allegations are alarming and must be investigated thoroughly.

It also said in our letter that these accounts don't comport with the statement of Dr. Ada Rivera, the medical director of the ICE Health Services Corps, who stated that, since 2018, only two individuals at Irwin County Detention Center were referred to certified, credentialed medical professionals at gynecological healthcare facilities for hysterectomies. Dr. Rivera also said that detainees are afforded informed consent, and a medical procedure like a hysterectomy would never be performed against a detainee's will.

On September 18, the Associated Press published an article citing the results of its own internal investigation. It stated that the AP's review did not find evidence of mass hysterectomies as alleged in a widely shared complaint filed by a nurse at the detention center.

The AP also noted that one attorney investigating the case had found that Dr. Amin has performed surgery or other gynecological treatment on at least eight women detained at Irwin County Detention Center since 2017, including one hysterectomy.

As a member of the Homeland Security Committee and the co-chair of the Bipartisan Women's Caucus, I am very concerned about these accusations in this situation. However, what happened in this body to due process?

The way the House is moving forward today on this resolution sets a very dangerous precedent. For instance, in the resolution itself, it states: ''Whereas these allegations indicate a failure by U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement to conduct rigorous oversight to protect the health and safety of people in its custody.''

However, we do not even know if the allegations are true. It should, instead, read: ''If true, these actions indicate a failure.''

We can't just base it on allegations. This is an example of my Democratic colleagues' acting first and learning later.

Right now, we need to investigate, not bring a resolution condemning ICE to the floor. This is backwards, and it is just wrong. America needs to see us together on this issue. Unfortunately, my Democratic colleagues clearly do not want to work with Republicans to make that a reality.

Madam Speaker, this rule also contains H. Res. 1154.

At the outset, let me be clear, Republicans are concerned with and do not embrace QAnon.

I have to admit, although I must confess I know little to nothing about this idea, organization, whatever it is, if what they say on Wikipedia is true, then, of course, we oppose it. In fact, on August 20, the House Republican leader, Mr. MCCARTHY, stated very clearly that there is no place for QAnon in the Republican Party.

It is a serious issue, and Republicans don't discriminate on which dangerous organizations or groups we take seriously. We don't just condemn groups because it is politically convenient. Because, unlike many of our colleagues across the aisle, we also take the threat of antifa seriously.

It is clear, unfortunately, that many of my Democratic colleagues refuse to condemn antifa. Chairman NADLER said here right on the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives something to the effect that antifa was a myth, a fantasy. Just the other night, Vice President Biden refused to condemn antifa at the debate.

That is why, last night, I offered an amendment to this resolution in the Rules Committee to include condemning antifa, so we, as a governing body, could unite against at least two threatening groups and ideologies, not just one.

Unfortunately, all of my Rules Committee Democratic colleagues voted against my commonsense amendment, even though FBI Director Wray, himself, testified recently in Judiciary Committee: ''Antifa is a real thing. It is not fiction.'' In other words, antifa is not a myth as some on the other side believe. According to the FBI and the Department of Justice, antifa is involved in the rioting and looting across our Nation.

So while I do wish that the majority would have included a resolution condemning antifa in this rule for floor consideration today, I am glad Republicans can put country first and agree when a group poses a threat.

Madam Speaker, I urge opposition to the rule, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I am so pleased to hear that we should all be working together to get to the bottom of this, because that is exactly what the resolution puts forward. It says that these are allegations. It doesn't say that they are conclusively proved. But the resolution asks for an investigation, and it asks our government to pull out all the stops to do that.

The reason we need a resolution and a sense of Congress about this is because we see ICE and the Department of Homeland Security undermining this investigation already. When the news broke 2 weeks ago, they promptly moved to deport one of the central witnesses. One of our colleagues, SHEILA JACKSON LEE, had to get that witness removed from a plane. She was on the tarmac ready to be sent overseas, where she then would not be available to testify.

That same person was given humanitarian relief. She is allowed to stay in the country. Today, this morning, as we speak here, she reported to check in to ICE, as she was required to and as most immigrants do in our system, and when she reported, they tried to arrest her and deport her again.

As we speak, Members of this body are having to work to keep ICE from undermining this investigation. So, yes, we need this resolution to move forward.

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

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

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of this rule and the underlying resolutions. We must pass the resolution from Congresswoman JAYAPAL. Medical procedures being done on immigrants without their consent harkens back to a dark time in our Nation's history when medical abuse against the poor and people of color happened again and again and again.

I rise today, though, to discuss the bipartisan resolution condemning the collective delusion known as QAnon. I don't say that description lightly, Madam Speaker, but we all must call it what it is: a sick cult.

We are not talking about a group of people with just some differing political views. Americans respect political disagreement. But what we do not respect and what this House should not tolerate are people using conspiracy theories from the darkest corners of the internet to spread hate and lies.

QAnon isn't some harmless distraction. It is an extremist ideology that exploits children and opens the door to

real-life violence. That is what we are talking about here: reality versus delusion; political discussion versus political violence.

Just ask the sponsor of this resolution, Congressman MALINOWSKI. In an interview that was published yesterday, he talked about the death threats and hundreds of hate-filled attacks sent to him from QAnon supporters after introducing this bill.

He is not the only Member of Congress who has been targeted. Sadly, there are candidates across the country running to serve in Congress who peddle this trash.

It is sick; it is wrong; and it is dangerous.

It is frustrating that the President wouldn't condemn QAnon. He says they like him. But, then again, I never thought I would see the day when a President of the United States would tell a white supremacist group to stand down and stand by in a national debate. He didn't use a dog whistle; he used a blow horn.

Extreme views like these are dangerous.

Are we really going to stand by and do nothing, Madam Speaker?

That is not who we are as a nation. All of us, especially my Republican colleagues, must condemn QAnon or risk being complicit in their dangerous hate peddling.

So let's make it crystal clear: This is a sick and a twisted ideology.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, let's be clear: I already said it, but we agree. We condemn QAnon, but we also ask the majority to condemn antifa.

Why is the majority condemning one group and not the other group? That is the point.

But let me go on to what my colleague, Representative SCANLON, said on H. Res. 1153. This was said in the Rules Committee last night, too, that all this resolution does is call for an investigation.

That is inaccurate. This resolution goes beyond that. In fact, it says it right here, and I said it last night. It says: ''Whereas these allegations indicate a failure by U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement.''

So, if all it did was call for an investigation, fine, but that is not what it all does. It says: Whereas these allegations indicate a failure by ICE.

Madam Speaker, you saw in the comments that Representative SCANLON gave that she was going after ICE. That is what this is about.

Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT).

□ 1200

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding, and I thank all of my colleagues for their comments.

Madam Speaker, I would like to focus my comments on the attacks on the Irwin County Hospital and the staff at the Irwin County Hospital. And one of the things that I would like to make very clear is: While I was not invited to the event at the Irwin County Detention Center that my colleagues had—even though it is in my district—I was on the telephone with people who were there at the time, including our local hospital administrator. I have been to that facility, and one of the things I want everybody in this Congress to understand is, surgical procedures are not done at the Irwin County Detention facility. They are not. They are done at the Irwin County Hospital.

So when you talk about procedures being done at the Irwin County Detention facility, it is just false. They are done at the Irwin County Hospital. The detention facility is not set up to do surgical procedures.

So the question is: How do we get here?

Well, there was a whistleblower complaint filed by a group named Project South on September 14, 2020. I have a copy of the complaint. The complaint focuses on COVID and the challenges that the facility may or may not have had with COVID. And every facility in the United States, including this Congress, had challenges with personal protective equipment and COVID, and how we were handling those issues.

Now, in this complaint, which focuses predominantly on COVID, they make an allegation of hysterectomies. And I read to you from one of the AP articles: ''But a lawyer who helped filed the complaint said she never spoke to any women who had hysterectomies. Priyanka Bhatt, staff attorney at the advocacy group Project South, told The Washington Post that she included the hysterectomy allegations because she wanted to trigger an investigation to determine if they were true.''

And the investigation has been triggered. And we all want the investigation to go forward, and we want the facts to come out. And nobody wants the facts to come out more than those of us who live in that area. Nobody wants the facts to come out more than the doctor and the hospital and the staff at that hospital and the people who work at the detention facility.

Madam Speaker, I share with you a couple of quotes from some other AP articles. This is from The Washington Post: ''The advocacy group that filed the complaint, Project South, did not make the hysterectomy allegations the focus of its September 14 complaint to DHS, a complaint that alleged there is poor medical care and novel coronavirus risks at the ICE facility.''

The attorney at Project South who was the lead investigator for the complaint said in an interview with The Washington Post that she did not speak to or identify any women who had undergone a hysterectomy.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD the Washington Post article.

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 22, 2020]

HOSPITAL WHERE ACTIVISTS SAY ICE DETAINEES WERE SUBJECTED TO HYSTERECTOMIES SAYS JUST TWO WERE PERFORMED THERE

(By Nick Miroff)

A hospital in rural Georgia where a physician has been accused of performing a large number of hysterectomies on immigrant detainees said its records show that just two women in immigration custody have been referred to the hospital for the procedure since 2017.

Heath Clark, an attorney for ERH Healthcare, which operates the Irwin County Hospital, said both of the procedures were performed by Mahendra Amin, the physician whom activists have accused of carrying out forced sterilizations on immigrant women in U.S. Customs and Immigration Enforcement custody.

According to a complaint filed last week by immigrant advocates and attorneys, a former nurse who worked at the Irwin County Detention Center, Dawn Wooten, claimed that a doctor known as ''the uterus collector'' was subjecting female ICE detainees to unwanted hysterectomies. The doctor was later identified in news reports as Amin. Through attorneys, he has denied the accusations, and calls to his office were not answered Tuesday.

Clark said hospital records show that Wooten's claims are ''demonstrably false.''

''These allegations are disturbing and sensational, but they are not supported by reality,'' said Clark, speaking by phone from Nashville. ''Dr. Amin is a longtime member of the Irwin County Hospital medical staff and has been in good standing for the entirety of his service to the Irwin County community.''

The allegations of forced sterilizations received significant attention from lawmakers, news organizations and human rights groups last week. Attorneys who represent several women have come forward to say that their clients received gynecological treatments from Amin that they did not agree to or fully understand, including one former Irwin detainee, Pauline Binam. Binam said that one of her fallopian tubes was removed without consent.

Binam's deportation to Cameroon was halted last week at the behest of Rep. Sheila Jackson Lee (D–Tex.).

Amin has a private clinic near the detention facility, but the hospital is the only place where such a procedure would be performed in small Irwin County, Clark said. Amin does not have an ownership stake in the hospital, contrary to some news reports, Clark said.

Rep. Bonnie Watson Coleman (D–N.J.), one of the lawmakers who participated in a virtual hearing Monday to discuss the ICE report, called Wooten's allegations of sterilization procedures on ICE detainees ''one of the most inhumane things I have ever heard.''

Rep. Pramila Jayapal (D–Wash.) wrote a letter signed by 173 lawmakers demanding a DHS inspector general investigation.

''There may be at minimum 17 to 18 women who were subjected to unnecessary medical gynecological procedures from just this one doctor, often without appropriate consent or knowledge, and with the clear intention of sterilization,'' Jayapal said.

In a subsequent interview, Jayapal acknowledged that she did not know the details of each of those cases, but the number she cited referred to the clients of attorneys with whom she had spoken.

The advocacy group that filed the complaint, Project South, did not make the hysterectomy allegations the focus of its Sept. 14 complaint to DHS, a complaint that alleged there is poor medical care and novel

coronavirus risks at the ICE facility. But it was the allegations of forced sterilizations that triggered a firestorm.

''The rate at which the hysterectomies have occurred have been a red flag for Ms. Wooten and other nurses at ICDC,'' the Project South complaint said, without identifying other nurses.

According to Project South, ''Ms. Wooten explained: 'We've questioned among ourselves like goodness he's taking everybody's stuff out . . . . That's his specialty, he's the uterus collector. I know that's ugly . . . is he collecting these things or something . . . . Everybody he sees, he's taking all their uteruses out or he's taken their tubes out.'''

Priyanka Bhatt, the attorney at Project South who was the lead investigator for the complaint, said in an interview with The Washington Post that she did not speak to or identify any women who had undergone a hysterectomy. Bhatt said she included the allegations to spark an investigation into their validity.

The legal director at Project South, Azadeh Shahshahani, said by email Tuesday: ''We have already heard from multiple attorneys representing numerous women who have suffered abuses reflected by Ms. Wooten's whistleblowing disclosures. Some of these women are considering speaking up because Ms. Wooten courageously stepped forward. There has been a troubling pattern of misreporting on the health and welfare of detained immigrants held inside ICE facilities, and we look forward to Congress, the Inspector General, and all other relevant offices conducting a full investigation and applying immediate, necessary, corrective actions.''

ICE said its own records show that two female detainees at Irwin have been referred for hysterectomies since 2018. Officials at ICE said the agency would have records of such procedures, which would require the approval of a supervising medical officer at the agency. ICE officials say they are cooperating with investigators.

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Madam Speaker, here is another article from Reuters: ''Mexican Foreign Minister Marcelo Ebrard said on Thursday that the government has not yet found any proof of forced sterilization of Mexican women being held at migrant detention facilities in the United States.''

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD this article.

[From Reuters, Sept. 24, 2020]

NO EVIDENCE OF STERILIZATION OF MIGRANT MEXICAN WOMEN, SAYS FOREIGN MINISTER

(By Reuters Staff)

MEXICO CITY (Reuters).—Mexican Foreign Minister Marcelo Ebrard said on Thursday that the government has not yet found any proof of forced sterilization of Mexican women being held in migrant detention facilities in the United States.

The comments came after U.S. immigration officials earlier this month said a federal watchdog would investigate complaints made by a whistleblower nurse in a Georgia immigration detention facility who alleged detainees had improperly received hysterectomies and other gynecological procedures.

Ebrard told reporters that 20 of 24 female Mexican nationals being held at detention centers in the U.S. states of Georgia and Texas had been interviewed and none of them had been subjected to such procedures.

He added, however, that an investigation was ongoing as more women still needed to be interviewed.

Ebrard at the time described such potential abuse as ''unacceptable'' and said that if the procedures were confirmed, measures would have to be taken, without giving details.

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Madam Speaker, now somewhere between September 14 and September 25, H. Res. 1153 was drafted. And I think that that date is extremely important because the resolution was drafted before you even went to the ICE detention facility in Irwin County. It was drafted before you even got on the site to see what was actually happening. The hospital administrator was there at the facility on the 26th. And there are a couple of things I want to point out:

One, the hospital administrator is a lady. She is a good lady and she is a good hospital administrator. And the doctor is an immigrant.

Now, everyone who came to that facility had the opportunity to meet with the hospital administrator, and every single one of you refused the opportunity to get the facts from the hospital administrator.

Never mind the facts. And you wonder why people hate us up here.

Madam Speaker, I have a statement I would read from the Irwin County Hospital, who wants a complete and thorough investigation: ''Irwin County Hospital is aware of various allegations of misconduct against individuals being detained at the Irwin County Detention Center.

''Irwin County Hospital is committed to the safety and welfare of everyone in our care, including patients referred for care from the Irwin County Detention Center. From 2017 to the present, two individuals in detention at the Irwin County Detention Center were referred to Irwin County Hospital for hysterectomies.''

You have made accusations of mass sterilization. You should be embarrassed by your conduct.

You don't want an investigation because you don't want the facts.

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

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Madam Speaker, ''From 2017 to the present, two individuals in detention at the Irwin County Detention Center were referred to Irwin County Hospital for hysterectomies. Mahendra Amin, MD, performed these two procedures. Dr. Amin is a long-time member of the Irwin County Hospital medical staff and has been in good standing for the entirety of his service to the Irwin County community.

''Irwin County Hospital is and will continue to cooperate with any and all regulatory investigations related to healthcare services provided at Irwin County Hospital.''

Dr. Amin has only performed two hysterectomies in 3.5 years on detainees at Irwin County Hospital. This has been acknowledged by independent reviews by ICH, ICDC, ICE, and even the Associated Press.

Independent peer review has confirmed those cases were medically necessary.

Irwin County Hospital is the closest hospital facility to the Irwin County Detention Center.

The CEO of Irwin County Hospital was available to the Hispanic Caucus during their visit to the detention center. The warden made the Caucus aware of her presence at the facility and availability and no questions nor interaction was made by the Caucus. You absolutely refused to even speak to the lady that runs the local hospital because you don't want the facts.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD this statement released by the hospital.

Irwin County Hospital is aware of various allegations of misconduct against individuals being detained at the Irwin County Detention Center.

Irwin County Hospital is committed to the safety and welfare of everyone in our care, including patients referred for care from the Irwin County Detention Center. From 2017 to the present, two individuals in detention at the Irwin County Detention Center were referred to Irwin County Hospital for hysterectomies. Mahendra Amin, MD performed these two procedures. Dr. Amin is a long-time member of the Irwin County Hospital medical staff and has been in good standing for the entirety of his service to the Irwin County community.

Irwin County Hospital is and will continue to cooperate with any and all regulatory investigations related to healthcare care services provided at Irwin County Hospital.

Ms. SCANLON. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CORREA).

Mr. CORREA. Madam Speaker, I thank Ms. SCANLON for yielding, and I rise in support of H. Res. 1153.

First of all, let me say to my colleague from Georgia, I was there on that trip and I was not aware that the hospital administrator was offering to meet with us. I was meeting with the people that would want to meet with me and would want to talk to me. As a matter of fact, I had a lot of discussions with a lot of members of ICE while I was there.

As a member of the Committee on Homeland Security, I have visited a number of ICE detention centers, especially in the State of California. But I must say nothing has prepared me or had prepared me for what I had found, what I saw and what I heard at the Irwin Detention Center.

This was the first time that I have heard individuals in ICE custody desperate to be let out—anywhere—to get out. Women crying, asking not to be left alone. They cried that we—please not forget us—don't forget them.

And yet, their stories had one very common theme. When asking for medical care, when asking for gynecological care, the care they received was without their consent and they had no idea what was going on, what they were doing to them.

The medical doctor that was delivering the healthcare—and I believe my colleague from Georgia mentioned his name—is a doctor that has allegedly been fined half a million dollars. He and his medical practice paid half a million dollars in fines.

So I would ask, why does the U.S. Government, why would ICE, contract with a healthcare provider that has been fined half a million dollars?

And if these women complained about their medical problems, they were placed in what was called isolation for observation. Many of them described it as solitary confinement for days. Solitary confinement that caused psychological pain. These women were scared. They were traumatized, they were scared to ask for further medical treatment and they wanted to be sent home.

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

Ms. SCANLON. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CORREA. Madam Speaker, first, we had child separations. Now we have mistreatment of women. This has to stop.

We need investigations. We need oversight. We need accountability. This is not going away.

Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague, Ms. JAYAPAL, for bringing this resolution forward, and I ask all the Members of this body to support this resolution.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, yield myself such time as I may consume. Again, we are all for investigations. Two investigations are already going on; one by the office of Inspector General; one by DHS. I wrote a letter, along with Representative CHRIS SMITH, to the DHS Secretary Chad Wolf last week, saying: Please investigate this, get back to us.

The problem that I have with this resolution is that it also condemns ICE, just based on allegations that haven't even been investigated. The findings haven't been done yet. So how can you condemn an agency based on allegations that haven't even been proven yet? That is the point.

That is what Mr. SCOTT was trying to say. There are opposing viewpoints. One side said this happened, another said it didn't.

So last night, in addition, in Rules Committee, I said: Why don't we postpone this resolution until October 9? Give it a week. Let's go through committee and find out what is exactly going on. Let's have DHS come in. But, no, they opposed that, too.

Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS), my good friend.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, it is not a surprise why we are here. To the gentlewoman from Arizona, it is not a surprise. They have nothing else to put on the floor except political statements a month before an election and to further an agenda that they don't like with ICE and the immigration process, which we have heard now in the Committee on the Judiciary for well over 2 years. Again, there are no actionable items that actually can fix them but a lot of talk.

So let's continue with this just amazing reason we are here on the floor. Because the majority has embraced this absurd and baseless accusation that employees and doctors at the Irwin County Detention Facility in my State of Georgia are engaged in a conspiracy—this is amazing—with local doctors to systematically sterilize illegal aliens.

They have proven to the American people that no story is too outlandish to use in furtherance of their radical agenda.

It would be a completely different situation if we were standing here today to take action on substantiated claims of mistreatment, but we are not.

We are here today so that the majority can attempt to squeeze one last bit of value out of the false claims propagated by Project South's complaint about the Irwin County Detention Center in Ocilla, Georgia. The left knows these complaints are not true, but they are hoping we will ignore the mountain of evidence contradicting them—Madam Speaker, I have news for them—we are not.

If claims of mass hysterectomies were true, or even if they were substantiated by the smallest amount of evidence, then there would be swift action. But to the contrary—and to the dismay of my Democrat colleagues—the claims of mass hysterectomies were quickly proven false mere days after the complaint was released. In fact, as Mr. SCOTT said, just days later, both the hospital and the detention center confirmed only two such hysterectomies were performed since 2017.

Madam Speaker, that didn't stop the whistleblower. That didn't stop Project South. That didn't stop us from bringing this show to the floor of the House.

In fact, in the complaint Ms. Wooten called the doctor at the center a uterus collector. Where does he go to get his reputation back from somebody who in a group who makes basic claims?

I need to remind Project South; they don't have speech and debate privileges like we do. They ought to be careful about who they are slandering and how they are doing it.

Ms. Wooten said she has spoken out about several inmates who have had hysterectomies. Even more sensationalized, Ms. Wooten stated that: Everybody he sees has a hysterectomy—just about everybody. This is what she is saying about the doctor.

Project South alleges that a detainee at the facility had talked to five different women detained between October and December 2019 who had hysterectomies done. But both the detention facility and the local hospital have clear evidence directly contradicting this hearsay: records showing that only two detainees have had hysterectomies since 2017. Let that sink in: Only two since 2017.

How can they claim mass hysterectomies performed by the uterus collector are true? The simple answer is they are not.

In fact, Project South's attorneys and lead investigator admitted to The Washington Post that she had not even spoken to or identified a detainee claiming to have undergone a hysterectomy. The group providing these claims has no evidence to back them up, but nonetheless, we are here embracing them and continuing to perpetrate a falsehood. Sounds like a little bit of another resolution that we are dealing with here today.

As the facts have come out to disprove these absurd claims, did the Democrats acknowledge they were wrong? No. There has been no acknowledgment of their wrong. They conveniently shifted their argument to uninformed consent and expanded the allegation to medical procedures generally and the lack of adequate translation services to strengthen their faulty arguments. But even those failed.

According to the employees at the facility, the center has 24-hour access to interpreters for virtually every language, which they consistently utilize. In fact, they even have several remote interpreters who specialize in relaying medical terms and advice to non-English speakers.

Clearly, the majority does not care about the credibility of their witnesses and their whistleblowers. They want the publicity. They want the political aspect of this because we are coming to the real reason. As long as they espouse these claims, it allows them to continue their attack on two places: The President and law enforcement. We have seen this during the sham impeachment, and we are seeing it here again today.

The Democrats have already expended a lot of time and effort trying to make the claim in this complaint true by writing letters to DHS IG and traveling to Ocilla. In fact, just 2 days after the release of Project South's complaint, 173 Democrats wrote DHS IG urging an investigation centering their call almost entirely on Ms. Wooten's debunked claims of mass hysterectomies.

Madam Speaker, now that is a mass progression to something—173 on a debunked complaint that has already been done. They have conveniently failed to update the DHS IG and the American public that their claims of a eugenics conspiracy in south Georgia have been proven false.

They have also conveniently failed to mention that, according to its website, Project South is committed to ending the use of local police to enforce what they characterize as the Federal Government's draconian and racist immigration policies. Further, the group

boasts a goal of shutting down immigration centers and is a frequent user of the hashtag, #abolishICE.

To set the record straight, Representative AUSTIN SCOTT and I wrote a letter to the DHS IG to shed light on the developments that followed Project South's complaint and the group's anti-law enforcement, anti-Trump agenda.

□ 1215

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

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, in the quest of their further radical agenda, the left has cast a shadow over an entire town in Georgia.

This is more than just political fodder here for this floor when the majority has nothing else to put on this floor and is wasting the American people's time here. This goes back to disparaging a respected doctor in the community, an Indian-American immigrant, who provides free medical services to low-income patients simply for political gain. The doctor has been viciously slandered by the left's accusation that he carried out mass hysterectomies.

Frankly, he should sue these organizations.

It is truly sad to see the lengths that the majority is willing to go to advance their own misguided policies, and they should apologize to the doctor and to the center.

It is clear to me that Project South has ulterior motives, and it is dangerous that the majority is permitting the group's complaint to serve as the foundation of a resolution when so many of the claims have already failed under scrutiny, and the credibility of the entire complaint is shattered by Project South's anti-ICE motives.

Despite Democrats' wishes, the American people deserve to know the truth, and they deserve to see the motives behind the claim. An investigation is always there; an investigation can start. But it is pretty amazing that the investigation—173 of my majority colleagues rushed to sign a letter without even knowing the facts, and especially because it has salacious details that they could get at ICE and to get at a system that they don't like, actually protecting the American public, enforcing our immigration laws.

Project South is an anti-law enforcement organization that has a stated mission of shutting down detention facilities. They included patently false claims in a complaint to the DHS IG.

Detention facilities like the Irwin County Detention Center serve an important purpose in upholding our Nation's immigration laws, and efforts like this one to disparage them and shut them down by choosing to ignore facts in favor of fiction is disgraceful, not even meeting with the hospital administrator.

Again, what are we here for? This is shown to be exactly what it is. This train is on the tracks. We are putting this up here for political purposes because, frankly, Madam Speaker, the majority has nothing else to put up, so let's get a last couple of days in to throw at our favorite targets: ICE and this administration. And who cares who we hurt, a hospital, a community, and a doctor who simply was doing his job.

This is an investigation that needs to happen, and the smear needs to stop now.

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

Wow, that was hard to follow. Just to take a couple pieces there.

There is no allegation here of mass hysterectomies. What there are allegations of, which have been strengthened over the intervening 2 weeks, are allegations that numerous women were subjected to inappropriate medical care. And their medical records, as we begin to receive them, are starting to confirm that there were a variety of procedures that were committed upon these people without their consent, including total and partial sterilization, but a range of procedures.

You know, Madam Speaker and I both come from Pennsylvania. We have seen this kind of corruption before in our prison systems, where you have a private prison system that gets involved in providing care—in Pennsylvania, it was called the ''kids for cash'' scandal, where public officials were being given kickbacks for interning children.

Now, is that what is going on here? The investigation may substantiate that or it may not, but there is a lot that needs to be dug into: the appropriateness of the medical care, whether someone was profiting off what happened there, the humanity of what happened to these women. All of that needs to be looked into.

That is what the resolution is asking for, that this be investigated, because the allegations are so serious, and everything we have seen so far has supported them.

Now, the IG is moving to investigate, and Congress has started to investigate. While there was a general invitation to folks to attend the codel that went down there last week, nearly a dozen of our colleagues did go. They met with people down there.

This is just a first step. There will be hearings. We will get to talk to the professionals from the community.

No one is saying that the investigation is complete, and no one is saying that it is completely proven, but it is absolutely something this body must do: to act, to make sure that our government agencies are not participating in a scheme that deprives people of their basic human rights.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Hampshire (Ms. KUSTER).

Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania for the time to speak as colead on this important resolution, to establish a thorough investigation. I know that we have colleagues across the aisle who want this investigation, and I ask them to join us today.

Before having the privilege to serve in Congress, I was an adoption attorney for 25 years. I sat with 300 birth mothers as they make the most profound, private, and consequential decision of their lifetime.

In America, the government should not interfere in this most personal and intimate decision. Any type of sterilization, without consent, is a shocking and wrong interference.

I ask my colleagues: How many hysterectomies would be sufficient for a resolution? Would a partial hysterectomy without consent, for those who hold themselves out to be pro-life? These are women who want to have children. We can find common ground.

In America, the government should not interfere, and that is why I and so many Members of this Congress were shocked and horrified, first, to read about the whistleblower complaint; then the expose in The New York Times, with even more detail; and, finally, to speak with our colleagues, the codel that took the time to go to Irwin, Georgia, over the weekend and to sit and speak with the women who have had unspeakable surgery on them without their consent or understanding.

This chilling report outlines invasive gynecological procedures, ranging from full abdominal hysterectomy to the removal of ovaries and fallopian tubes.

We will acknowledge, not every surgery was a full hysterectomy, but that should not keep us from helping these women who have come forward detailing the pain and the trauma that these procedures have inflicted with life-changing consequences.

These procedures, performed without consent, in some cases result in the woman's inability to ever have a child, to ever bear a life. We have removed that life choice without her consent. And women who want to bear a child should have that right.

In America, the decision of whether to have a child rests squarely with women and is protected by the United States Constitution and 50 years of precedent under the law; yet we find ourselves amidst a renewed national conversation about whether women can make healthcare decisions about their own bodies and whether they can have the choice to bear a child.

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

Ms. SCANLON. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from New Hampshire (Ms. KUSTER).

Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire. Madam Speaker, these are the most difficult and private decisions that women will make, and the government should never have a role in that decision.

So make no mistake about it: Women's reproductive health and well-being is under attack in America, and whether that battleground may be a detention facility in Georgia or the highest court in the land, we must speak out, in unequivocal terms, to condemn efforts that take away a woman's ability to make her own healthcare decisions, including when and whether to bear a child.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

If we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to immediately consider Small Business Committee Ranking Member STEVE CHABOT's H.R. 8265, to reopen the Paycheck Protection Program to America's 30 million small businesses.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. LESKO. This amendment would ensure our Nation's smallest and most vulnerable firms get the support they need by allowing an opportunity for a second PPP loan with specific funds set aside for small businesses with 10 or fewer employees, expand the list of eligible covered expenses, simplify the loan forgiveness process, and extend PPP through the end of 2020.

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

Mr. ROY. Madam Speaker, to this body, I say enough, enough of the swamp games.

The House needn't wait for the powers that be to meet in a dark room and come out and tell us what so-called deal has been cut, whether it is the Speaker, the Treasury Secretary, or anybody else. And I shouldn't have to learn what is in the bill from K Street on Twitter.

Nor should the House take up a partisan $2 trillion bill with no chance of becoming law, and you know exactly that is what it is.

This is the people's House. We should act like it. We should debate. We should vote. We should actually do our job and amend.

To my House Democratic freshman colleagues: Your Speaker is playing political games with people's lives.

We are used to it. We are used to the Speaker playing games:

With immigrant's lives, shouting: kids in cages, for Obama policies rather than supporting security;

Refusing to call out antifa, or refusing to come to this floor and have this body stand with our law enforcement officers—not once;

Supporting Iran over Israel;

Refusing to stand against the extermination of babies born alive;

Seeking to destroy American oil and gas and energy freedom and cheap energy in favor of radical Green New Deal policies;

Working to take away your private doctors, taking away your private insurance; and

Killing 6 months of this body's time with partisan impeachment proceedings.

But this is a whole other level.

In June, the Heroes Act, $3 trillion in partisan hackery with no chance of passage.

But in June, I, along with freshman Democrats, led by my friend DEAN PHILLIPS, worked together and passed the PPP Flexibility Act. We saved jobs.

We now know that, according to the S&P, 13.6 million jobs have been saved nationally; in the district I represent, 90,000 jobs, 18,500 businesses, $633 million.

But small businesses are still struggling. Forty-seven percent of PPP borrowers say they need additional support to survive.

Right now, we have a bipartisan piece of legislation specifically designed and ready to help small businesses, but we are not debating or voting on it. Instead, the Speaker chooses what? Political messaging resolutions that won't do a darn thing.

Worse yet, the Speaker is again purposely choosing legislation that is designed to fail: a tax cut that will go exclusively to the wealthy; banking for marijuana businesses; PPP loans to Planned Parenthood; billions to bail out State and local governments; environmental justice grants; weed diversity studies; soil health studies; stimulus checks for illegal immigrants; bailouts for Amtrak; and bailouts for the National Endowment for the Arts. And the kicker? Refusing to call out antifa.

And the one thing cut from the first Heroes Act? Law enforcement funding: $300 million for COPS grants, $300 million for State and local law enforcement officers.

Why won't the Speaker—why won't Democrats—stand with our law enforcement? Why won't they stand for small businesses instead of playing games on the floor of this House, the people's House? It is an absolute abomination.

I urge my colleagues to reject the ways of the swamp. Let's unite together and vote ''no'' on the previous question and work to help small businesses right now.

Ms. SCANLON. Madam Speaker, of course, I look forward to joining my colleagues in passing another round of coronavirus relief, as we did unanimously or near unanimously the first four times, because we know our communities, our colleges, our schools, our State and local governments, our law enforcement officers, our healthcare systems all need that relief that has been held up by the Senate and the White House since May.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN).

Mr. COHEN. Madam Speaker, I came here for the purpose of commending Representatives MALINOWSKI and RIGGLEMAN for bringing the resolution condemning QAnon and its baseless, racist theories. But having heard some of the remarks today, I have to tell you: Speaker PELOSI is standing up for American values and standing up for the least of us, while the Republicans are standing for the most of us.

The Republicans passed a $150 billion tax break for the richest Americans, people like Donald Trump who don't pay taxes. They get a 4-year backlog to file losses in real estate deals to cut out their taxes.

They won't do anything for children in a child tax credit, but they think that that policy of giving people, on average, a $1.6 million tax benefit to the richest 1 percent is good values. That is not good values. That is bad values.

That is not good values; that is bad values. And the Republicans ought to object to that because it is making them the party of greed and tax weaselers and the bad people in America and not caring about the least of these.

□ 1230

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CLOUD) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. CLOUD. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to call up H.R. 8265 to extend the Paycheck Protection Program to help small businesses and the families they represent.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would advise that all time has been yielded for the purpose of debate only.

Does the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania yield for the purpose of this unanimous consent request?

Ms. SCANLON. No, Madam Speaker. I do not yield for that purpose, and I have no intention of doing so during this debate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Pennsylvania does not yield; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. STAUBER) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. STAUBER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to call up H.R. 8265 to extend the Paycheck Protection Program to keep millions of employees on the payroll of America's small businesses.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. WALORSKI) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mrs. WALORSKI. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to call up H.R.

8265 to extend the Paycheck Protection Program to keep millions of employees on the payroll of America's small businesses.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. ROY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to call up H.R. 8265 to extend the Paycheck Protection Program to keep millions of employees on the payroll of America's small businesses and continue the benefits that we have done through bipartisan work previously.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

The Chair would advise Members that even though a unanimous consent request is not entertained, embellishments accompanying such request constitute debate and will become an imposition on the time of the Member who yielded for that purpose.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SMUCKER) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. SMUCKER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to call up H.R. 8265 to extend the Paycheck Protection Program to keep millions of employees on the payrolls of America's small businesses.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to call up H.R. 8265 to extend the Paycheck Protection Program to keep millions of employees on the payrolls of America's small businesses.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to call up H.R. 8265 to extend the Paycheck Protection Program to keep millions of employees on payrolls of America's small businesses.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. KEVIN HERN) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to call up H.R. 8265 to extend the Paycheck Protection Program to keep millions of employees on the payroll of America's small businesses.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. NORMAN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to call up H.R. 8265 to extend the Paycheck Protection Program to keep millions of employees on the payroll of America's small businesses.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JOHNSON) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to call up H.R. 8265 to extend the Paycheck Protection Program to keep millions of employees on the payroll of America's small businesses.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HILL) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to call up H.R. 8265 to extend the Paycheck Protection Program to keep millions of employees on the payroll of America's small businesses.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to call up H.R. 8265 to extend the Paycheck Protection Program to keep millions of employees on the payroll of America's small businesses.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BABIN) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. BABIN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to call up H.R. 8265 to extend the Paycheck Protection Program to keep millions of employees on the payroll of America's small businesses.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WALKER) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. WALKER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to call up H.R. 8265 to extend the Paycheck Protection Program to keep millions of employees on the payroll of America's small businesses.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BAIRD) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. BAIRD. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to call up H.R. 8265 to extend the Paycheck Protection Program to keep millions of employees on the payroll of America's small businesses.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. WATKINS) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. WATKINS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to call up H.R. 8265 to extend the Paycheck Protection Program to keep millions of employees on the payroll of America's small businesses.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. CRAWFORD) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to call up H.R. 8265 to extend the Paycheck Protection Program to keep millions of employees

on the payroll of America's small businesses.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. KELLER) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to call up H.R. 8265 to extend the Paycheck Protection Program to keep millions of employees on the payroll of America's small businesses.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to call up H.R. 8265 to extend the Paycheck Protection Program to keep millions of employees on the payroll of America's small businesses.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. GARCIA) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. GARCIA of California. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to call up H.R. 8265 to extend the Paycheck Protection Program to keep millions of employees on the payroll of America's small businesses.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to call up H.R. 8265 to extend the Paycheck Protection Program to keep millions of employees on the payroll of America's small businesses.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to call up H.R. 8265 to extend the Paycheck Protection Program to keep millions of employees on the payroll of America's small businesses.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to call up H.R. 8265 to extend the Paycheck Protection Program to keep millions of employees on the payroll of America's small businesses and keep our businesses open and functioning.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SCANLON. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, let me thank the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania and thank my colleagues for this vigorous discussion and the unanimous consent.

I want to give them comfort. Tomorrow, we will be able to vote on the Heroes bill that we ask each and every one of them to support to provide moneys not only for small businesses but nonprofits and faith institutions because we believe in the American people, and we are going to keep them working.

I look forward to them joining this bipartisan effort, supporting the Heroes bill that we have offered under the leadership of Speaker PELOSI.

□ 1245

I rise today to support both H. Res. 1153 and H. Res. 1154.

I traveled to Irwin County this past weekend, but my exposure to this tragedy was not just that day; just last week, with butterflies in my stomach, if you will, and concern for a young woman, 29 years old, about to enter onto a plane that she obviously was directed to go to a place that she had never been, or had not been since she was 2 years old, a young woman from Cameroon who did have, who admits that her fallopian tube was removed without her consent.

So people of color are not unused to having medical procedures without our consent. Women are not unused to and unfamiliar with having medical procedures without their consent.

Think about these women, speaking mostly a different language, detained for civil matters, and that is, not being statused. Young women, women intimidated in the midst of COVID–19 in a facility where there is one physician who is supposed to be an OB/GYN, and you are carted off like cattle in a bus with one diagnosis: Oh, you need a fallopian tube removed.

Let my friends on the other side of the aisle be reminded that they have been throwing the word ''uterus'' and other words around the floor of the House.

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

Ms. SCANLON. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman from Texas an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, this is not a condemnation of ICE. Read the language. It just says that they should engage in more vigorous oversight, and they are doing that with an inspector general's investigation.

Look at this. This is from one of the women:

Liberty, we are daughters and we are mothers, but you are stopping us from doing that.

And H. Res. 1154 that I join in supporting, as well, condemning QAnon, talks about a better America, that we are not the way it is described in this resolution.

I ask my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying bills because we are daughters and we are mothers, and what is going on there is an atrocious condition that should not exist.

I ask my colleagues to join me, and I thank my good friend from Pennsylvania for yielding.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. CHABOT. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to call up H.R. 8265 to extend the Paycheck Protection Program bill that I introduced to keep millions of employees on the payroll of America's small businesses.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would advise that all time has been yielded for the purpose of debate only.

Does the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania yield for the purpose of this unanimous consent request?

Ms. SCANLON. Madam Speaker, I do not yield.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Pennsylvania does not yield; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to call up H.R. 8265 to extend the Paycheck Protection Program to keep millions of employees on the payroll for America's small businesses.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr.

BALDERSON) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. BALDERSON. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to call up H.R. 8265 to extend the Paycheck Protection Program to keep millions of employees on the payroll of America's small businesses.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. JOYCE) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to call up H.R. 8265 to extend the Paycheck Protection Program to keep millions of employees on the payroll of America's small businesses.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TIPTON) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. TIPTON. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to call up H.R. 8265 to extend the Paycheck Protection Program to be able to keep millions of employees on the payroll of America's small businesses.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BISHOP) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to call up H.R. 8265 to extend the Paycheck Protection Program to keep millions of employees on the payroll of America's small businesses.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MEUSER) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. MEUSER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to call up H.R. 8265 to extend the Paycheck Protection Program to millions of employees on the payroll of America's small businesses.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. PALMER) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. PALMER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to call up H.R. 8265 to extend the Paycheck Protection Program to keep millions of employees on the payroll of America's small businesses.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MARSHALL) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. MARSHALL. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to call up H.R. 8265 to extend the Paycheck Protection Program to keep millions of employees on the payroll of America's small businesses.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. OLSON) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. OLSON. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to call up H.R. 8265 to extend the Paycheck Protection Program to keep millions of employees on the payroll of America's small businesses.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to call up H.R. 8265 to extend the Paycheck Protection Program to keep millions of employees on the payroll of America's small businesses.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUDD) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. BUDD. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to call up H.R. 8265 to extend the Paycheck Protection Program to keep millions of employees on the payroll of America's small businesses.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, in closing, we need to help the American people. The House should be considering a bipartisan COVID–19 relief package right now, not binding resolutions that simply have the purpose of making political points.

Our constituents need us, so let's get to work on a bipartisan package that could actually be signed into law because, let's face it, anything else is worthless to the American people.

Madam Speaker, I urge ''no'' on the previous question, ''no'' on the underlying measure, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

We are in trying times. We have an erratic administration that operates with the primary, if not exclusive, goal of winning reelection at any cost and a Republican Party willing to do anything necessary to aid in that goal.

We are in the midst of a global pandemic that has already upended virtually every facet of our lives. Millions of people are unemployed or facing unemployment, and over 207,000 of our friends and neighbors have died.

Many of my constituents are facing eviction or are struggling to find food for their families.

The fact that much of this suffering could be alleviated if not for the apathy of Senate Republicans is tough to reckon with, but the American people know who is on their side.

This Congress has passed more than 600 bills, and a quarter of them have become law. Over 350 bipartisan bills lie untouched on MITCH MCCONNELL's desk while he focuses all of his energy on confirming as many rightwing judges as he can.

We stand ready to negotiate, and we will pass a COVID relief bill every day and twice on Sundays if that is what we have to do to get MITCH MCCONNELL's attention. And we will do it while passing other legislation that is for the benefit of all the American people—not just a select few, not just for those who dodge taxes—because that is what governing is, and that is what we will continue to do.

We have a duty to provide an equal opportunity for all Americans to live, work, and thrive in this country, and that is a responsibility the administration and Senate majority leader have abdicated.

So for all of the criticism lobbed from the other side of the aisle for taking up important resolutions like the ones we do today while a COVID package still hasn't been signed into law, your words are misplaced and you know exactly who to blame.

We were elected to govern, and that is exactly what we are going to do. You are more than welcome to join us, but we are not going to let you stand in our way while we move to protect human

rights and advance the best interests of the American people.

Madam Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support the rule and underlying legislation.

The text of the material previously referred to by Mrs. LESKO is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 1164

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 3. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall proceed to the consideration in the House of the bill (H.R. 8265) to amend the Small Business Act and the CARES Act to establish a program for second draw loans and make other modifications to the paycheck protection program, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any 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 Small Business; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 4. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 8265.

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

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

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

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

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

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

QUESTION OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Speaker, I rise to raise a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has been made aware of a valid basis for the gentleman's point of personal privilege.

The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Speaker, I appreciate being recognized here on the floor of the United States House of Representatives, and throughout the years I have had the privilege to serve Iowans and Americans here. This is a great deliberative body, although sometimes we miss the facts.

And I know that there is a phrase that I heard back in a political era, which is, whenever you lose a vote, you can sometimes use this analysis:

Nor is the people's judgment always true: the most can err as grossly as the few.

And that has happened a number of times in my 18 years that I have served in this Congress. This is the 116th Congress, and if someone were to ask me, well, what was your favorite session of Congress, I don't have to worry about the 116th being on that list.

□ 1300

But I rise to focus on a specific circumstance here, and that is a misquote of me that was driven into just a national feeding frenzy. It was validated by this Congress, this misquote.

And when I stood on the floor of this Congress and made a statement to describe what likely happened in an interview with The New York Times that took place in early January of 2019, I made the point on what that statement was, and the statement was regarding white nationalists, white supremacists. There always was a pause between those two odious ideologies and the term ''western civilization.''

I advised Congress that there would be a distinct pause to demonstrate a new thought started rather than jamming those three ideologies together.

Who would compare white nationalism and white supremacy, those odious ideologies, who would compare them to western civilization, the very foundation of American civilization, the foundation of the First World, and here, America, the flagship of western civilization today? There is no comparison and should never be equated between the two.

Yet, I didn't tie that thought together, but the stenographers did.

And I am not here to be a critic, because they have done terrific work for me over the years, and their skill set, and their professionalism are second to none. They are the best in the world, as far as I am concerned, but if they can make a mistake, so can The New York Times, which is my point.

So in this narrative, Madam Speaker, I will take you back a little way. And I want the Congress to know what all has transpired here that brought us to the point of the feeding frenzy and the political lynch mob that was here that day on about January 12 or so, or January 13, and it was this: that during my election in the year 2018, November of 2018, there was a national media focus on attacking me. That happens in other races, but I don't know that it ever happened as intensively as it did in my race.

In any case, we came through that with a 3.4 percent victory, and I thought that was the end of it. I expected that I would come back. You know, even your political opposition needs a rest from time to time, and so after the election is when they take a deep breath, retool, and get ready for the legislative session.

But I sat down with a political operative, who was one of the top political campaign managers at the presidential level in the Nation, and a successful one at that. He came in to give me a little bit of his advice, and as I am listening to that, he said: They are going to try again. They are going to try again to drive you out of office with a national media assault on you, and they are going to attack you with everything. They will throw everything at you. He didn't say but the kitchen sink, but I got the message.

And when he first brought that up, Madam Speaker, I passed it off, because I didn't take it seriously. Nothing like that had ever happened before in the history of this country that I knew.

And he brought it up a second time, and I passed it off again, because I didn't take it seriously. But the third time, he got my attention.

And the third time he brought it up, he said: They are going to make another run at you.

This was the day before Thanksgiving of 2018, by the way. He said: They are going to make another run at you, and they believe that they were—this meaning Democrats, yes, but also Republicans, establishment, the swamp creatures, the elitists, those folks, and also the media. They are going to make another run, because they believe that the midterm elections of 2018 were a bit distracting, they had other races to be concerned about, and so, therefore, they couldn't bring all their guns to bear on this Member of Congress from the Fourth District of Iowa.

So he did have my attention by then. And as much as it didn't seem plausible, his advice to me was this: They have a messenger that they will send to the President, a messenger whom the President trusts and who has his ear, who is going to be directed to convince the President to send out a negative tweet on Congressman KING, and that negative tweet will be the trigger that launches another media assault, all the broadsides that they can get on this Member of Congress. And he used these words: And they believe they can force you to resign.

Now, that is a hard concept to get into your head when nothing like that had ever happened before and there was no substance for that to be based upon, but he did convince me.

So I set about preempting this, at his advice, and I did, to the extent I could, preempted it at the White House. And I think history proves that that has been successful. President Trump has not taken a shot at me, even though there were many others who couldn't resist the press's temptation to take a cheap shot, but the President did not. So I take it that the effort to preempt it at the White House was at least partially successful.

Yet, I couldn't get a meeting with the messenger until January 8, 2019. So on January 8, I had that meeting with the person that was at least named as the potential messenger, and in that conversation, I was assured: I would never do that to you, STEVE. Be assured that that won't happen.

Well, I was fairly confident that those words were honest, and actually felt pretty happy about it when I walked out of that meeting. But I also suspected that the people that were