



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 166

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MAY 27, 2020

No. 99

Senate

The Senate was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Thursday, May 28, 2020, at 11 a.m.

House of Representatives

WEDNESDAY, MAY 27, 2020

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CUELLAR).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
May 27, 2020.

I hereby appoint the Honorable HENRY CUELLAR to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

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

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with time equally allocated between the parties and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

BLACK LIVES MATTER

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

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, and still I rise, as I rise today, Mr.

Speaker, to speak the truth about the circumstance as it relates to African Americans in the United States of America.

I rise to say, Mr. Speaker, that Black lives do not matter as much as White lives. If Black lives matter as much as White lives, Mr. George Floyd would still be breathing. If Black lives matter as much as White lives, Ahmaud Arbery would have finished his jog. If Black lives matter as much as White lives, Christian Cooper wouldn't have been falsely accused.

Black lives do not matter as much as White lives. Why? Because we tolerate hatred, bigotry, and invidious discrimination. We tolerate it. And because we tolerate it, we allow it to be perpetuated.

We in this country have the power to do something about the racism that exists as it relates to Black people. We have tolerated it since 1619 and the arrival of Black people in the Americas. But it is time for us to do something about it.

We have had the opportunity to do something.

When the Chief Executive Officer of this country is a racist and a bigot, we should do something about that. And we had the opportunity to, but we did not. We tolerated it. And there were some who went so far as to almost justify it with some of their commentary about the comments that were being made: Oh, he is just a jerk.

Black lives matter, and we ought not tolerate it to the extent we have.

I believe that we in the Congress of the United States of America have a

duty to do what has been done in the past. We declared a war on poverty. We declared a war on drugs. Why not declare a war on racism? Why not decide that, here and now, we are not going to allow racism to continue in this country to the extent that people lose their lives?

What happened to some of the persons who have lost their lives as of late is almost predictable, because we have seen circumstances similar occur and we have not taken aggressive action.

The officers in the Floyd case should not only be arrested; they ought to be prosecuted. I was a magistrate. I know probable cause when I see it, and there is probable cause to arrest and prosecute those officers.

Black lives matter. And those who have not allowed the Black Lives Matter movement to continue, to become the movement that could make a difference in the lives of people in this country, have some responsibility because they fought the very movement that was going to make a difference in the lives of people, may have saved some lives of people.

So I rise today, Mr. Speaker, to say that we in Congress have some responsibility to the people we serve; and a part of that responsibility is to assure them that they can go jogging and return home, that if they are arrested by the police, they won't be suffocated to the extent that they lose their lives. We have to make sure that we tell this country, in no uncertain terms, that Black lives do matter.

And, finally, this: It is not about Democrats and not about Republicans.

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

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



Printed on recycled paper.

H2285

I am not blaming the Republicans for what is happening. I am not blaming the Democrats for what is happening. I am blaming people who hold public trust and tolerate hate and invidious discrimination.

We are the people who can make a difference, and we ought to make a difference. We ought to demand that the people running for public office make public statements about how they plan to end invidious discrimination, not how they plan to tolerate it, how they plan to manage it.

How do you plan to end it?

How do you plan to end it in banking?

How do you plan to end it in hiring and promotions?

This is our time. If we don't do it now, when will we do it? No candidate should be off limits. Every one of them ought to have to tell us what they plan to do.

And, finally, as my final comments: I love my country. And because I love my country, I feel that I have this duty, obligation, and responsibility to speak up when these kinds of injustices occur.

I love my country, Mr. Speaker.

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

FOLLOW THE SCIENCE, FOR A CHANGE

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

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, just a few months ago, America enjoyed the most promising economic expansion in our lifetimes, lifting millions of Americans out of poverty, boosting wages for American workers, and producing the lowest unemployment rates in 50 years. Today, the American economy lies in rubble, with tens of millions of Americans thrown into unemployment, poverty, and despair.

Now, that damage was not done by a virus. It was done by ordering entire populations into indefinite home detention, shuttering countless businesses, and desecrating the most fundamental human rights that our Constitution demands our government to protect.

Now, we are told to follow the science and data. That would be nice, for a change.

What does the science tell us about the severity of COVID-19? Well, we know that about 80 percent of those who get it either have no symptoms at all or experience it as a mild respiratory infection. In New York, 74 percent of those who died were over age 65 and six one-hundredths of 1 percent were under the age of 18. Three-quarters of those who died had underlying medical conditions.

So how does it follow the science to close the schools where it poses the

least danger while packing infected patients into nursing homes where it poses the greatest danger?

Once epidemiologists began surveying general populations, they discovered the disease isn't nearly as severe as the claims that set off the global panic. Researchers at Stanford University surveyed the population of Santa Clara, California, and estimated a fatality rate of seventeen one-hundredths of 1 percent. New York serology tests revealed a fatality rate of one-half of 1 percent.

So, simply stated, if you get the flu, your chance of survival is 99.9 percent; and according to these studies, if you get COVID-19, your chance of survival is better than 99.5 percent.

So how does this science justify throwing nearly 40 million Americans into unemployment?

Does the science support population-wide lockdowns?

In 2006, based upon an Albuquerque teenager's science paper, the Bush administration proposed mass lockdowns in the event of a severe flu pandemic. Leading epidemiologists warned at the time that: "The negative consequences of large-scale quarantine are so extreme that this mitigation measure should be eliminated from serious consideration." It wasn't.

New York Governor Andrew Cuomo has now admitted that 84 percent of COVID-19 hospitalizations in New York are people who are either already quarantined at home or are at nursing homes.

Statistical analysts, including Stanford University's Michael Levitt, Tel Aviv University's Isaac Ben-Israel, Kentucky State University's Wilfred Reilly, and Cypress Semiconductor's T. J. Rodgers, are finding no significant statistical difference in the infection curves between those jurisdictions that have destroyed their economies and those that haven't. In fact, a study by J.P. Morgan has found an inverse relationship as economies began to open back up.

A study of 318 outbreaks involving 1,245 cases in China found just one outbreak that occurred outdoors, involving just two cases. Eighty percent of the outbreaks occurred in people's homes. So how does it follow the science to close outdoor venues and order people indoors?

Mr. Speaker, it is high time we considered how many Americans will die because of the COVID-19 lockdowns. The Well Being Trust predicts up to 75,000 "deaths of despair" due to suicide and drug and alcohol abuse because of the lockdown.

In March, the Epic Health Research Network warned of a 94 percent decline in breast, colon, and cervical cancer screenings. The Rape, Abuse & Incest National Network reports a 22 percent increase in children calling for help.

A 2011 Columbia University study funded by the National Institutes of Health estimated that 4½ percent of all deaths in the United States are related

to poverty. So how does it follow the science to destroy the livelihoods of millions of Americans, cut them off from their social networks, force them into isolation, and plunge them into poverty and despair?

Now, I don't blame public health officials. They have the luxury of ignoring the effect of their policies beyond their area of expertise. The responsibility rests, rather, with public officials who failed to consider the catastrophic collateral damage that they have caused, who became so drunk with power and so besotted with self-righteousness that they lost any reference to common sense or any concern for the damage they have done.

NEED FOR FIFTH CORONAVIRUS STIMULUS BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) for 5 minutes.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor to echo the rising chorus for a fifth coronavirus bill and to applaud three vital provisions addressed to the special circumstances of the District of Columbia in that bill.

Speaker NANCY PELOSI and the Democrats have taken needed initiative in introducing the HEROES Act to get ahead of this virus, instead of chasing it.

The first four bills have proven themselves. Jurisdictions following the CDC guidelines, like the District of Columbia, are seeing deaths decrease. Across the country, careful reopenings are occurring. To be sure, scientists are warning of prolonging the virus unless there is more social distancing and masking, because that is far from universal.

But my Republican friends have called for a pause. Of course, we have seen unprecedented spending, but this is an unprecedented virus. The virus has shut down the entire world.

I am pleased that Republicans may be declaring the end of their pause barely a week after House passage of the HEROES Act. Yesterday, the Senate majority leader said Congress will probably have to pass a fifth bill. Thank you, Senator MCCONNELL.

President Trump said—and I am quoting him—"I think the United States will need another round of stimulus."

They may be following Federal Reserve Chairman Jerome Powell, who said more is needed for the economy shortly after the April report showed a 14.7 percent unemployment rate.

Mr. MCCONNELL only wants to fund increased losses due to COVID-19, whatever that means. But tailoring the next bill based on whether COVID-19 or something else caused the losses would require an inexact calculus that itself could bog down the next bill, particularly what I regard as the most essential part of the HEROES Act, \$1 trillion for State and local government.