

people of faith from the greater Miami area for over a century. The church has provided summer camps and afterschool programs for children, worked to feed the homeless, and assisted families facing hardships. Rooted in the values of Ministry, Mission, and Service, the church is a valued and integral piece of our community and history.

I am deeply grateful to Macedonia Missionary Baptist Church for its dedication to serving the Miami area. May the church continue this excellent work for many years to come.

RECOGNIZING THE 10TH ANNIVERSARY OF DISTRACTED DRIVING MONTH

HON. RAJA KRISHNAMOORTHY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 20, 2020

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to join thousands of organizations and individuals around the country in observation of Distracted Driving Awareness Month. First recognized by Congress 10 years ago, this commemoration brings attention to the persistent problem of distraction on our Nation's roadways.

More than 700 people still die or are injured every day in the U.S. as a result of distracted driving crashes. According to a recent survey released by the National Safety Council—a nonprofit based in my district—only 62 percent of drivers were “very willing” to obey state laws preventing cell phone use. This tells me drivers fail to see the dangers of distracted driving.

Research shows that using electronic devices increases cognitive distraction. This can be deadly on the road, where a split-second distraction can cause a crash. Approximately 2,841 people died in distraction-affected driving crashes in 2018—that's eight people every day dying from a completely preventable cause—and this is widely believed to be undercounted as many states do not include the option on crash reports to document distracted driving. We have to close these gaps, and that starts with raising awareness.

Despite a decrease in traffic volume during the pandemic, crash fatality rates have risen at an alarming level, with estimates that the rate of death on our roadways was 20 percent higher in the first six months of 2020 versus the same time period last year. We've taken cars off the roads, but we haven't reaped any safety benefit.

Recognizing these dangerous trends, last year I was proud to introduce the SAFE TO DRIVE Act with my colleagues Mr. GALLAGHER and Mr. COHEN, to incentivize states to pass laws eliminating distraction on our roadways. I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting passage of this legislation. We need it now more than ever.

As we mark the 10th Anniversary of Distracted Driving Awareness Month, I encourage all motorists to commit to driving attentively and safely and to avoid using cell phones and in-vehicle technology that take attention off the task of driving. I also hope my colleagues will join me this month in raising awareness about this important issue. Do it for all of our constituents. Their lives are more valuable than any call, email, or text.

HONORING MARK GUETHLE OF THE INTERNATIONAL UNION OF PAINTERS AND ALLIED TRADES (IUPAT) UPON HIS RETIREMENT

HON. BILL FOSTER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 20, 2020

Mr. FOSTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Mark Guethle of the International Union of Painters and Allied Trades (IUPAT). With a long and illustrious career working for the citizens of North Aurora and Kane County, Mark has distinguished himself as a valuable and dedicated member of the community.

Mark has served as the Director of Government Affairs of the Painters Union since the early 2000s. Throughout his career, Mark has been dedicated to advocating for working people and their families. I have been lucky to work closely with him on a variety of labor issues to benefit working families in Illinois, and I am proud to call him my friend.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Mark Guethle's exemplary service to the people of Aurora and congratulating him on a prominent career.

IN RECOGNITION OF DANIEL J. FORTE

HON. RICHARD E. NEAL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 20, 2020

Mr. NEAL. Madam Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to recognize Mr. Daniel J. Forte as he completes his 35-year tenure with the Massachusetts Bankers Association. After joining the MBA in 1985, Daniel ascended to the position of President and CEO in 1997 and has since developed close relationships with many bankers, lawmakers, and banking regulators in New England and across the country.

Representing 72,000 employees across 130 banks, his contribution to the New England banking community cannot be overstated. His accomplishments include working in conjunction with the Massachusetts Congressional Delegation to support the passage of the 2010 Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, various pieces of banking modernization legislation, and the Emergency Economic Stabilization Act of 2008. He will be remembered by his colleagues for his leadership, integrity, strong faith, wit, and attention to detail.

I'm proud to recognize Daniel for his distinguished service to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and the New England banking community. I wish him, his wife Stella, and their two children the best of luck in their future endeavors.

OPPOSITION TO THE NOMINATION OF AMY CONEY BARRETT AS ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF SUPREME COURT

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 20, 2020

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, as senior member of the House Committee on the Judiciary, as citizen of the United States, as a mother, and as a African American woman I rise in my strong opposition to the nomination of Judge Amy Coney Barrett to replace the late Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg on the Supreme Court of the United States.

I oppose this nomination because Judge Barrett's extreme record on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, along with her ideologically driven writings and speeches, demonstrate that she is incapable of rendering equal justice under law.

Judge Barrett is hostile to *Roe v. Wade*, 410 U.S. 113 (1973), and to Supreme Court cases upholding the Affordable Care Act (“ACA”) and is being nominated to be the decisive vote on the Court to reverse these landmark rulings, so that millions of people can be deprived of access to essential health care services and abortion access.

One highly respected legal commentator who has studied her record in depth called Judge Barrett's record on the bench “fundamentally cruel” and said that she “has either written or joined a remarkable number of opinions that harm unpopular and powerless individuals who rely on the judiciary to safeguard their rights.”

The rush to confirm Judge Barrett is a key part of this impeached and dissembling president's corrupt scheme effort to avoid a peaceful transfer of power and remain in office at any cost.

Indeed, the President recently admitted that he wanted a ninth justice in place because he believes the Supreme Court will end up deciding the election winner, and he wants another loyalist on the Court to tip the scale in his favor.

No justice confirmed under these circumstances would have legitimacy in a case bearing on the outcome of the presidential election, so it is troubling that Judge Barrett has not stated publicly that she will recuse herself from participating in any such case.

By nearly a two-to-one margin, Americans believe that the winner of the upcoming presidential election should fill the current Supreme Court vacancy.

In this they are in lockstep agreement with the principle enunciated by Senate Majority Leader MCCONNELL on February 13, 2016, when he refused to even confirmation hearings, much less a floor vote, for President Obama nomination of Judge Merrick Garland to succeed Justice Scalia:

The American people should have a voice in the selection of their next Supreme Court Justice. Therefore, this vacancy should not be filled until we have a new president.

This principle was echoed by the current Judiciary Chairman GRAHAM who stated in 2016:

I want you to use my words against me. If there's a Republican president in 2016 and a vacancy occurs in the last year of the first term, you can say Lindsey Graham said let's

let the next president, whoever it might be, make that nomination.

Before she became the beneficiary of this 180 degree reversal in principle, even Judge Barrett herself enthusiastically agreed with Majority Leader McCONNELL and Judiciary Committee Chairman GRAHAM that the Senate could and should refuse to advise and consent to a Supreme Court nomination made in an election year, especially where the nomination would alter the ideological balance of the Court.

The legitimacy of the federal judiciary stems from the public's faith that its decision-making is fair and impartial but the rush to confirm Judge Barrett will deeply tarnish the integrity and reputation of the Supreme Court.

As a group of former federal judges counseled in their letter to Senate leaders:

Our nation is on the precipice of a national election and is in the grip of a global pandemic. Our citizenry is sharply polarized—a foreboding sign for the health of any democracy. The judicial confirmation process has increasingly become dangerously politicized. Injecting a Supreme Court confirmation fight into this noxious mix will unalterably change and diminish the public's faith in this vital institution.

Let me now turn to the specific harm to the American people that will result if this nominee were to be confirmed as an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court.

Judge Barrett is expected to be the deciding vote to strike down the constitutionality of the Affordable Care Act, or "ObamaCare," depriving millions of people with access to health care amidst the worst public health crisis this nation has witnessed in over a hundred years.

The ACA provides critical health care protections to millions of people, including an estimated 130 million Americans with pre-existing conditions such as the seven million Americans who have tested positive for COVID-19.

If this crucial health care access is stripped away, it would have a particularly devastating impact on communities of color and people with disabilities; the rate of Black people who are uninsured would dramatically increase 20 percent, and an estimated 5.4 million Latinos, 2 million Asian Americans, Native Hawaiians, and Pacific Islanders, and 300,000 Native Americans could lose coverage, and Americans with disabilities would be particularly impacted, with the uninsured rate for people with disabilities rising by up to 42 percent.

Invalidation of the ACA would not only remove critical health care protections for people with pre-existing conditions and people with disabilities, it would disproportionately harm people of color and potentially jeopardize access to a COVID-19 vaccine, the Medicaid expansion that has brought health care to tens of millions of people, critical nondiscrimination provisions, coverage for those under 26 who are currently on their parents' health care insurance plan, insurance coverage for substance abuse treatment including opioid addiction, and the removal of caps that insurance companies previously placed on expensive medical treatment.

The Supreme Court is set to decide the fate of the ACA and its protections for people with pre-existing conditions this term and will hear oral arguments in *California v. Texas*, ___ U.S. ___, No. 19-840 (2020)—the legal challenge to this vital law—on November 10, just one week after Election Day, and that is why the President and his Senate acolytes are

rushing forward with this nomination to try to install Judge Barrett on the Court in time to kill the ACA, a feat they have tried but failed to accomplish 70 times through the legislative process.

In *Doe v. Purdue University*, 928 F.3d 652 (7th Cir. 2019), Judge Barrett wrote an opinion that allowed a male student—who was credibly accused of committing multiple sexual assaults and suspended from the university—to advance a Title IX lawsuit against the university alleging he was discriminated against because he was a man.

Judge Barrett's ruling turned a sex discrimination statute on its head, using a law meant to prevent and address sexual assault to promote impunity for that very same behavior and will discourage universities from disciplining male perpetrators of sexual violence since doing so may result in their being sued for sex discrimination.

Judge Barrett's opinion in this case intimidated erroneously and intentionally that the U.S. Department of Education's Obama-era 2011 Title IX guidance calling on schools to take sexual harassment seriously resulted in discrimination against men—even though this guidance prohibited the unfair procedures the male student alleged he experienced.

It is unconscionable that we are even considering replacing Justice Ginsburg's legacy with a judge who is willing to allow sex discrimination laws to be used as a sword for men rather than a shield to protect women.

In the field of criminal justice and procedure, Judge Barrett's judicial record raises serious questions about whether she would be fair to victims of law enforcement misconduct; she has regularly ruled for law enforcement and against defendants in criminal cases and people in prison, often in dissent, reflecting her extreme views.

For example, Judge Barrett dissented in *United States v. Uriarte*, No. 19-2092, 2020 WL 5525119 (7th Cir. Sept. 15, 2020), where the Seventh Circuit, sitting en banc, applied the reduced mandatory minimum sentencing requirements of the First Step Act, an important, bipartisan criminal justice reform measure passed by Congress and signed into law in 2018.

In a 9-3 opinion, the Seventh Circuit held that at the time of the enactment of the First Step Act, Hector Uriarte, a federal defendant, was convicted but not yet sentenced, and therefore eligible for the First Step Act's reduced sentencing procedure.

Mr. Uriarte was resentenced under the First Step Act to a term of 20 years, and the Trump administration challenged that new sentence, and predictably Judge Barrett authored the dissent, siding with the Trump administration that the First Step Act did not apply to the defendant.

In another case, *McCottrell v. White*, 933 F.3d 651 (7th Cir. 2019), the majority reversed the district judge's finding that the guards had fired "reasonable" warning shots and remanded the case but Judge Barrett dissented, siding with prison guards who fired buckshot from their shotguns, significantly injuring two inmates, and opining that the inmates should be denied the opportunity to prove at trial that excessive force was used against them in violation of the Eighth Amendment.

Judge Barrett's reasoning was so unreasonable that the majority was moved to note that "the dissent suggests that firing two shotguns

loaded with buckshot into the ceiling of a crowded dining hall cannot be deemed to be malicious and sadistic or even characterized as an intentional application of force without a showing that a guard 'intended to hit or harm someone with his application of force.' That standard is met here."

The scourge of gun violence kills nearly 40,000 Americans every year but Judge Barrett's record indicates she would likely be a pivotal vote on the Court to support the gun lobby and strike down common-sense gun safety laws.

In *Kanter v. Barr*, 919 F.3d 437 (7th Cir. 2019), a Seventh Circuit panel majority consisting of Reagan held that a law barring felons from possessing a firearm did not violate the Second Amendment but unsurprisingly Judge Barrett dissented, accusing the majority of treating the Second Amendment as a "second-class right" and stating that she believed the ban on gun possession should only apply to violent felons.

And outrageously, Judge Barrett also concluded that it was appropriate to deny non-violent felons the right to vote but not the right to bear arm, writing "history does show that felons could be disqualified from exercising certain rights—like the rights to vote and serve on juries—because these rights belonged only to virtuous citizens."

We do not need a Supreme Court Justice whose world view is that the right to own an AR-15 is more precious and valued than the fundamental right to vote.

Upon Judge Barrett's nomination to the Supreme Court, the Giffords Law Center stated:

Judge Barrett holds Second Amendment views that are far more extreme than conservatives like Justice Antonin Scalia. Her willingness to disregard established precedent and strike down gun safety laws is too radical for this country and even past Republican administrations.

Moreover, it is clear that based on her statements and judicial record, Judge Barrett is incapable of serving as a fair and neutral arbiter in reproductive rights cases, including those involving abortion, contraception, and perhaps even fertility care.

In 2006, Judge Barrett signed her name to a two-page advertisement in a South Bend, Indiana newspaper calling for the end of the legal right to abortion—which, under her extremist views, includes some forms of birth control and in vitro fertilization but she failed to disclose this document in her Senate Judiciary Committee questionnaire.

In 2012, Judge Barrett signed a letter entitled "Unacceptable" that protested the Obama administration's good faith effort to create a compromise in carrying out the ACA's requirement ensuring comprehensive birth control coverage, an accommodation permitted eligible employers and schools to opt out of covering birth control but still ensure that the workers and students had access to seamless coverage of essential care.

As a signatory to this letter, Judge Barrett demonstrated that she is willing to eschew science in favor of her own personal biases and thinks employers can deny their workers birth control coverage.

And unsurprisingly, Judge Barrett's judicial record reflects her deep hostility to reproductive freedom.

In *Planned Parenthood of Ind. & Ky., Inc. v. Adams*, 937 F.3d 973, 981 (7th

Cir. 2019), Judge Barrett voted to rehear a case involving an Indiana abortion restriction that judges already deemed likely unconstitutional.

The Indiana law put minors in dangerous situations by requiring them to notify their parents even if a judge already found the minor to be mature enough to make this decision without involving a parent, which the district court noted that “the requirement of providing parental notification before obtaining an abortion carries with it the threat of domestic abuse, intimidation, coercion, and actual physical obstruction.”

The Indiana law was in clear violation of longstanding Supreme Court precedent, and the three-judge Seventh Circuit panel that blocked the Indiana law found that it would likely impose “an undue burden for the unemancipated minors who seek to obtain an abortion without parental involvement via the judicial bypass.”

Yet Judge Barrett joined a dissent that questioned whether the plaintiffs could even challenge the law before it went into effect, arguing erroneously that the status of pre-enforcement challenges in the abortion context” was “unsettled” and deserved full court review.

In another case, *Planned Parenthood of Indiana & Kentucky v. Commissioner of Indiana State Department of Health*, 917 F.3d 532 (7th Cir. 2018), Judge Barrett voted in dissent to rehear a case already deemed unconstitutional and joined a dissent that argued that a state should be able to restrict abortion when the reason for that choice is the fetus’s gender, race, sex, or fetal diagnosis (often known as “reason bans”), even though that provision was not being considered in the decision before the court.

President Trump has bragged repeatedly that he would only nominate justices who would “automatically” overturn *Roe v. Wade*, 410 U.S. 113 (1973); it is clear that Judge Barrett has passed his litmus test.

Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg was a fearless champion of justice and the conscience of the Court so it is doubly outrageous that the Senate majority is attempting to rush through Judge Barrett’s nomination rather than addressing the many urgent challenges that are gripping our nation at this moment—from the devastating impact of the worst public health crisis in a hundred years, to the racial reckoning over police brutality and violence, to the need to safeguard our democracy by helping fund the election and U.S. Postal Service.

At a time when more than 215,000 Americans have lost their lives to COVID-19 and the need for health care access is more acute than ever, this President and this temporary Republican Senate majority has chosen to subordinate passing legislation to aid an ailing nation to stealing and filling a Supreme Court vacancy with a nominee hostile to health care access, hostile to women’s rights, and indifferent to the plea for equal justice being voiced across the country by Americans of every race, creed, color, religion, and region.

Madam Speaker, I end where I began: Judge Barrett’s extreme record on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, along with her ideologically driven writings and speeches, demonstrate that she is incapable of rendering equal justice under law.

I urge this nomination be defeated and that this vacancy not be filled until after the election of the next President of the United States.

RECOGNIZING OSCARIN ORTEGA AS CONSTITUENT OF THE MONTH

HON. MIKE LEVIN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 20, 2020

Mr. LEVIN of California. Madam Speaker, it is my honor to recognize Oscarin Ortega, Founder and Executive Director of Lived Experiences, a local youth outreach program, for my October Constituent of the Month. Born and raised in Oceanside, Oscarin launched Lived Experiences in 2018 to provide critical support and resources for underserved kids and teenagers in my District.

After studying the effects of early childhood trauma and understanding the hardships on a deeply personal level himself, Oscarin wanted to ensure others could be set on a life path of success by providing the proper resources and guidance to help them flourish. Through training and mentoring, Oscarin educated himself on various restorative and therapeutic practices that could help him and others overcome the damages of their past. With programs dedicated to healing and hope, Lived Experiences prides themselves on encouraging their amazing kids to embrace their brightest futures.

Oscarin has also stepped up to support local youth during the COVID-19 pandemic, which has exacerbated food insecurity, domestic abuse, and financial hardships. Seeing these strains particularly heightened among his youth and staff, Oscarin and Lived Experience set up food drives, school supply donations, fresh haircuts, community events, and much more to help alleviate the challenges of these unprecedented times. With the support of the community, the Lived Experiences team has so far distributed a total of 270,413 pounds of food to working families in Oceanside.

I launched a Constituent of the Month program to recognize individuals who have gone above and beyond to make our region and our country a stronger place for everyone to live and thrive. Today, I am proud to recognize Mr. Ortega as my Constituent of the Month, and I thank him and his team at Lived Experiences for being incredible role models and positive examples for the youth in our community. I am honored to represent such an outstanding leader in my district.

SPINA BIFIDA AWARENESS MONTH

HON. KEVIN HERN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 20, 2020

Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for one minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

I rise today in honor of National Spina Bifida Awareness Month to pay tribute to the numerous individuals and their families across our country living with this condition.

Spina Bifida is a condition I am very familiar with. My sister and my niece both suffer from spina bifida. I know how it can impact a family.

Spina Bifida is the nation’s most common permanently disabling birth defect compatible

with life. Because Spina Bifida stems from a hole in the spinal cord, a condition known as a neural tube defect, as the spinal column fails to close properly during development in the womb, it impacts virtually every major organ system. Children born with Spina Bifida typically undergo dozens of surgeries before they become adults. Adults living with Spina Bifida face myriad physical health, mental health, and other challenges, such as unemployment and limited access to quality primary and specialty care.

There are currently an estimated 166,000 individuals in the United States living with Spina Bifida, approximately 65 percent of whom are adults. This disease is now witnessing its first generation of adults, an incredible milestone, considering that the original designation of Spina Bifida as a childhood condition meant that the vast majority did not experience life beyond youth.

We have taken tremendous steps forward in recent years due to dedicated medical research, but there is so much we still don’t know.

Unfortunately, funding for Spina Bifida is limited. The only place in the federal government that is specifically studying this complex condition for children and adults is the Spina Bifida Program at the National Center on Birth Defects and Developmental Disabilities at the CDC through the National Spina Bifida Patient Registry and the Spina Bifida Collaborative Care Network.

People with Spina Bifida deserve no less than the rest of us as we age. We must ensure that adults with Spina Bifida can receive high-quality medical care, and that researchers have the funds necessary to continue the development of treatments for spina bifida.

CELEBRATING THE WATER FORUMS 20TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. AMI BERA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 20, 2020

Mr. BERA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and celebrate the 20th Anniversary of the Sacramento Area Water Forum. I commend the Water Forum’s work on the Lower American River and for forging lasting partnerships with diverse organizations, including the US Bureau of Reclamation. The Water Forum and the Bureau of Reclamation have been strong collaborators on multiple habitat enhancement projects and on implementing the Modified Flow Management Standard.

With negotiations starting in 1993, the Forum has come a long way to provide cohesion in responsibly handling the water supplies and care of the Lower American River. Although the agreement was signed on April 24, 2000, today we celebrate this milestone of 20 years virtually as a community.

I want to thank the Water Forum members for the progress towards providing a safe and reliable water supply and the preservation of the fishery, wildlife and recreational values of the lower American River. I stand with the Water Forum today celebrating the opportunity to serve the Sacramento region in the future as we address climate change in our own community and across the nation.