

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

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

How do you plan to end it?

How do you plan to end it in banking?

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

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

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

I love my country, Mr. Speaker.

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

#### FOLLOW THE SCIENCE, FOR A CHANGE

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Does the science support population-wide lockdowns?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### NEED FOR FIFTH CORONAVIRUS STIMULUS BILL

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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