

While the spotted lanternfly is harmless to humans, it can seriously impact our surroundings. The Pennsylvania Department of Agriculture estimates the potential damage in lost revenue from the spotted lanternfly could amount to \$18 billion per year, statewide.

I have been pleased to work with my colleague, Congresswoman HOULAHAN, to stress the importance of ridding the Commonwealth of this pest. It will take continued support to eradicate the spotted lanternfly and prevent further harm to our environment and economy.

I would like to encourage any Pennsylvanian who encounters a spotted lanternfly to get rid of it and to report an infestation to the Pennsylvania Department of Agriculture.

HONORING THE LEGACY OF FRED CERULLO, JR.

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

Mr. ROSE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the legacy of Fred Cerullo, Jr., a family man, a business owner, and a fellow Army vet.

For more than 40 years, Mr. Cerullo welcomed friends and neighbors to Owl's Head Service Center, the business his father established in Bay Ridge in 1956. He treated everyone who stopped by this neighborhood landmark as if they were family, so much so that even those who did not own a car would stop by to visit Fred.

After serving in the Army at Fort Dix, Fred passed his devotion on to his children, to include his son, Fred, my dear friend, who served New York City as a four-term city councilman and in several other roles in city government.

Today, my heart goes out to Fred Cerullo's family and to everyone whom he touched in such a wonderful way. May he rest in peace. We will never forget Fred's incredible legacy.

□ 1015

HONORING FRANCES COLEMAN

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

Mr. GUEST. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize retiring Mississippi State University Dean of Libraries, Frances Coleman, for her outstanding contributions to Mississippi's higher education and to the Starkville community. Over the course of her career, Dean Coleman championed unprecedented expansions of facilities, technologies, and programming throughout the MSU library system. She was instrumental in the transfer of the Ulysses S. Grant collection to Mississippi State's Mitchell Memorial Library, which established the university as one of only six campuses to hold a Presidential library.

Dean Coleman has received numerous recognitions for her service to our State, including the G.V. "Sonny" Montgomery Excellence in Leadership Award, and the lifetime achievement honor bestowed by the Mississippi legislature.

In addition to her professional achievements, she is also active in her community through the Rotary Club, the Starkville Chamber of Commerce, and the Aldersgate United Methodist Church.

Please join me in recognizing Dean Frances Coleman for her significant contributions to the great State of Mississippi.

WISHING GARRY AND JACKIE SMALL A HAPPY 65TH ANNIVERSARY

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to wish a happy 65th anniversary to Garry and Jackie Small of Chico. The couple wed in 1955 after meeting as students at Chico State University, but that is not where the close ties to the university stop.

Garry was a lifelong administrator, with titles ranging from director of plant operations to associate vice president for administration. Jackie worked at the bookstore working her way up, and eventually retiring from the Meriam Library on campus.

The Smalls have three daughters, Kari, Julie, and Lynn, and two grandsons, Keaton and Tyler.

Mr. Speaker, again I congratulate Garry and Jackie on 65 years and send them my best wishes and blessings for many years to come.

REMEMBERING ANDY QUINNEY

(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. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember and honor my friend, Andy Eugene Quinney, of Georgia's First Congressional District who passed away at the age of 64.

Mr. Quinney was born in Savannah, Georgia, and graduated from Robert W. Groves High School.

Andy was a dedicated insurance agent, serving Chatham County and the Lowcountry of South Carolina for over 4 decades, most recently working with Jimmy Swain of James M. Swain & Associates.

Andy took his leadership skills to new heights when he was the mayor of Garden City, Georgia, from 2002 to 2009.

One of his goals as mayor was to "put the garden back in Garden City," and that he did. He was blessed with a green thumb and could bring any plant or city back to life.

Garden City thrived thanks to his devout leadership and commitment to

improving the lives of its citizens. Andy was pivotal in making it the success it is today.

Andy was a pillar for the Masonic Lodge through his service as Worshipful Master and was one of the founders of the Band of Brothers.

Andy loved music, reading, and gardening, and he used all those gifts he was given for God's glory.

Everyone who encountered him would be met with an infectious smile, and it was evident that the joy of the Lord was his strength.

My thoughts and prayers will continue to be with my brother in Christ's friends and family during this most difficult time.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, July 28, 2020.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on July 28, 2020, at 10:14 a.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 881.

That the Senate agreed to without amendment H. Con. Res. 105.

That the Senate agreed to without amendment H. Con. Res. 106.

Appointment:

Independent Mexico Labor Expert Board.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

CHERYL L. JOHNSON,
Clerk.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 7617, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2021

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1067 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1067

Resolved. That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 7617) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2021, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. An amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116-60, modified by the amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. Clause 2(e) of rule XXI shall not apply during consideration of the bill. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to

final passage without intervening motion except: (1) 90 minutes of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations; (2) the further amendments described in section 2 of this resolution; (3) the amendments en bloc described in section 3 of this resolution; and (4) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. After debate pursuant to the first section of this resolution, each further amendment printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules not earlier considered as part of amendments en bloc pursuant to section 3 of this resolution shall be considered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, may be withdrawn by the proponent at any time before the question is put thereon, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

SEC. 3. It shall be in order at any time after debate pursuant to the first section of this resolution for the chair of the Committee on Appropriations or her designee to offer amendments en bloc consisting of further amendments printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution not earlier disposed of. Amendments en bloc offered pursuant to this section shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for 30 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their respective designees, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

SEC. 4. All points of order against the further amendments printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules or amendments en bloc described in section 3 of this resolution are waived.

SEC. 5. During consideration of the amendments described in sections 2 and 3 of this resolution, it shall not be in order to consider an amendment proposing both a decrease in an appropriation designated pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 and an increase in an appropriation not so designated, or vice versa.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE), 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

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule, House Resolution 1067, providing for consideration of H.R. 7617, the Defense, Commerce, Justice, Science, Energy and Water Development, Financial Services and General

Government, Homeland Security, Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, Transportation, Housing and Urban Development Appropriations Act of 2021.

The rule provides for consideration of H.R. 7617 under a structured rule, with 90 minutes of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. It self-executes a manager's amendment from Chairwoman LOWEY. It makes in order 340 amendments and provides that the chair of the Committee on Appropriations or her designee may offer amendments en bloc, which will be debatable for 30 minutes. Finally, the rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, the measure before us is what it looks like when you don't take an ax to our priorities, as the President has advocated, but instead, you invest in what is important to the American people. This is what it looks like when we actually lay the groundwork for a real recovery from the coronavirus pandemic, instead of just wishing it away as this President has done.

There are billions and billions of dollars in emergency funding here to build and repair water projects, to modernize energy infrastructure, and rebuild our Nation's crumbling infrastructure in this time of COVID-19. These projects will help get Americans back to work and kick-start our economy.

The bills included in this underlying package also make long-term investments in our Nation: In food safety, curbing tobacco use, and combating domestic abuse and sexual assault; all at levels that exceed the President's budget request.

There is also landmark grant funding to carry out police reform efforts, and, yes, even funding to address the health impacts of climate change because, Mr. Speaker, this majority believes in science, and we believe in facts.

This bill also includes provisions to stop costly, endless wars by sunseting the 2001 Authorization for the Use of Military Force, the AUMF, repealing the 2002 AUMF, and prohibiting funds for the use of force against Iran.

Just as important as what this measure does is what it ensures this administration cannot do: Like steal money for President Trump's ineffective border wall, implement its dangerous plan to restart explosive nuclear testing, or launch another endless war using the 2001 AUMF.

This is about addressing our Nation's emergency needs during this pandemic today, while building a strong foundation for the future.

Thinking that this pandemic will magically vanish, as this President has suggested, is not a plan. Hoping that COVID-19 just goes away without a vaccine, as this President has done, is not a plan.

Real resources like those in this bill, especially when taken with those in the HEROES Act that passed this

House over 2 months ago, will enable us to confront this virus and build a true recovery.

340 amendments were made in order under this rule, many of which will make this bill even stronger.

Among them is an amendment I authored to provide more money for radon testing and mitigation. A national investigation recently uncovered this harmful chemical in public housing units across the country, including in my hometown of Worcester, Massachusetts.

This administration, and HUD in particular, has an obligation to act. This language will help ensure more funding is there to help protect people's health and safety.

I am also proud that the underlying bill sets aside \$10 million to create a new nationwide pilot program to help the many grandparents who are raising their grandchildren today. This funding will provide more access to safe, affordable, and appropriate housing.

Mr. Speaker, there are two policy ideas put forward during this process that I especially want to highlight.

The first was an effort led by my good friend, Congressman BOBBY RUSH, to create a more 21st century approach toward Cuba. This President has taken us back to a failed Cold War policy that held our country back for more than 50 years, a policy that hurts the Cuban people, and a policy that denies American farmers and American businesses the opportunity to engage with their counterparts in Cuba. In short, our policy, Mr. Speaker, is an embarrassment.

The gentleman from Illinois wanted to mitigate some of the pain U.S. policies impose on the Cuban people by providing easier access to food and medicine and by making it easier for families in the United States to send support to their relatives still on the island, especially during this pandemic.

Now, although the gentleman from Illinois has withdrawn his amendments, I want to recognize him for his leadership. He has shined a bright light on a failed policy that badly hurts the Cuban people, and it urgently needs to change.

Mr. Speaker, we have to change our policy. We must and we will change our policy, and I look forward to being part of that effort. If we can trade with China and Russia and Vietnam, we certainly can trade with Cuba. If Americans can travel virtually to any country in the world, we ought to be able to travel to Cuba without restriction. And if we really care about human rights and human suffering, then we ought to recognize that the American blockade on Cuba is causing tremendous suffering to the Cuban people.

□ 1030

So I hope, Mr. Speaker, that we will in short order take a fresh look at our policy and move to a more mature, sensible, thoughtful approach to dealing with Cuba.

I thank my colleague from Massachusetts, Representative AYANNA PRESSLEY, along with Representatives LEE, OCASIO-CORTEZ, SCHAKOWSKY, CHU, DEGETTE, TLAIB, OMAR, POCAN, and SPEIER.

Together they led an important effort to repeal the Hyde Amendment. This disastrous policy prevents so many, particularly low-income women and women of color from deciding their own future.

Constitutional rights should not belong to just the wealthy or the privileged. They belong to every single American, regardless of where they get their health insurance.

And although this amendment wasn't able to be made in order here because of several budgetary points of order, I want to say loud and clear here today that they are right. We need to end this discriminatory policy, and I look forward to working with them to do just that. This is a fight that we must have.

Mr. Speaker, getting this broad package here today was a herculean effort by so many in this Chamber, and I urge all of my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying measure. Let's get our communities the resources they need, and let's get our economy back on its feet.

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts, the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and, Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, today's debate is on a rule providing for consideration of H.R. 7617, which contains 6 of the 12 annual appropriations bills recently reported by the House Appropriations Committee. These six bills include the two largest, Defense, and Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, as well as the titles covering Commerce, Justice, Science, Energy and Water Development, Financial Services and General Government, and finally, Transportation, Housing, and Urban Development.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Appropriations Committee, it is always encouraging to see the appropriations process moving forward. Passing these 12 bills is one of the biggest responsibilities we have as Members of Congress; to fund the government and keep it open and operating for our constituents.

Despite that great responsibility, I am disappointed by the partisan approach taken by the majority in crafting the bills in this package, and I cannot support them at this time.

I single out the majority in my comments because the 12 bills that were reported out of committee this year were all written to satisfy the concerns and wishes of one party, the Democratic party. While that is often how the appropriations process begins, it is ultimately

never where it ends. At the end of the day, for us to pass 12 full-year fiscal year 2021 appropriations bills, in an era of divided government, it will require Members on both sides of the aisle and in both Chambers of Congress to reach consensus. That ultimately means that the partisan bills like those we are considering today are non-starters and cannot become law.

During markup on these measures in the Appropriations Committee and again yesterday in the Rules Committee, Republicans rightfully raised several reasons why these bills cannot become law and should not pass the House. Those objections were ignored. Consequently, today's bill will have very little, if any, Republican support. That means these bills are effectively dead on arrival in the United States Senate and would never be signed by a Republican President, and there are a lot of reasons for that.

First, all 12 appropriations bills are marked at 302(b) allocation numbers that violate the fiscal year 2021 total spending limit negotiated in the current budget agreement just last year.

□ 1030

Indeed, I remind my friends, Congress is lawfully bound to uphold that agreement.

Instead of abiding by the negotiated numbers that were agreed to in both Houses of Congress by both parties and by the President, the majority has used a huge amount of emergency-designated funds as a workaround scheme to break that good faith budget agreement.

In this bill alone, there is well over \$200 billion in so-called emergency spending. That violates the budget agreement. This will make it much more difficult to negotiate final bills with the Senate that can actually become law.

But what is more disappointing than the widespread use of budget gimmicks is the prolific use of partisan policy riders throughout the appropriations bills, including these six. These riders are simply unacceptable, and they must come out before bipartisan agreement can be reached.

Consider the bill that I am most familiar with, which came out of the Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee, where I am the ranking member. The text of that bill includes a wide variety of harmful riders.

In the first instance, the bill includes partisan policy prescriptions that will tie the hands of the administration with respect to Title X family planning. Most notably, the riders would force the administration to resume grants awarded to controversial groups that provide abortions, such as Planned Parenthood, and it would prevent the administration from granting waivers that protect deeply held religious beliefs of institutions, organizations, and individuals that provide vital services funded in the bill.

The Labor, Health and Human Services title includes riders that would undo the Department of Labor's rule clarifying the so-called joint employer standard. If this policy rider were enacted, it would cause chaos for thousands of businesses and millions of employees, leaving them uncertain about the nature of their employment relationship.

Not to be outdone, the bill also includes riders micromanaging and second-guessing how Health and Human Services administers the Unaccompanied Alien Children Program, which will ensure that the individuals devoting their energies to assisting such unaccompanied minors will find themselves devoting their energy, becoming wrapped up in evermore deeply and congressionally mandated red tape.

The same can be said for the other divisions in this package. Throughout this minibus, the majority has inserted policy riders that tie the hands of the administration.

They have limited the ability of the administration to reprogram funds even when necessary. They have inserted rider after rider aimed at preventing the President from spending money on barriers and security measures at the southern border. And they have removed countless bipartisan policy revisions that have been routinely carried in previous years' bills.

Let me say it again: Partisan riders like these must come out before a bipartisan agreement can be reached.

On top of this, while I understand we are living through unprecedented times and have had to rightly limit our physical interactions, I have serious concerns about considering these bills in a six-division, trillion-dollar spending bill.

Debating these measures together as one shuts out the ability of most rank-and-file Members to have their ideas heard on the floor, or limits them to having their amendments included in massive all-or-nothing en bloc packages, and places many Members in an untenable all-or-nothing vote on both the en bloc packages and ultimately final passage of the bill.

We can do better than that, Mr. Speaker, and we must do better than that.

Mr. Speaker, I am still hopeful that we can reach a bipartisan appropriations deal for the full year. If we can get the prolific emergency spending and budget gimmicks out of these bills, and if we can eliminate all partisan policy riders, then I think the majority in the House will have a workable starting point to begin negotiations with the Senate toward a bipartisan deal.

Under such circumstances, they would still not be the bills I would have written, but they would be a reasonable basis on which to begin negotiations. But until then, these bills are going absolutely nowhere. They will not pass the Senate, and they will not be signed by the President into law.

Frankly, I do not believe they should be passed by this House, either.

Mr. Speaker, I urge opposition to the rule and the underlying legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I appreciate the gentleman's comments. And I acknowledge, I think we all acknowledge, that we are living in an unusual moment, dealing with a health pandemic that has already claimed the lives of 150,000 of our fellow citizens, that has infected millions of our other fellow citizens, and we are trying to do our best to operate and to get the people's business done amidst this pandemic.

So, we have given committee chairs en bloc authority to try to consider amendments en bloc so we can consider more ideas.

In the package that we are bringing before the House today, there are 341 amendments in order. Some of them will require separate votes on amendments because, quite frankly, there isn't a consensus on some of them. But many of them are good ideas that can be put in an en bloc amendment and be incorporated into this bill.

I just say that because the alternative in the middle of this pandemic is to have fewer amendments, and I don't think that that is something that Members would want to see happen.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI), a distinguished member of the Rules Committee.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the rule for H.R. 7617, the second appropriations package.

The funding included in this bill will advance crucial priorities like increased broadband access, advancing medical research, and supporting police reform. These investments are necessary as we continue to combat the spread of COVID-19 and encourage economic recovery.

By providing \$61 billion in emergency funding to the FCC, we can expand internet access to unserved and underserved households. As schools continue to adjust to distance learning, I believe every student, regardless of their family's ZIP Code or income bracket, deserves a reliable internet connection to participate in the modern classroom.

The rule also provides consideration of my amendment to advance breakthroughs in medical research. My amendment directs an additional \$4.5 million to DOD's Congressionally Directed Medical Research Program. This program funds high-impact projects, including medical research for rare diseases like bone marrow failure.

Some of you remember we lost my late husband, Bob Matsui, to MDS, a bone marrow failure disease. Countless other families across the country rely on the Defense program's work to discover and develop new therapies and cures, especially for rare diseases.

I am also very glad that this program dedicates \$400 million in grant funding

to help implement needed police reform. This includes pattern and practice analyses and independent investigations of law enforcement departments across the country.

While there is still much work to be done, this funding will move us closer to an America where all are treated equally under the law.

This is a strong comprehensive bill, and I look forward to supporting it on the floor soon.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to respond quickly to my friend.

While we appreciate the number of amendments made in order, let's just look at the statistics. Twenty percent of all the amendments in this bill are Republican, 60 percent are Democrat, 20 percent are bipartisan.

Frankly, I am pleased to have hit 20 percent, because for the year, we are down at about 17 percent of the amendments.

So while we appreciate the difficult conditions, I also remind my friend that in the last Congress, when we held the majority, they actually always had more amendments than the Republicans did. So let's not get carried away with the difficulties of the situation or the fairness of the process.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS), my good friend, a distinguished Member, and an outstanding member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding me the time.

We should at least comply with the law. I would think that a law-writing body, Congress, and the Appropriations Committee should at least follow the law.

Well, again, this rule doesn't do that, and this bill doesn't do that. Let me explain what I am talking about.

Spent nuclear fuel and defense waste is at 121 sites in 39 States across this country. The DOE, Department of Energy, was supposed to take title to this spent fuel and this defense waste in 1998.

Appropriators will like to hear this number. We spend unbudgeted out of the Judgment Fund \$2.2 million every day—\$2.2 million unbudgeted—unappropriated through legal action because we are not complying with the law.

□ 1045

The Nuclear Waste Fund currently is booked as having \$40 billion in it, Mr. Speaker, and that \$40 billion comes from ratepayers, not even Federal money. It is people whose States have nuclear power. They pay into this fund to find a safe disposal site.

Over the past 30 years, \$15 billion has been spent. I brought examples of that \$15 billion. Mr. Speaker, this is one box of five of the Department of Energy's scientific analysis of the safety of Yucca Mountain, the long-term repository. They finished that, and then they turned over all of their science.

Let me tell you who was part of this billions of dollars of research by eight national labs, which comes through this appropriation bill. Eight labs, the U.S. Geological Survey, and many universities helped do this research. Then, they sent this research to our independent nuclear safety agency called the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, and they issued a five-volume report.

This is the fifth volume of that, which says: Using Yucca Mountain as a long-term geological repository would be safe for a million years, not 10,000 years, not 100,000 years, not 500,000 years, a million years.

Now, who did this research? Well, you had experts in geochemistry, hydrology, climatology, structural geology, volcanology, seismology, and health physics, as well as chemical, civilian, mechanical, nuclear, mining materials, and geological engineering.

If we want to use science, want to talk about science, science from the Department of Energy, science reviewed by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission says Yucca Mountain will be safe for a million years for long-term storage of not just spent fuel but also of our defense waste.

So, what happens when we legally block the final portion of the law? And the final portion would be: Let's get money to allow Nevada to argue the science. That is what they always say: Let's argue the science. Well, this bill, like other bills coming out of the Appropriations Committee, has zero money to debate the science and do the adjudication.

So if it had money, and this is part of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, if the adjudication were to resume, one or more boards would hear evidence and issue decisions on approximately 300 admitted issues contesting DOE's application or the NRC's staff decision to adopt the DOE environmental impact statement.

If we would finish the last portion of this debate and have the—it is actually called the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel. They would look at the science. They would hear Nevada's complaints, and they would render judgment. That is why we go to courts and stuff to resolve conflict.

If they don't like that decision, Nevada can appeal the Board's decision to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. If they don't like the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's final decision, they can go to the U.S. Court of Appeals.

Now, let's address a few things about the State of Nevada. I include in the RECORD Nye County Resolution No. 2020-11, which passed this year. I will read a few portions of it. The title is: "A Resolution of the Nye County Board of County Commissioners Supporting the Efforts to Complete the Yucca Mountain Licensing Process and Resolve the Nuclear Waste Issue."

Here is one of the whereases. "Whereas, almost 1,000 nuclear devices were detonated on the Nevada test site."

“Whereas, Nye County and eight other Nevada counties have passed resolutions supporting the completion of the Yucca Mountain licensing process by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to determine if Yucca Mountain is safe.”

So, that is nine Nevada counties that say we should move forward.

“Now, therefore, be it resolved that the Nye County Board of Commissioners does hereby continue to support the efforts to complete the Yucca Mountain licensing process and resolve the nuclear waste issue.”

So, that is Nye County, which has the site of Yucca Mountain.

NYE COUNTY RESOLUTION NO. 2020-11

A RESOLUTION OF THE NYE COUNTY BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS SUPPORTING THE EFFORTS TO COMPLETE THE YUCCA MOUNTAIN LICENSING PROCESS AND RESOLVE THE NUCLEAR WASTE ISSUE

Whereas, Nye County Nevada is the third largest county in the continental United States comprising over 11 million acres; and

Whereas, almost 98 percent of this land is under either management or control of various agencies of the federal government; and

Whereas, Department of Defense and Department of Energy have withdrawn approximately 4 million acres from public access and restricted this land to defense, nuclear and other related government uses; and

Whereas, almost 1000 nuclear devices were detonated on the Nevada Test Site; and

Whereas, the 1987 Nuclear Waste Policy Act amendment selected Yucca Mountain as the single site to be studied, and in 2002 Congress approved the site for development of a repository; and

Whereas, Nuclear energy is needed to integrate with renewable energy to significantly reduce CO2 emissions; and

Whereas, the United States has over 80,000 tons of Spent Nuclear Fuel and large quantities of High-Level Waste and other radioactive waste that will require isolation in geologic repositories; and

Whereas, the Nuclear Waste Policy Act directs the Department of Energy to pursue a licensing proceeding to determine if Yucca Mountain is a safe site to house a repository for Spent Fuel and High-Level nuclear waste; and

Whereas, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission is directed by the Nuclear Waste Policy Act to adjudicate if Yucca Mountain is safe to house a nuclear waste repository; and

Whereas, the Nuclear Waste Policy Act has never been repealed and remains the law of the land; and

Whereas, this waste is currently located in temporary storage facilities at over 100 sites in 39 states; and

Whereas, reprocessing of spent fuel and fast reactors have the potential to reduce the amount of waste generated in the future, there will always be large quantities of radioactive waste for geologic disposal; and

Whereas, Nye County and 8 other Nevada counties have passed resolutions supporting the completion of the Yucca Mountain licensing process by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to determine if Yucca Mountain is safe; and

Whereas, the Nye County Board of County Commissioners have approved multiple resolutions and letters to the federal government asking for negotiations with Nye County and the State of Nevada to identify a package that includes mitigation and benefits for Nevada residents; and

Whereas, the federal government has made no serious efforts to negotiate with State

and local leaders or offer benefits to residents of Nevada; and now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Nye County Board of Commissioners does hereby continue to support the efforts to complete the Yucca Mountain licensing process and resolve the nuclear waste issue; and be it further

Resolved, That as part of that effort, Nye County supports the use of innovative technologies to minimize the amount of nuclear waste. The research and investments for these technologies should be done in Nevada creating jobs and enhancing Nevada's Universities; and be it further

Resolved, That pursuant to the Nuclear Waste Policy Act, Nye County encourages the Trump Administration and Congress to develop a benefit package that offers jobs, educational benefits and with potential revenue for services to residents and visitors of Nye County and the State of Nevada.

Passed, Adopted, and Approved the 7th day of April, 2020.

Ayes: Koenig, Strickland, Wichman, Cox, Blundo.

Absent: None.

Nayes: None.

Nye County Board of County Commissioners: John Koenig, *Chairman*.

Attest: Kelly Sidman; Sandra L. Merlino, Nye County Clerk, and Ex-Officio Clerk of the Board.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, what if we don't do this? Here is a chart. Here is Yucca Mountain, secure, in the desert, underneath a mountain, 90 miles from Las Vegas.

Right here in this Chamber, we are 44 miles from the nearest nuclear power plant. It just happens to be Calvert Cliffs. It is on the Chesapeake Bay, and so it is close.

The State of Nevada will argue it will hurt our tourism. Well, let me tell you, Chicago, Los Angeles, and New York City have more tourists than Las Vegas and are closer to spent nuclear fuel than any other place.

Again, it is a travesty that we spend \$2.2 million every day for not complying with the law. This bill does not help us comply with the law. In fact, I would say this bill breaks the law, which is another example for the great American public to observe how dysfunctional we are in this day and age in the people's House. It saddens me.

I thank my colleague for yielding me the time.

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

Mr. Speaker, just to respond to my good friend, Mr. COLE, who I have great, great admiration for, but the gentleman said that more Democratic amendments were made in order. Well, let's kind of put that into context. More Democratic amendments were submitted, period. Actually, more than half of the amendments were Democratic.

Let me put it this way: Twice as many Democratic amendments were offered as Republican amendments, and there was a big chunk of bipartisan amendments that were made in order.

I don't like to compare our record to their record because the gentleman wasn't chair of the Rules Committee when the Republicans were in charge. But I just want to throw this little tid-

bit out there so that people can have this: We have made in order 25 percent more amendments this month than were made in order in all of 2018 under the Republican control of the House.

Again, I know my friend wasn't the chair at the time, but I just wanted to point that out for the RECORD because I think it is a nice statistic.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. MCADAMS).

Mr. MCADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise today in support of my amendments to H.R. 7617. My amendment would provide additional resources to the National Suicide Prevention Lifeline. The CDC reports that from 2001 to 2017, the Nation saw a 31 percent increase in the suicide rate. It is now the second leading cause of death among Americans ages 15 to 24 and the leading cause of death for Utahns in this age group.

The lifeline is a nationally accessible service that supports people in crisis and connects them to the help that they need. The lifeline has had great success, but it is also under strain as its funding has not kept pace with its caseload, particularly amid the pandemic's effects.

I want my amendment to speak clearly to Americans in crisis: There is help; there is hope; and we are fighting for you.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today also in support of two amendments to protect children's safety and well-being.

First, the National Center for Missing & Exploited Children has reported staggering increases in online child sex abuse material, commonly called child pornography. The Federal Internet Crimes Against Children Task Force Program supports task forces in every State to investigate such online exploitation and abuse of children and bring perpetrators to justice. My amendment enhances this grant program to support State and locally driven efforts to protect our children.

Second, child advocacy centers are an incredible tool to support child survivors of abuse. These centers bring together specialized child welfare and law enforcement professionals to provide holistic services to children and to seek justice against abusers. COVID-19 has put many kids at risk, and my amendment provides additional resources for centers to meet this demand.

I urge my colleagues to support these amendments to protect, heal, and give hope to Americans.

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

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to immediately bring up S. 939, the CONFUCIUS Act, which passed the Senate by unanimous consent a month and a half ago.

If enacted into law, S. 939 will address China's influence on American

colleges and universities through Confucius Institutes, which are cultural institutes directly or indirectly funded by the Chinese Government.

Specifically, colleges and universities receiving Federal funds will be required to certify that the institution ensures that any contract or agreement between the institution and a Confucius Institute includes clear provisions that protect academic freedom at the institution, prohibits the application of any foreign law, and ensures the institution retains full managerial authority over the Confucius Institute.

Mr. Speaker, in recent years, Confucius Institutes have become commonplace among higher-education campuses. While ostensibly high-minded, these organizations are funded by the Government of the People's Republic of China and focus on a Beijing-approved view of Chinese history. They are noted for presenting Chinese Communist Party propaganda, ignoring human rights abuses in Tibet and among the Uighurs, and insisting that Taiwan belongs to mainland China.

What is worse, Chinese influence on American campuses comes at a time in which China is engaged in ongoing efforts to steal American intellectual property and research, particularly in research institutions like those located on our higher education campuses.

It is inarguable that Chinese espionage efforts like these pose a clear threat to national security. Passage of the CONFUCIUS Act would help close an open loophole on our college campuses currently being exploited by the People's Republic of China.

Mr. 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 gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on the previous question, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Let me remind my colleagues what the previous question vote is all about. It really isn't about substance. It is about turning control of the House over to my friends on the Republican side.

As the chair of the Congressional-Executive Commission on China who is very, very concerned about these Confucius Institutes and about China's continuing escalation of activities within our country, I am happy to sit down with the gentleman and anyone else to try to bring legislation to the floor.

We brought a lot of legislation to the floor to check China's growing power in the world. But this is really not about the Confucius Institute. This is about turning power over to my friends on the other side of the aisle.

If they were to succeed, they could bring up whatever they want to within

the rules of the House. And based on some of the statements in recent weeks by some of my friends on the other side of the aisle about some of their priorities, it could be some pretty, in my opinion, awful stuff.

So, I would urge my colleagues to reject the gentleman's plea here.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ).

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support passage of the House's second package of appropriations bill for fiscal year 2021 as a proud member of the Appropriations Committee and chair of an appropriations subcommittee.

The defense division of the bill will safeguard our national security and give our troops a much-needed pay raise.

I appreciate the inclusion of language to expedite replacement of PFAS fire-fighting foams and funding to study their health implications.

The bill also supports research for metastatic cancer and encourages clinical trials that affect the demographics of our population.

□ 1100

The Commerce-Justice-Science division includes language from my PACE Act, which I introduced with Congressman ALCEE HASTINGS. Our legislation seeks to disrupt the distrust and improve communication between police and communities of color.

I am also proud that my colleague, Congresswoman BRENDA LAWRENCE, and I secured \$8 million for the Matthew Shepard hate crime investigation and prosecution grant program that was previously authorized and will now be funded for the first time.

The bill addresses the growing problem of online child exploitation by carving out \$40 million for Internet Crimes Against Children task forces.

Funding is also included to research coral reef disease and harmful algal blooms, two significant problems for sea life in the State of Florida.

I am particularly proud of the Energy and Water division, as a member of that subcommittee. The bill funds Everglades restoration projects at a historic \$250 million, a major bipartisan achievement. I am also grateful for the inclusion of a fix to cut red tape that has delayed Everglades restoration projects and will allow them to begin. To protect our investment, the bill includes language that I wrote to block oil drilling in the Florida Everglades.

I am encouraged that this bill provides increases for the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy and ARPA-E.

I am glad that the Financial Services division includes \$500 million for election security grants for States to fight foreign intervention because, apparently, the President isn't interested in doing that.

The report also includes language to improve postal security, which affected

my office as well as the offices of Congresswoman MAXINE WATERS and numerous other leaders after a failed bombing attempt, an incident that raised serious postal security concerns.

I am also pleased that the bill includes funding for pool safety grants that address swimming pool drownings, the number one cause of accidental death for young children in this country.

Next, the Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education division includes vital funding for EARLY Act activities, an initiative I passed to promote breast cancer awareness for young and at-risk women. I was diagnosed with breast cancer at 41 years old, and I am proud to say that I am now approaching my 13th year as a survivor, and I appreciate the opportunity to make sure we can educate more young women and women at higher risk of their risk of breast cancer so they pay attention to their breast health.

Additionally, the bill includes support for Holocaust survivors, who face countless obstacles as they age.

Further, the bill protects unaccompanied migrant children by ensuring Members of Congress can visit child detention facilities with no prior notice—important accountability provisions. Language similar to my Families, Not Facilities Act was included to help unaccompanied migrant youth find sponsors.

Finally, the Transportation, Housing and Urban Development division provides investments in our transportation infrastructure and housing programs. I am glad to see \$60 million for housing homeless veterans who have given so much for this country.

I applaud the inclusion of provisions throughout the minibus to assert our authority as a coequal branch of government by prohibiting funds from being stolen by the President to pay for any border wall, which would be grossly irresponsible.

I thank my fellow subcommittee chairs and, once again, thank Chairwoman LOWEY as she retires from the Appropriations Committee, and their intrepid staff for the hard work that went into producing this minibus that takes care of the many needs people of all backgrounds face in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of the bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, I just want to respond quickly to the overall thrust of what is in these bills. There is no question, as my friend from Florida said, there are a lot of good things in these bills.

My friend from Florida is actually a distinguished member of the Appropriations Committee, one whom I have had the opportunity to work with on many occasions. We don't object to those. But what is undeniable is there is roughly \$40 billion more in spending than my friends agreed to only last year. Now, that is a budget cap imposed by law.

Occasionally, Mr. Speaker, you have reason to do emergencies. We are living through an emergency right now. But if you need emergency spending, you negotiate that with the other side. There was no negotiation here with Republicans in the House. You certainly negotiate with the other Chamber, Mr. Speaker, particularly when it is controlled by the other party. There was no negotiation with the other Chamber. And you certainly negotiate with the President of the United States—no negotiation with him either. It is just a number made up out of whole cloth to keep my friends from having to make some tough budgetary decisions that they agreed to make and passed into law only last year.

The second thing, as I mentioned, is these bills are chock-full of partisan riders. That is just the reality. Now my friends know none of these riders are going to remain in these bills or the bills will never pass the United States Senate and never be signed by a Republican President, so I suppose they were put in there for some internal reason.

I hope they are not put in there to keep us from going past the September 30 deadline, which all these bills should be finished by, into later this year or, goodness knows, next year, when my friends might think they might have a more politically favorable environment. That is a disservice.

This Congress ought to get its job done. It can't get its job done when one side decides to break its agreement, add almost a quarter of a trillion dollars in new spending, and add dozens of new policy provisions that they know are unacceptable.

We can have those debates. They are good debates to have, but they don't belong in the middle of appropriations bills. I am not naive enough to say that both sides don't do this. We certainly did it when we were in the majority on some occasions. But when we did do it, it always slowed down the process and made agreement more difficult.

Last year, 2019, the President, the Speaker, the minority leader, the Senate majority leader, and the Senate minority leader sat down and negotiated a deal. They said that these are going to be the spending limits, and we are not going to put any extraneous things in these bills.

To my friends' credit, last year they actually did that. They stayed within the limit that we had set, and they did not put extraneous things in the bill. Consequently, all those bills passed; they all got enacted into law; we have had no government shutdowns; and we have had regular order.

Why they decided this year to abandon the agreement that they actually committed to last year and launch spending initiatives and policy initiatives that they said they would not do is beyond me, but I do remind them it will make it much more difficult to come to agreement.

So, given that, and given the fact that my friends have not kept the

agreement that they agreed to last year, assented to last year, I am going to oppose the rule and urge rejection of the underlying legislation.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I have no more requests for time on my side. I would just say to my colleagues before I yield to the gentleman for his closing remarks that I think these are good bills that will help us not only get through this pandemic, but help set the stage for the economic recovery that we need.

While we are all here talking, I hope my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are picking up the phone and calling their Senate counterparts and calling the White House and urging them to get serious about a coronavirus relief package that we desperately need.

Schools in some districts are about to open up, and there is no Federal aid to help with what they may need to keep our children and our teachers safe. There is no money going to our cities and towns that are financially strapped because of our economy having shut down, no money to protect people so we can have safe elections, nothing—not anything—to help the millions of people in this country who are hungry.

The Senate proposal, which I am not even sure it is a proposal anymore, has no money in it for SNAP. The most vulnerable people in this country get nothing when it comes to putting food on the table. They have reduced unemployment benefits, and then they sneak in money for an FBI building and money for defense contractors while they shortchange everybody else.

We are in a healthcare crisis, we are in an economic crisis, and we need to respond. These appropriations bills, again, are a way to help us get back on our feet; but, in the immediate term, we need to get the Senate to get serious and respond, as the House did over 2 months ago, and extend a lifeline to the American people.

This is serious. Mr. Speaker, I don't care whether you are a Democrat or a Republican. I hear from constituents of all political persuasions who are begging us to do something to help teachers and superintendents.

Where is the help? Mayors, town managers, and city managers are asking: Where is the help?

The House acted over 2 months ago—nothing from the Senate. So I think these appropriations bills are good, but we need to get something else done even before these become enacted.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to begin by telling my good friend that I have many of the same concerns he does about the coronavirus crisis and the need to act on another bill.

That is not what is before us today, but I look forward to when that time

comes and we have a negotiated product to working with my friend and seeing if we can find the necessary support to make sure that is enacted into law. Indeed, the Senate is involved in doing that right now.

What is before us today is the work of the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives, not coronavirus legislation per se, although there are certainly elements in this bill that deal with that.

Let me again reiterate what I said just a few minutes ago: There are a lot of good things in these appropriations bills. Appropriators work hard and quite a few often work together. We have an excellent chairman and an excellent ranking member, and so we cooperate. So there are many good things in these bills. But what makes them fundamentally unacceptable is, first, a decision to insert almost a quarter of a trillion dollars of emergency spending that violates the budget agreement that my friends signed only last year.

Mr. Speaker, if you need an emergency measure—that happens—then you sit down and negotiate with the other side about what the amount is and what the nature of the response is. There was no effort to negotiate with Republicans on this emergency spending—not in the House, not with the Republican-dominated United States Senate, and not with the Republican President. So these are just numbers willy-nilly sort of thrown in there, and they are not going anywhere. In that sense, we have wasted a lot of time.

Second, my friends agreed, also, last year to no riders, no policy provisions in the bills. We will just have straight government funding bills. Last year, they did that. They kept that agreement last year. They kept to the top line numbers, and they kept to their agreements in terms of policy. We passed all 12 bills in a bipartisan manner. The President signed them, and we have enjoyed the benefit of that this year. We have had no government shutdown and we have had no crises. The work was done in a timely fashion.

Why my friends abandoned a formula and an agreement that worked last year to do this is beyond me. Frankly, it smacks a little bit of election-year politics; but, regardless, the purpose is to fund the government and to keep the government working for all of our citizens, providing basic services.

These bills won't do that because they violated an agreement last year and they contain things that my friends recognized a year ago that, if we do that, then we are not going to get to any agreement on spending. The same thing is true today. The political constellation hasn't changed. It won't change for the balance of this fiscal year, and it won't change for the balance of the calendar year.

If we were serious about legislating, we would write real bills that adhere to the agreements that both sides make, not add additional hundreds of billions of dollars of spending and add additional policy provisions that we know

the other side will not accept. Unfortunately, that is what is being done here.

So I regret that. I hope my friends at some point will decide to come back and bargain. I suspect they will. They usually do. But we are wasting precious time now. We could have completed all these bills.

Frankly, I will chastise the Senate here, too, because they are not moving very fast on the basic necessity of these bills. They have a tougher process. They can't just get a majority and ram things through the way my friends have the ability to do when they are in the majority and we have the ability to do when we are in the majority. It is a little bit different in the Senate of the United States. I recognize that.

But we should make a contribution. We should have stuck to our agreement. We need emergency spending, which I think we do. That should come outside the confines of this legislation in standalone, emergency legislation agreed to by both sides negotiating in good faith. We have done that four times this year already. We are pretty good at it. If we would do it again for a fifth—and they are trying to do it now in the Senate—then I think we could deal with those other items that are in these bills that, quite frankly, belong in a standalone supplemental dealing with coronavirus.

So, with that, I want to thank my friend for the time, and I want to thank him for the debate. As always, I look forward to working with him; but, for the moment, I urge the rejection of the rule and urge the rejection of the underlying legislation.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, let me begin by thanking the Rules Committee staff and members for all of their incredible work during the last few weeks. We have processed thousands of amendments. We have had hours and hours and hours of hearings. We have listened to countless Members testify, and we were able to get through it all.

But, again, I want people to appreciate especially the work of the staff. I say that in a bipartisan way that the Democratic staff and the Republican staff of the Rules Committee worked incredibly hard. I don't think most people even know it, but they ought to know it because this is a lot of work.

I say to the gentleman from Oklahoma who is my friend, we don't always agree on everything, but I am very fortunate to have him as a ranking member because I think he respects this institution and he fights very hard for his beliefs. I fight hard for my beliefs. But even when we disagree, it is not in a personal way. We can disagree without being disagreeable, and I appreciate him for that, and my other colleagues as well.

□ 1115

Mr. Speaker, this rule is about moving forward to consider a measure to

get annual and emergency funding moving to help put people back to work, to reinvigorate our public health system, to rebuild our aging roads and bridges, and to put an important check on this administration. This rule also is about whether we should debate hundreds and hundreds of amendments from Democrats and Republicans.

Mr. Speaker, this is ultimately about whether we fulfill one of our most fundamental responsibilities. I urge all of my colleagues to come together in support of this rule and the underlying legislation. Let's ensure this Congress continues to provide the leadership the American people are demanding.

The material previously preferred to by Mr. COLE is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 1067

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 6. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall proceed to the consideration in the House of the bill (S. 939) to establish limitations regarding Confucius Institutes, 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 Education and Labor; and (2) one motion to commit.

SEC. 7. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of S. 939.

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

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

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

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

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

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

CHILD CARE IS ESSENTIAL ACT

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1053, I call up the bill (H.R. 7027) making additional supplemental appropriations for disaster relief requirements for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCGOVERN). Pursuant to House Resolution 1053, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116-58 is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

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

H.R. 7027

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

The following sums in this Act are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

ADMINISTRATION FOR CHILDREN AND FAMILIES
PAYMENTS TO STATES FOR THE CHILD CARE AND DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT

For an additional amount for "Payments to States for the Child Care and Development Block Grant", \$50,000,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2021, for necessary expenses to carry out the Child Care Stabilization Fund grants program, as authorized by section 1 of this Act: Provided, That such funds shall be available without regard to the requirements in subparagraphs (C) through (E) of section 658E(c)(3) or section 658G of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act: Provided further, That funds appropriated under this heading in this Act may be made available to restore amounts, either directly or through reimbursement, for obligations incurred prior to the date of enactment of this Act for the purposes provided herein: Provided further, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 and shall be available only if the President subsequently so designates such amount and transmits such designation to the Congress.

CHILD CARE STABILIZATION FUND

SEC. 1. (a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) CCDBG TERMS.—The terms "eligible child care provider", "Indian tribe", "lead agency", "tribal organization", "Secretary", and "State" have the meanings given the terms in section 658P of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 9858n) except as otherwise provided in this section.

(2) COVID-19 PUBLIC HEALTH EMERGENCY.—The term "COVID-19 public health emergency" means the public health emergency declared by the Secretary of Health and Human Services under section 319 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 247d) on January 31, 2020, with respect to COVID-19, including any renewal of the declaration.

(b) GRANTS.—From the amounts appropriated to carry out this section and under the authority of section 658O of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 9858m) and this section, the Secretary shall award child care stabilization grants to the lead agency of each State (as defined in that section 658O), territory described in subsection (a)(1) of such section, Indian tribe, and tribal organization from allotments and payments made under subsection (c)(2), not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(c) SECRETARIAL RESERVATION AND ALLOTMENTS.—

(1) RESERVATION.—The Secretary shall reserve not more than 1 percent of the funds appropriated to carry out this section for the Federal administration of grants described in subsection (b).

(2) ALLOTMENTS.—The Secretary shall use the remainder of the funds appropriated to carry out this section to award allotments to States, as defined in section 658O of the Child Care Development Block Grant Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 9858m), and payments to territories, Indian tribes, and tribal organizations in accordance with paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a), and subsection (b), of section 658O of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 9858m).

(d) STATE RESERVATIONS AND SUBGRANTS.—