

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

Representatives, and we are supposed to march down here like lemmings, push a button yes or no, and then let leadership go out on the steps and give a press conference.

How is that representation? Where is the Speaker? It is not enough to come down and give lip service for 10 seconds about riots and about how those are lawless but not come down here and actually recognize our men and women in uniform who are serving us in blue across the country.

Or how about our Border Patrol? How about ICE? Many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle like to go around saying defund ICE, abolish ICE, take away resources from Border Patrol and ICE.

Have they walked a mile in the shoes of the Border Patrol or ICE that I know on the border in Texas, where cartels have operational control of our border still to this day right now? We just had apprehensions of about 45,000 in August, the second highest number in the last 6 years, second only to last year.

Do you know why that number is low right now? Guess. Title 42 protecting our health because of the virus. Our men and women in uniform on the border of the United States serving their country, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle say abolish them, get rid of them, when they are securing the border of the United States outmanned, outgunned. They can't navigate the Rio Grande.

I would invite any of my colleagues to come down along with my Democratic friend HENRY CUELLAR. He and I have cosponsored legislation to clear cane and open roads along the Rio Grande. Why can't we do that? We could do that in a matter of seconds right on this floor and give our Border Patrol and give our ICE agents the ability to actually stop and stem the tide of the horrors being perpetrated by cartels along our border.

We duck our head in the sand and ignore it while little girls get raped and abused on the journey through Mexico; while we find stash houses with 50 people in basements in Houston; while families get held hostage for ransom; while meth comes pouring across our border, fentanyl, cocaine, large quantities, pouring across our border; all while we have been shutting down our way of life, causing people to have extreme mental health concerns and issues and addictions being fed heavily by the Chinese running right up through the gut through Mexico, right into Texas, right into our country, and what are we doing? Playing politics with our border instead of doing what any sovereign nation would do, which is defend the border of the United States for the interests of our community and the migrants who seek to come here, who are being abused, who are being sold into the sex trade, who are being held ransom by cartels.

□ 1830

There is a bloody civil war going on along the border along the Rio Grande,

and my colleagues on the other side of the aisle come out and say, "kids in cages"; they come out and say, "drinking out of toilets."

It is just simply not true. I have been to these facilities. We have all been to these facilities. We know it is not true. The Speaker knows it is not true. Yet that is the stated position of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

"Kids in cages," the very barriers put up by the previous President and the previous President's administration for what? To separate kids, to separate them from other dangerous individuals who may or may not be their family members, people coming across claiming to be their parents. We don't know.

What are we supposed to do, just take them and throw them to the wolves? Or maybe we should have a system for trying to figure it out.

And you go down there and you look and you see what our Border Patrol agents are doing, and you see what our ICE agents are doing: working hard to try to figure it out when you have 900,000 people apprehended in fiscal year 2019.

I didn't make that number up. All right? This is how many people were apprehended. I am not talking about the ones who got away. I am talking about the ones who were apprehended, coming into our facilities, and we have to manage it.

Where is the Speaker? Where is the Speaker for any member of our law enforcement community on the streets in any city in America, Federal, State, or local, Border Patrol, ICE? Where is the Speaker? Completely MIA, wandering around D.C. no doubt raising money for the D triple C or something to go have another political speech, but sure as heck not on the floor of the House of Representatives standing alongside law enforcement.

Let's consider the grand successes of this body of the House of Representatives under Speaker PELOSI.

Proxy voting. For the first time in the history of this body, under the Speaker of the House, this body, led by Democrats, is allowing proxy voting.

Now, for those of you at home, what that means is that you can have a Member, as has happened, vote from a boat—get on a screen, log in, and vote from a boat. That happened.

This body, if you are elected to it, you cannot delegate that which has been delegated to you under the Constitution of the United States, by the people, that sacred obligation to represent them, you cannot delegate that to another. That is plainly and clearly unconstitutional.

I look forward to that question getting to the Supreme Court. I am proud to be a part of litigating that. I look forward to getting it to the Supreme Court so we can actually answer that question.

We don't need the Court to answer it. This body can answer it. It is plainly unconstitutional.

Yet for the first time in our history, we have allowed and enabled proxy vot-

ing where a Member of this body can allow somebody else in this body to cast a vote for him or her.

For two centuries, through the yellow fever of 1783, which took out 10 percent of the population of Pennsylvania, the burning of the Capitol during the War of 1812, the Civil War, the Spanish flu of 1918, both World Wars, 9/11, Congress never flinched from its constitutional duty to assemble in the Capital City.

Ten percent of Philadelphia in 1793—think about that—was wiped out. They found a way to meet. They found a way to carry out their solemn obligation.

The Speaker continues to refuse regular order. I have already referred to that. We bypass the committee process, block amendments for every bill, effectively shutting out participation for rank-and-file Members of both parties of the House.

Just yesterday we voted on a continuing resolution to fund government \$1.6 trillion, ladies and gentlemen. You are sitting back at home. Yes, another number stuck in front of a trillion—\$1.6 trillion.

Your august body, the House of Representatives, representing you, had approximately 20 minutes to review the continuing resolution funding \$1.6 trillion of government, busting caps of busted caps already busted.

That is your House of Representatives, ladies and gentlemen, and I don't think you should accept it. I don't think the American people should accept this level of complete incompetence and disgrace that we are seeing on the floor of the House of Representatives.

Twenty minutes.

How about that 72-hour rule? We like that? We adopt the rules every time we come into Congress. Seventy-two hours you must have to read legislation, they say. Does that ever happen? Let's be honest. Does that ever happen? No.

And when you go home and you talk to your constituents, they say: Why is Washington broken?

I say: Because we never sit down at a table, roll our sleeves up, and do the work that you do in your home, that you do in your business, that you do in your nonprofit, that you do in your church to actually balance your budget, to actually make tough decisions.

We never do that.

Democrats and Republicans should be appalled at the way this body has been operating.

We should have debate. We should have votes. We should have amendments.

What are we afraid of? Bring your amendments down. I will vote, and I will go face my constituents and explain why.

And you know what? There will be tough votes, and they will be used against you.

And you know what? That is the process.

I have already mentioned that the Speaker refuses to stand for law enforcement. It took months to even

come down here to condemn the looting and the rioting and the violence, and she still won't condemn BLM or antifa.

In July, the Speaker's response to the chaos on the streets was: "People will do what they do."

Well, boy, oh boy, is that blowing the socks off of our law enforcement community getting the great leadership from the Speaker of the House that "people will do what they do." Well, they sure will if we don't stand behind our law enforcement community and stand up for the rule of law.

The Speaker infamously pushed an impeachment inquiry without a vote on the House floor for the first time in history. Now, that has played out. I haven't heard much about impeachment over the last 7 months.

It gripped the Nation, supposedly. I think it gripped the body. I think it gripped half of this body.

We spent 6 months essentially shutting this Chamber down to pursue that inquiry, and now the Speaker is talking about impeachment again.

The Speaker has refused to condemn the blatant anti-Semitism that some in her own party have used, and she herself has referred to Republicans as "enemies of the people," the Speaker of the House.

The Speaker recently referred to the peace agreements, the historic peace agreements between Israel and Bahrain and Israel and UAE—these are massively successful, important peace agreements. She referred to them as "distractions"—Israel, our great ally in the Middle East.

These were great agreements. This is historic stuff.

There are other countries considering it. Why? Because we led.

We moved our Embassy to Jerusalem, and other countries followed. Why? Because we took out Soleimani.

And what did the Speaker do? She wanted to condemn the President for taking out Soleimani, a murderous thug who targeted American soldiers.

It was great that the President of the United States took out Soleimani.

And now, as I said, the Speaker is threatening impeachment 2.0. Why? Because President Trump is daring—hold on, here it comes—daring to do what every President in the history of this country has done when there is a vacancy on the Supreme Court in the fourth year of their term, every one, 29 times.

That the President would exercise Article II authority to nominate an individual to fill a vacancy on the United States Supreme Court, for that—for that—the Speaker is suggesting we should consider Articles of Impeachment 2.0.

It is facially absurd. It is not an arrow in a quiver. It is facially absurd. It is an embarrassment to this institution. It is an embarrassment to this Congress.

We should have an open and vital debate about all of these issues we are

talking about right here, amending, debating, voting. No, no, no. We are going to go rattle that impeachment and go give some press conferences. This is just politicizing the process.

Now, we have seen that before. We have seen this many times before, the politicization of this process.

I was a lawyer on the Senate Judiciary Committee in 2003. I had the great honor and privilege of serving Senator JOHN CORNYN. I spent 5 years as a lawyer on that committee working on a host of issues. One of the issues I worked on was nominations.

Now, you might be asking: Who are these two women?

Well, Judge Janice Rogers Brown was—if my memory serves correctly; I don't have any notes; I am doing this from memory—a supreme court justice in California who was nominated to the Ninth Circuit. Priscilla Owen was nominated to the Fifth Circuit.

Now, in 2003, the Democrats in the United States Senate sought to stop—that is, filibuster—stop their nominations.

Their great crimes? They were conservative women. And in one case, a minority conservative woman. Those were their great crimes in 2003, ladies and gentlemen.

And that is what your Democrats in the United States Senate did: attacking them, tearing them down, blowing up the very process that people are talking about right now, the confirmation process. They attacked them, these two public servants.

I met both of them. Very kind, nice people being ruthlessly attacked for simply being conservative women, or a conservative minority woman.

We can't have that. We can't have those dastardly Republicans appointing someone who doesn't fit the narrative by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, but yet that is precisely what happened in 2003.

What have we seen since? We saw the complete horror show that was the Kavanaugh hearing 2 years ago, an utter disgrace by Senate Democrats.

But I also remember the 2005 confirmation of Sam Alito. I also was there for the Roberts confirmation.

Ask Justice Alito's lovely wife, Martha-Ann, how she feels about the way her husband was treated, attacked, torn down, vilified through his confirmation proceedings by Senator SCHUMER.

It was vitriolic. It wasn't just highlighting differences of views or judicial philosophy; it was targeting him personally and attacking. But that is the playbook that I have to suggest is the routine playbook for my colleagues on the other side of the aisle in the United States Senate.

Of course, that wasn't the first time. We all know, in 1987, there was a new verb in the lexicon of the confirmation process called borking, because Judge Bork was borked. They took down Judge Bork.

And, again, what was his great crime? He was a constitutional con-

servative. He was a constitutionalist. That was his great crime.

It took a mere 4 years later for Justice Thomas, in his own words, to receive a "high-tech lynching."

□ 1845

I say to the ladies and gentlemen watching, watch the video. It is on my Twitter feed. You can go find it. Google it. Go watch the great biopic. You can go find that on PBS. There is a great documentary on the life of Clarence Thomas who was born into the relative poverty of Savannah, Georgia. He was raised by his grandfather. Read his book, "My Grandfather's Son."

A life overcoming many obstacles to end up at Yale, and then to end up at the Supreme Court. And if you remember at his confirmation hearings, what did he say? He said: This isn't worth it for the court at the hearings, when he was being pilloried, his character assassinated. He said, You know what, the Supreme Court isn't worth it.

But you know what was worth it and the reason he came back, and the reason he shoved it right back down the throats of those members of the Senate Judiciary Committee, including, by the way, Chairman Joe Biden, because it was his character. It was his name, the name that he had inherited, and he had from his grandfather that loved him and raised him.

It was his name and he brought that Senate Judiciary Committee to its knees. And we should be grateful for it because he has been an excellent justice on the United States Supreme Court, and he did not deserve the attacks that he got.

Let's talk about the person to the left of Justice Thomas, Miguel Estrada. Does anybody know that name, remember that name? Miguel Estrada is a good human being. He is a good man. He was also a nominee in the Bush administration in 2003, during that same time that I was describing with Janice Rogers Brown and Priscilla Owen, and there were others.

I think there were some 50 that were filibustered during that time. I can't remember. Do you know why Miguel Estrada was filibustered? Ultimately, he was stopped. A deal was cut, and Janice Rogers Brown and Priscilla Owen ended up on the bench. Miguel Estrada was not fortunate.

Miguel Estrada was targeted and stopped precisely because he is Hispanic. That is a known truth in Washington, D.C., but nobody talks about it. Do you know why?

Because of concerns about how a leaked memo was found. It was a leaked memo that was found on a server. It is the stuff that would be great for ethics classes in law school or undergrad about what folders are open and who can look at them and who can see them. It is a reasonable debate.

But the fact of the matter is, there was a memo by Senate Democratic leadership saying we must stop him because he is a Hispanic. I say to the ladies and gentlemen who are watching

this, this is what is wrong with Washington, D.C. And what are we going to see transpire in the coming weeks?

I hope we have a great celebration of Justice Ginsburg's life this week. Obviously, it has transformed very quickly into what is next, but I hope we will stop and celebrate.

But as we go forward, we know what is going to happen. We know it as sure as we are sitting here, as sure as the Sun comes up tomorrow that it doesn't matter who the President nominates. He or she will be attacked viscously, violently.

We certainly know that if Judge Barrett is nominated, she will be attacked viciously. Her faith will be attacked viciously. The fact that she is a proud mom to, I think, seven, of whom I think two are adopted, she will be attacked.

Why is this? It is because we have made Washington, D.C., and its institutions too consequential to the lives of Americans in a country in which we are supposed to live freely.

We have taken issues that you are supposed to work out and debate at the State legislature and the local level and, at most, in this body, in this Chamber, in the Senate, and we have placed them into the hands of nine judges.

So now every June everybody waits with bated breath outside of the Supreme Court Chamber. What great pronouncement shall come down from on high?

Why do we choose to live that way? Why don't we choose to make decisions in this body?

Why don't we the people of this body make Article I great again? Why don't we make Congress work again?

I introduced legislation a year and a half ago called the Article I Act, designed to take power away from the President and expand power here in times of emergencies, so you can't have situations like we have now where over the last 30 years vast numbers of emergencies have just been perpetual. And we still operate and give the executive branch authority to operate under these emergencies, 30 years later. That is facially absurd.

Why don't we fix that? I have had conversations with friends and colleagues on the other side of the aisle who are interested in doing that. Why isn't the Speaker?

Look, I did that with a Republican President in the White House who is trying to secure the border, a proposition with which I agree not just a little, but strongly. It is our job to secure the border of the United States. I fully support the President in securing the border of the United States.

I fully agree that it is an emergency at our border. I fully agree that we need to stop the cartels. I fully agree that we need to protect migrants who are seeking to come here. I fully agree that it is in the best interests of the people of the United States and the people who seek to come here for us to have a simple, secure border.

No one could logically disagree with that statement, by the way. But we don't deal with logic. We deal with grand statements, and emotion, and allegations of kids in cages. But why don't we have a debate?

This Republican introduced legislation in the time of a Republican President that would pull power back from that Republican President because I believe it is in the best interests of this body, this Chamber, the House of Representatives. Why don't we do it?

Do it now, I say to my Democratic colleagues. Don't wait to do it when there is a Democrat in the White House. Let's do it now. It is our job to make Article I great again.

Why do we turn virtually all of our power over to courts and executives? We see it unfolding before our very eyes right now in the course of this pandemic.

What are we doing with respect to the pandemic? What are we doing with respect to COVID?

We launch a \$2 trillion missile in April, and we walked away. Now we have executives around the country who are making all sorts of decisions irrespective of what their State legislatures might be doing. We have a lot of power being executed in our Article II executive branch without any checks or balances here because we are not doing our job.

Let's have those debates. Let's bring Scott Atlas, Fauci, Birx, a host of other doctors, let's bring them before this body; not in some random committee with a handful of people on it on a Zoom call. Bring them before this body and let's hear from them and let's cross-examine them. And let's understand what is at stake. Let's make good decisions based on that and let's make sure the American people know the facts.

I happen to be one of those people who believes that we should take this virus very seriously, who has a 77-year-old father who survived polio, and a 71-year-old mother that I want to protect from the virus. I also happen to be somebody who believes that we have scared the bejesus out of the American people in such a way that we are causing them harm.

They are having mental health issues. They are not getting cancer screenings. Suicides are up, addictions are up, and we just bury our head in the sand and go around, and some people on the other side of the aisle scream 200,000, and they think that is an argument when it is not an argument. It is an irresponsible effort to instill panic in the American people for political purposes. And that is precisely what my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are doing.

Why don't we have a debate and have a discussion and bring people forward and determine the facts and share those facts with the American people so we can open our society up again properly, wisely, but open.

I am always mystified while I watch people running around talking about

how much we need to be locked down, but they are drinking their bottle of water. Sitting at a hearing today I saw Dr. Fauci drinking his bottle of water. I see people saying we need to stay locked down. They are drinking their Starbucks coffee. I see them stop off and pick up Little Taco in Austin, Texas, or go pick up some food.

Who made it? Who distributed it? Who brought it to them on the curbside service? Who brought them their latte? Who is making their electricity run? Essential workers? Who among us are fine with endangering essential workers in grocery stores and power companies and food service so that some people can pat themselves on the back saying, They are doing a great thing by staying locked down?

Let's study the data, the reports that came out just today from Brown University showing a relatively low transmission rate for some kids in college in our schools. Let's study that data. Let's look at how many are hospitalized. Let's talk about how we are going to achieve immunity. It might be a vaccine. It might be that some of the most healthy members of society continue to engage and operate and we build up immunity.

That is what we do for other things. Let's talk about that, instead of scaring the heck out of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, this is no way for us to do our job. Our job is to represent each and every American and to be here and debate and to vote.

I am going to say one more time, with all due respect to the Speaker of the House, I cannot, for the life of me, understand why this body cannot meet and stand up for our law enforcement.

I cannot understand why this body cannot meet, debate, and vote on a PPP extension bill, or another form of that kind of legislation to make sure our small businesses can survive; the restaurants, the music venues, the wineries, distilleries, breweries, barber shops, hotels—all of the entities that are struggling to survive right now throughout this country.

Where are we? We have been back now after a long hiatus for 10 days-ish, not really. We will be back next week. What are we doing? Let's pass that. Let's stand up with law enforcement. Let's pass a bill to protect our small businesses.

Let's do the basic duty that is incumbent upon us as Members of the United States House of Representatives to represent the people who are asking us to do those things. It is our job. We are asking millions of Americans to do their job while we completely and totally fail to do ours.

Mr. Speaker, we are \$27 trillion in debt. It is about to jump to \$30 trillion, and we walk around here like nothing is going on. Drugs and narcotics are still flowing across our southern border, and we don't do a thing about it. Law enforcement is getting attacked on the streets—targeted—buildings are

getting burned, streets are in unrest, and we are doing nothing about it.

Mr. Speaker, I will close by just saying, it is an honor to serve in the United States House of Representatives, but this body has got to do better. It is time for this body to do its job. It is time for us to stand up for America.

Mr. Speaker, 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 for morning-hour de-

bate and 11 a.m. for legislative business.

Thereupon (at 6 o'clock and 59 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, September 24, 2020, at 9 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

BUDGETARY EFFECTS OF PAYGO LEGISLATION

Pursuant to the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (PAYGO), Mr. YARMUTH hereby submits, prior to the vote on passage, for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that H.R. 5245, the SHIELD for Veterans Act, as amended, would have no significant effect on the deficit, and therefore, the budgetary effects of such bill are estimated as zero.

Pursuant to the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (PAYGO), Mr. YARMUTH hereby submits, prior to the vote on passage, the attached estimate of the costs of H.R. 7105, the DELIVER Act, as amended, for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

ESTIMATE OF PAY-AS-YOU-GO EFFECTS FOR H.R. 7105

	By fiscal year, in millions of dollars—													
	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2020–2025	2020–2030	
Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Impact	0	106	182	– 50	– 63	– 80	– 75	– 23	0	0	0	95	– 3	

Components may not sum to totals because of rounding.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,
ETC.

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

5357. A letter from the Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Vice Admiral Frederick J. Roegge, United States Navy, and his advancement to the grade of vice admiral on the retired list, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 1370(c)(1); Public Law 96-513, Sec. 112 (as amended by Public Law 104-106, Sec. 502(b)); (110 Stat. 293); to the Committee on Armed Services.

5358. A letter from the Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting authorization of Colonel Jason G. Woodworth, USMC, to wear the insignia of the grade of brigadier general, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 777(b)(3)(B); Public Law 104-106, Sec. 503(a)(1) (as added by Public Law 108-136, Sec. 509(a)(3)); (117 Stat. 1458); to the Committee on Armed Services.

5359. A letter from the Chairman of the Board of Directors and Director, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's FY 2019 actuarial evaluation of the expected operations and status of the PBGC funds, pursuant to 29 U.S.C. 1308; Public Law 93-406, Sec. 4008 (as amended by Public Law 109-280, Sec. 412); (120 Stat. 936); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

5360. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Limited Approval and Limited Disapproval of California Air Plan Revisions; San Diego County Air Pollution Control District; Stationary Source Permits [EPA-R09-OAR-2019-0449; FRL-10013-14-Region 9] received September 14, 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.

5361. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Georgia: Permit Requirements [EPA-R04-OAR-2020-0071; FRL-10013-22-Region 4] received Sep-

tember 14, 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.

5362. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; California; Feather River Air Quality Management District [EPA-R09-OAR-2020-0180; FRL-10012-89-Region 9] received September 14, 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.

5363. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Wisconsin; VOC RACT for the Wisconsin Portion of the Chicago-Naperville, Illinois-Indiana-Wisconsin Area [EPA-R05-OAR-2020-0030; EPA-R05-OAR-2020-0101; FRL-10011-74-Region 5] received September 14, 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.

5364. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Inpyrfluxam; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2018-0038; FRL-10011-32] received September 14, 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.

5365. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — 2-propenoic acid, 2-methyl-, polymer with 2,5-furandione and 2,4,4-trimethyl-1-pentene, potassium salt; Pesticide Tolerance Exemption [EPA-HQ-OPP-2019-0549; FRL-10003-65] received September 14, 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.

5366. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Commonwealth of Kentucky: Final Approval of State Underground Storage Tank Program [EPA-R04-UST-2020-0248; FRL-10013-46-Region 4] received Sep-

tember 14, 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.

5367. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Oil and Natural Gas Sector: Emission Standards for New, Reconstructed, and Modified Sources Reconsideration [EPA-HQ-OAR-2017-0483; FRL-10013-60-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AT54) received September 14, 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.

5368. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; California; Consumer Products Regulations [EPA-R09-OAR-2020-0213; FRL-10013-66-Region 9] received September 14, 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.

5369. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — PM10 Maintenance Plan and Redesignation Request; Imperial Valley Planning Area; California [EPA-R09-OAR-2019-0654; FRL-10014-02-Region 9] received September 14, 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.

5370. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Alabama: Air Quality Control, VOC Definition [EPA-R04-OAR-2020-0170; FRL-10013-41-Region 4] received September 14, 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.

5371. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Amendments Related to Marine Diesel Engine Emission Standards [EPA-HQ-OAR-2018-0638; FRL-10013-36-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AU30) received September 14, 2020,