

authorizes these user facilities and bio-energy research centers, along with a host of other basic research provisions.

My point is: That there are productive alternatives that have the right focus and are ready to be passed, instead of this partisan package in front of us today.

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. LAMB), a hardworking member of the committee.

Mr. LAMB. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the chairwoman for bringing this bill to the floor.

Madam Speaker, I come from western Pennsylvania, home of the first oil well, home of coal and steel, home of the first nuclear power plant, home of the fracking revolution, and most importantly, home of the people who built all of these things.

And it is as a western Pennsylvanian today, not as a Democrat or Republican, but as a western Pennsylvanian that I am proud to have supported and contributed provisions to this bill. Both Democrats and Republicans will vote for this bill tomorrow—they will. And that is how it should be.

Somehow people got the idea that energy was one more topic that should be politicized in America, and they are wrong. The future of energy is about jobs, not red jobs, not blue jobs, just jobs. And we know how to create jobs in America when we use our government to win the race to new technologies. That is why I have never thought the best analogy here is the New Deal, it is the Manhattan Project.

Back then, when we had a threat from outside our country, it required us to double down on all the nuclear science and then get it out of the lab and into the factories, into the power plants, into the construction camps. We created jobs.

And just like that was a competition against Germany, and just like today, we still thank the Greatest Generation for refusing to tolerate Germany beating us to the bomb. Today, we should refuse to tolerate China beating us to those jobs.

Someone will get these jobs. Someone will build the next advanced nuclear reactor. Someone will figure out how to build a gas-fired power plant with carbon storage, and someone will win the race on batteries. It should be us. And this bill will give us a leg up in each one of those technologies. There is no more time to waste.

My colleagues across the aisle have raised fair points about their own ideas and legislation, but make no mistake, this bill is a blueprint for more jobs, less carbon, more science, less partisanship, and we should all pass it without delay.

Mr. LUCAS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. FULCHER).

Mr. FULCHER. Madam Speaker, I stand in opposition to H.R. 4447. A clean energy future is not possible without advanced nuclear energy.

We are in a global competition. Russia is building seven reactors in Asia, has 22 more under contract in Asia and Europe, and proposals to put more in Africa. China is on pace to double nuclear capacity by 2030 and has stated it wants to build 6 to 8 reactors a year. In the U.S. we are currently building two.

If we fall behind, so does our national security and geopolitical standing.

That is why I introduced the Next Generation Nuclear Advancement Act, which was ruled out of order as an amendment. All sections of this act, the Nuclear Energy Strategic Plan, and Integrated Energy and Light Water Reactor Programs, have Senate counterparts with bipartisan support.

These provisions need to be inserted for legislation to have a chance at becoming law; anything less is only useful as a social media post.

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Virginia (Mrs. LURIA).

Mrs. LURIA. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of this bill, H.R. 4447, and applaud the inclusion of nuclear power as a critical element of our energy future and our national security.

As an engineer who operated nuclear reactors in the Navy, I saw firsthand that nuclear power, when deployed safely and responsibly, can play a key role in our future as a zero-carbon energy source. Advanced nuclear designs carry potential for our economy, our national security, and electrical grid, as they can provide a steady source of clean energy and reduce carbon emissions.

The Nuclear Energy Leadership Act section of this bill would jump-start innovation and advanced nuclear energy by authorizing \$55 million per year through 2025 for an advanced reactor technologies program and establish the University Nuclear Leadership Program to develop our future nuclear workforce.

The inclusion of my bipartisan legislation, the Nuclear Energy Leadership Act, in this bill will facilitate the path to market for advanced reactors and help the U.S. maintain international leadership in nuclear technology and safety.

Madam Speaker, I thank Chairwoman JOHNSON and Representative LAMB, and the Science, Space, and Technology Committee for working with me on this important legislation, and for including the important element of nuclear power in this energy package.

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

Madam Speaker, as I said in my opening statement, as ranking member of the Science Committee, I am disappointed we are debating a messaging bill today, rather than a substantive bipartisan bill, the kind that we worked on to address clean energy and climate change.

I would like to thank my Republican colleagues, Energy Subcommittee Ranking Member WEBER, Space Sub-

committee Ranking Member BABIN, Research and Technology Ranking Member BAIRD, and Representatives WALTZ, CRENSHAW, and FULCHER, and many others for their hard work in championing energy R&D issues that will truly deliver on the promise of our clean energy future.

It is not too late to make progress. If there is one thing to take away from this, it is that Science Committee Republicans are ready and willing to work with our shared priorities.

So let's set aside this bipartisan messaging exercise and start having serious conversations about supporting the basic research needed to make real progress in clean energy.

Madam Speaker, I once again urge my colleagues to oppose this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Let me just simply say, our planet screams out for our help. This is not intended to be a Democratic exercise. It is a stand for a real need to give attention to the climate change we are experiencing that can only get worse without us doing something.

So I extend my hand to the Republican members of this committee to join us and understand that it is not just a political ploy that we are trying to do here, it is time for us to address climate change. We are suffering too much and losing to many unnecessary spent dollars dealing with the situation that we are in now.

The people are depending on us to take the lead and address the problem. So I plead with you, join with us. This is not partisan; it is to save our planet. I ask you to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of H.R. 4447 is postponed.

□ 1815

HONORING JAMES BENNETT

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

Mr. VAN DREW. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize the life of James Bennett.

James was a loved, trusted, compassionate, and hardworking young man. I had the pleasure and honor of knowing him his entire life.

James was as gifted athletically as he was academically, a wrestler who notched 95 wins in high school and was also selected into the prestigious National Honor Society and graduated from Rowan University in south Jersey.

The positivity and the energy that he brought to this world will be missed by everyone who had the pleasure of ever

knowing him. I know that I personally miss him very much.

We all wish we had more time on this Earth with you, James, but know we know that you are looking down on your mom and your dad, your entire family, and your friends, and you are in Heaven right now.

Rest in peace, my friend, and God bless you.

RECOGNIZING LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. ROY. Madam Speaker, last week, I took some time on the floor here in the House of Representatives to recognize our important law enforcement community and what they mean to the American people and why this body should stand alongside, behind, and in defense of our law enforcement community unapologetically.

Since speaking on the floor last week, I have been, frankly, inundated by emails, Instagram messages, Facebook messages, tweets, phone calls from I think all 50 States. The video from the floor of the House of Representatives has been seen almost 8 million times. I, frankly, was blown away, but it just tells you how many Americans are looking for the leadership of their country to stand by and stand alongside our law enforcement community.

Some of the messages that we received—and this isn't about me, and this isn't about any Member of this body, but these were some of the messages we received.

This was sent to me: "Your speech about the 43 officers was moving. My father is a police officer. The world would make me feel as though I shouldn't be proud of that, let alone give any support to the police. Thank you."

Another message: "Thank you for addressing the 43 law enforcement officers who have been killed this year so far. I am a law enforcement officer's wife for over 20 years. My husband is a phenomenal human being and law enforcement officer. He has spent his life protecting strangers. I won't rant. You know how we are living right now," she said. "I just wanted to thank you for being bold and brave and having his six."

For the record, I don't consider myself bold or brave. I just consider myself a representative of constituents who share my complete disbelief that this body refuses to take any action, to do anything as a body in unison to defend and stand alongside our law enforcement community.

It is an abject failure by the Speaker of the House of Representatives and this body that we have not passed a resolution; we have not joined to-

gether; we have not stood on the steps of the Capitol; we have not done a thing to stand alongside our law enforcement community who keep us safe every day. And I think that is an embarrassment. It is an embarrassment that the people's House refuses to do that.

Another message: "I start off first saying I am law enforcement, and I want to continue saying thank you for your support. I have watched your C-SPAN video so many times, and it gets me every time. It is just nice to have some people out here backing us."

Again, this is not about me. I wish there were 435 Members sitting here on the floor right now together, all doing that for these people, for those law enforcement officers.

Another message: "Thank you, sir, for your speech in the House. We at the Nevada Highway Patrol were rocked by our first line of duty death since 2006. On March 27, 2020, Sergeant Ben Jenkins stopped on a snowy Nevada rural road to help a stranded motorist. After his attempts to get the motorist's vehicle unstuck failed, the motorist pulled out a .308 rifle and shot Sergeant Jenkins in the right shoulder. Sergeant Jenkins retreated to the back of his vehicle, severely wounded, got 'shots fired' over the radio before he collapsed. The suspect walked up to Sergeant Jenkins as he lay in the cold, snowy Nevada highway and shot him in the head. Sergeant Ben Jenkins died doing what any trooper would do when they see a stranded motorist. He would have helped anyone. He lost his life doing it." This person said: "Your speech was impactful. Thank you for being our voice."

I don't know the race of any of these people. I don't. I don't know the race of the officers. I don't know the race of the perpetrators. I don't know the race of any other victims. I literally have no idea. But these are people from all over the country, thousands calling in, tweeting, checking. They are hungry for a body that is supposed to represent them in the people's House to stand up and just say a simple thank-you. Just say a simple, "We have got your back."

Since I spoke just under a week ago, three more officers have been killed in the line of duty. I read all the names of the 43 who have been killed last week. Here are three more: Investigator Luis Mario Herrera, on September 7; Deputy Sheriff Ryan Phillip Hendrix, on September 10; Sergeant Alvin R. Sugranes-LeBron, on September 16.

That means we are up to 46 officers who have been killed thus far in 2020, a 53 percent increase from the same period in 2019.

As I said last week, eight categorized as premeditated murder, two were a victim of unprovoked attacks, eight fatal shots were fired at point-blank range zero to 5 feet from the officer, eight shot in the front of the head, two in the back of the head, six in the neck, nine in the chest.

We have an over 50 percent increase in officers killed in the line of duty,

the law enforcement officers who represent the thin blue line between us and anarchy.

My grandfather was the chief of police of Sweetwater, Texas. My great-great-grandfather was a Texas Ranger. I was proud to be an assistant United States attorney working with the law enforcement community.

Where is the people's House? Again, sitting here at 6:23, we had three votes this afternoon in series. We marched in here, we voted. We don't have any debate. We vote, we clean, we vote, we stand out on the steps, and we walk out. And, thus, has been the people's House for the last 190 days.

It is an embarrassment. We are sitting here in an empty Chamber. We haven't passed a PPP extension bill. We haven't done the hard work of trying to make sure our small businesses that are struggling in this environment survive. We sure as heck have not been on the floor of this body engaged in any kind of effort to pass a resolution, to sit here and have a moment of silence, an understanding, a recognition for any member of the law enforcement community.

With all due respect to the other side, where is the Speaker? Where is the Speaker of the House? Last Thursday, after a number of us gave speeches about this issue, after I gave a speech, Speaker PELOSI came down to the floor of the House and said a handful of words: "We support peaceful demonstrations. We participate in them. They are part of the essence of our democracy." She went on: "That does not include looting, starting fires, or rioting. They should be prosecuted. That is lawlessness."

Well, congratulations to the Speaker of the House for recognizing the rule of law. The body that passes laws, including our Federal criminal laws, the body that represents the people, all 330 million of them, the Speaker of that body came all the way down to the floor of the House of Representatives to explain to us that she supports the basic fundamentals of the rule of law but did not say a word about law enforcement and backing them up, did not say a word about calling out Antifa or BLM or any organization behind a lot of the activities going on around our country, endangering our communities, burning down stores, wrecking people's lives, putting people in danger, letting people get killed, having officers put in danger.

I read through a number of officers who have been killed throughout this process, and what are we doing?

When we had a debate back in June when it was politicized, Senator SCOTT sent over legislation. Did we have any robust debate about that? No. We haven't had a single vote on an amendment on the floor of the House since May of 2016, and that is an absolute embarrassment.

We have groups of people who sit up in the Rules Committee. They throw down a bill on the floor of the House of