

Madam Speaker, we are a great country, and we should darn well start acting like it again.

Let's debate on the floor here what we should be doing with our military abroad authorizations of force.

Let's secure the border of the United States and not allow the swamp to stand in the way of common sense.

Let's stand up for law enforcement, secure our communities, and don't let people run over streets and burn down buildings.

Let's stand up in the face of a virus. Let's say we are going to defeat it, and let's damn well defeat it. It is who we are as a people. It is in our DNA. It has been since our founding. It has been there through all the wars. It has been there through previous pandemics. And it is with us here now if we will just tap into it.

This should not be partisan. I look at both directions when I say that. It should not be partisan. I cannot believe we are sitting here in an environment where we have allowed a virus to become partisan, but that is precisely what we have done.

Madam Speaker, I am not going to take up too much more time. I know that the gentleman from Arizona has been patiently waiting. I didn't even start to bring up my charts and talk about numbers because I could never do battle with the gentleman from Arizona when it comes to presenting that kind of information. I know he will do it well.

But I do know this: We are a great country that is doing great things right now to combat this virus. I do know that my physician is a great man. Dr. Yunis grew up in Damascus, Syria.

I asked Dr. Yunis: Doc, I am stage III. I have a 4-month-old, a 2-year-old, and a wife. I am 39. What am I looking at?

Dr. Yunis looked at me and said: I am not going to give you a percentage.

Later he gave me one because I made him give me one.

He said: I am not going to give you a percentage. For you, it is zero percent or 100 percent. Choose 100 percent.

When are we going to choose 100 percent? When are we as a body, when are we as the Senate, when are we as the White House, when are we together on a nonpartisan basis going to choose 100 percent behind this country, 100 percent for the rule of law, 100 percent standing alongside of our law enforcement keeping our communities safe, 100 percent that we are going to have our kids go back to school, we are going to get back to work, we are going to lift our economy up, and we are going to prove that the 21st century is going to be the greatest century that this country has ever known, not because we are cowering in fear, but because we are facing these things head-on?

That is what 100 percent means. That is what being an American means.

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

□ 2145

COVID-19 MEDICAL INNOVATION IDEAS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT) until 10 p.m.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Madam Speaker, we know we are in an election year. We know passions are running high. We know we have an environment where our country is incredibly hurting right now.

If you saw the unemployment numbers this morning, the GDP numbers, how vibrant the economy was last quarter, you can almost have your heart ache. We have millions and millions and millions and millions of our brothers and sisters outside these walls who are hurting. And I guess for many of us in the minority, there is that frustration of "we care, but we want something that actually works."

And so one of my reasons for taking some time tonight is I wanted to do one or two things.

Originally, I was going to bring in all this data of what we have learned about who gets sick and who doesn't get sick, and those things. And I realized, maybe that is not what we should do. So I was going to do just a couple data points and then actually talk about pieces of legislation that should be easy for us, that actually would help our brothers and sisters out there in dealing with the coronavirus, in dealing with the economic devastation it has brought to us, and providing some of the basic mechanisms. None of them are panaceas, but it is good policy.

Let me start with one thing, just so we have this: If we look at our fellow Americans that we have lost since the pandemic—family members, mothers and fathers, grandmas and grandpas who passed away—45 percent of them were actually in a nursing home or hospice-type care and their death certificates make it clear that there was COVID as part of it.

So if you actually had that as a data point, I am hoping we can sort of think through who are the most vulnerable in our society, and do we continue to sell, tell, share the message that if you are in some of these vulnerable groups, if you are in the nursing home, it is risky. There is a concentration where resources should go and what we can do.

And that is an interesting baseline for those who actually have great interest in the numbers. For myself in Maricopa County, Arizona, our nursing home fatality rate is at 39 percent of the fatalities. There are other places where it is over 50 percent. Using that actually is a benchmark. If the national number is 45 percent of the fatalities from COVID come from nursing homes and those types of facilities, if you are above that, you really need to think about how you are treating that population, how you are working with

that care delivery network. If you are below it, maybe you have a sense you are going in the right direction.

But these are the types of things we need to be sharing with people around the country, to understand that if you are 25 years old, the chance of you losing your life—and we don't want anyone getting sick—but you are well under 1 percent.

And this is something called—I do a lot of presentations here on the floor, and I didn't bring all the charts because I just didn't want to overwhelm the conversation—allocation of resources.

If your community, when you pull up your ZIP Code map—and in Arizona, we are doing a really good job of using this heat map, where you can see where we are having outbreaks—how do we actually share? Because we have provided resources—maybe we need to provide more technology or other things—but if you see on the heat map that this neighborhood, this part of your community is having an outbreak, why don't we have outreach into that community? Why don't we have people knocking on the doors saying, Do you have a mask? Do you understand all the little rules? Do you understand the Sunday barbecue in the backyard with everyone in the neighborhood probably isn't a brilliant idea?

I really want us to communicate the idea where the devastation is but also, how do we be proactive? How do we get out there? Instead of doing some of the craziness of everything shuts down, whether you are in communities where we can't find efficacy of transmissions to where we see some pretty tough numbers. So that is actually one of the things we have been trying to communicate to the professionals in Arizona, is sort of, how do we reach out to where we see the problems?

In Arizona recently, we had the Federal Government provide testing in some of the hardest hit areas, and we hoped actually some of those numbers helped. There are other economic numbers that are really tough because some of it is getting on the cusp of being partisan. And I am going to beg for my brothers and sisters on the left, and those of us on the right, to back away from it and actually sort of think it through.

We actually have built a number of charts, and we are trying to build more data of what is actually going to happen if schools aren't able to find a safe way to open up.

Do you actually know what happens to long-term incomes of females in the country? These are things people don't necessarily think about, but we can show you—we are working on it because we are trying to make sure we are getting our math right—that by not having the daycare facilities and our schools open, it turns out the moms and dads—but, particularly the moms that work—that may now have lost several months of being in the workplace, it actually has an effect on

their entire future working careers, income potential, if not their Social Security and other things.

We need to understand the totality of the decisions we are making. And this was just a chart I grabbed because I thought the information was interesting, but the compound effects of when we are not able to come up with a safe method to open up our schools, you actually start to see that for, particularly moms, it looks like by the numbers they lose about half their working time. But we can even find another set of numbers that 19 percent of those who are actually healthcare workers can't be there providing those services.

We don't seem to stop and take a step backwards. And on one hand, we are talking about how desperately we need healthcare workers and facilities in places that are having a tough time. Oh, by the way, we are not going to come up with a safe way for education, for daycare to open up. You do realize that actually just reduced your healthcare workers by 19 percent?

We haven't been taking a step backwards and thinking about this holistically. And that is why I am going to walk through a couple of the pieces of legislation we have introduced in the last couple of weeks. We are trying to come up with ways to try to help. In the future, we are going to talk more about this on the effects on the children.

I have a little girl that is about to turn 5. She passed her test to get early enrollment into kindergarten. When I go home, you can just see almost how desperate she is to be with other little kids. I mean, she loves mommy and daddy, but, apparently, we don't play the same way as other 4-and-a-half-year-olds, five-year-olds. What would be the long-term effect in her ability to socialize?

What is the effect? We came across—and we haven't been able to vet it yet, so I am going to say it, but understand, we haven't vetted the numbers—of high-school age kids that will pass away from the coronavirus compared to the increase of high-school aged suicides. And not being able to have services, not being able to have counseling, not be able to have social relationships. And I know these are sometimes really uncomfortable numbers to, one, get accurate, but even talk about.

We have got to find a way to understand decisions we are making over here. Are we ultimately doing more damage to the people in our country? And this is more than the economy. It is people's mental health, their economic future, their future earnings power, and just societal cohesion.

Let's actually talk about some things I think that are both optimistic and opportunities. One of the things that happened when we started to do some of the emergency legislation on the pandemic, for some of the staff that have been here, you know, there are a handful of us who have been

pounding the doors around here for years about expanding telemedicine.

Oddly enough—I know this sounds crazy right now—but telemedicine in the past has been a controversial subject here because it disrupts some of the medical delivery business model. We have lots of lobbyists in Washington, D.C., that really don't like telemedicine because it is another avenue of competition. But we did it. We took a piece of legislation that Mr. THOMPSON and I had passed, grabbed some of the language, and that is actually the law right now—except for one catch: When the pandemic is declared over, that expanded authorization of telemedicine goes away. But we are getting a living test right now.

What is fascinating is, if you and I go back to 2019, only about 11 percent of healthcare consumers—you and I—11 percent in 2019—use telemedicine. In the last few months, we are actually seeing it around 46 percent of folks that need some type of medical advice or doctor visit are actually using telemedicine. We have just proven it works.

And there is actually some amazing data coming in about the ability to make it very cost-effective, and the ability to find out the satisfaction levels. Turns out that people are more satisfied with many of their telemedicine visits than when they go visit the doctor's office. And it turns out, also, that the actual face-time with that medical professional actually is longer in telemedicine than when you have actually gone to the doctor's office.

So we need to understand these things, because when we get beyond this pandemic, will we understand that telemedicine isn't scary. We need to find a way to extend it, make it permanent, and actually expand what the definition is. Look, we have some great data that is coming in that this is working. This is one of the things we did, bipartisan, on something that we couldn't get done for years. It is happening right now.

So we have introduced a piece of legislation that will just make it so when the pandemic is declared over, telemedicine isn't ended in its new reimbursements, in its efficacy, in its availability.

Now, I want to go further. I actually believe the future of telemedicine is more than just picking up your phone and talking to a medical professional or face-time. I also think it is the body sensors you can put on that produce data from your body, that the algorithm can be calculating, that finds if there is something wrong, the medical professional can call you.

So we are going to try to see if we can expand that definition to even the technology out there, because this is one of our arguments that we have been making here, that as Republicans and Democrats, we have been having the wrong debate about healthcare. We keep debating on who should pay, who should get subsidized, and we are not

having enough of the debate on technology. What are the things we can do that would actually change the price? Changing the price is what makes healthcare much more available, not a constant debate on who should end up paying and who should be subsidizing.

This piece of legislation has been dropped, and I am very grateful. Thank you for those who are helping us co-sponsor it. We want to see more.

Another thing we are having that discussion of:

How do you start to open up society? How do you open up your community?

How do you open up the little businesses in your neighborhood?

Many of them need to be able to put up that plastic shield. They are going to need to be able to buy protective equipment or ways to sterilize those things.

We have come up with a tax credit idea for those businesses. It is 50 percent of their cost, particularly for testing. If you want to test your employees, a tax credit—but it is not the tax credit that at the end of the year, next year you might get some money. We do it as a tax credit off your payroll.

And the benefit of that is certain businesses, every couple weeks, every month, they are turning in their FICA, you know, their payroll tax, they can get the credit right there. So the cash flow is available to go pay for testing, pay for things that make their businesses safe. So as they start to invite their teams, their employees back, it is a way to make sure they are staying safe.

The other one—and this is a big deal, and this one I think actually both Republicans and Democrats will embrace—and we are going to geek out just a tiny bit.

When the ACA passed—most folks know it as ObamaCare—one of the mechanisms in there was the ability to deduct your medical expenses was going to go up over time to 10 percent of your adjusted gross income. And for a lot of seniors, that was going to be pretty tough. When we did tax reform, we actually extended the 7½ percent of your adjusted gross income when you hit that level the next dollar you could start to deduct off your taxes for a couple of years.

But the fact of the matter is, it is scheduled to go up to 10 percent of your adjusted gross income, your medical expenses, before you can start to deduct them.

In a time like this, in a time when we all talk about healthcare and the financial stresses and impacts that puts on our family, let's do this: For the next 2 years, let's make it 5 percent. So if you had medical expenses that you are paying for, you hit the 5 percent, you can actually take it. And after that, we will keep it at the 7½ percent.

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

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Madam Speaker, we will come back next week and do

the Invest Act, and I yield back the balance of my time.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 4(b) of House Resolution 967, the House stands adjourned until 9 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon (at 10 p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, July 31, 2020, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

4853. A letter from the Program Specialist, Chief Counsel's Office, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's interim final rule — Margin and Capital Requirements for Covered Swap Entities (RIN: 1557-AE98) received July 6, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

4854. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — Impact Aid Program: Extension of the Application Amendment Deadline [Docket ID ED-2015-OESE-0109] (RIN: 1810-AB24) received July 7, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

4855. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval and Air Quality Designation; Connecticut; Determination of Clean Data for the 2008 8-Hour Ozone Standard for the Greater Connecticut Area [EPA-R01-OAR-2020-0132; FRL-10011-52-Region 1] received July 7, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4856. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's withdrawal of direct final rule — Air Plan Approval; Massachusetts; Negative Declaration for the Oil and Gas Industry [EPA-R01-OAR-2019-0220; FRL-10011-42-Region 1] received July 7, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4857. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; North Carolina; Miscellaneous Permit Provisions Revisions [EPA-R04-OAR-2019-0638; FRL-10011-31-Region 4] received July 7, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4858. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Arizona; Maricopa County Air Quality Department and Pima County Department of Environmental Quality [EPA-R09-OAR-2019-0633; FRL-10011-25-Region 9] received July 7, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4859. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental

Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Wisconsin; Redesignation of the Inland Sheboygan, WI Area to Attainment of the 2008 Ozone Standards [EPA-R05-OAR-2019-0557; FRL-10011-17-Region 5] received July 7, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4860. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Quality State Implementation Plan Approval; Nevada; Infrastructure Requirements for the 2010 Sulfur Dioxide National Ambient Air Quality Standard [EPA-R09-OAR-2014-0812; FRL-10011-07-Region 9] received July 7, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4861. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Revisions; California; Technical Amendments [EPA-R09-OAR-2020-0088; FRL-10011-00-Region 09] received July 7, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4862. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; KY: Jefferson County Performance Tests [EPA-R04-OAR-2020-0156; FRL-10010-78-Region 4] received July 7, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4863. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; California; Maricopa County Air Pollution Control District [EPA-R09-OAR-2019-0291; FRL-10010-73-Region 9] received July 7, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4864. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Long-Chain Perfluoroalkyl Carboxylate and Perfluoroalkyl Sulfonate Chemical Substances; Significant New Use Rule [EPA-HQ-OPPT-2013-0225; FRL-10010-44] (RIN: 2070-AJ99) received July 7, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4865. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Conditional Approval and Disapproval; Arizona; Maricopa County; Power Plants, Fuel Burning Equipment, and Internal Combustion Engines [EPA-R09-OAR-2019-0321; FRL-10009-81-Region 9] received July 7, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4866. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes; Indiana; Redesignation of the Indianapolis Sulfur Dioxide Nonattainment Area [EPA-R05-OAR-2017-0462; FRL-10008-35-Region 5] received July 6, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4867. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agen-

cy's final rule — National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants: Coal- and Oil-Fired Electric Utility Steam Generating Units — Subcategory of Certain Existing Electric Utility Steam Generating Units Firing Eastern Bituminous Coal Refuse for Emissions of Acid Gas Hazardous Air Pollutants [EPA-HQ-OAR-2018-0794; FRL-10007-26-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AU48) received July 6, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4868. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's issuance of regulatory guide — Safety Related Structures for Nuclear Power Plants (Other than Reactor Vessels and Containments) [Regulatory Guide 1.142, Revision 3] received June 29, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4869. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's issuance of regulatory guide — Guidance for a Technology-Inclusive, Risk-Informed, and Performance-Based Methodology to Inform the Licensing Basis and Content of Applications for Licenses, Certifications, and Approvals for Non-Light-Water Reactors [Regulatory Guide 1.233, Revision 0] received June 29, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4870. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's issuance of regulatory guide — Safety-Related Concrete Structures for Nuclear Power Plants (Other Than Reactor Vessels and Containments) [Regulatory Guide 1.142, Revision 3] received June 29, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4871. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's issuance of regulatory guide — Seismic Qualification of Electrical and Active Mechanical Equipment and Functional Qualification of Active Mechanical Equipment for Nuclear Power Plants [Regulatory Guide 1.100, Revision 4] received June 29, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4872. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's non-major rule — Guidance for Coronavirus-Related Distributions and Loans from Retirement Plans Under the CARES Act [Notice 2020-50] received July 7, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4873. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Qualified Business Income Deduction [TD 9899] (RIN: 1545-BP12) received July 7, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows: