

the majority leader to immediately schedule this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman is not recognized for debate.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the House majority leader, for the purpose of explaining the week to come.

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

As I have expressed, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. RICHMOND), my friend, would like to have a moment.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. RICHMOND).

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Speaker, I thank both the majority leader and the minority whip for yielding me time.

Today is a great day, but it is also a sad day for me. I am losing my chief of staff, the only one that I have had since I have been here, Virgil Miller, who, the funny story is, John Dingell made the reference for me to hire him.

The one thing I appreciate now is that when I called John Dingell for a recommendation, he was on the House floor, but told his staff, "No matter where I am, pull me off so I can talk about how great Virgil Miller is."

Some of you may have seen the news, but Virgil proposed. More importantly, Kirby said yes. So he is getting married and starting another chapter of his life.

It was great to have him here in this body, and I hope for him the best. He is not only my chief, but he has come to be part of our family and like a younger brother to me. I just want to wish him the best as he goes off to start a more exciting part of his life and wish him the best.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the majority leader for allowing me to say a few words.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments.

I know that I speak on behalf of all the Members of the House to wish Virgil Godspeed, great success in the future, and great happiness.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, if I may reclaim my time from the majority leader.

Mr. Speaker, I do also want to thank Virgil for his time and his service to the House for so long and to work so closely with my friend, CEDRIC RICHMOND, but also with the entire Louisiana delegation. We have had a long history of working incredibly well together on issues that are important to our State and the country.

Virgil has been right there from the beginning of CEDRIC's career and a great part of the Louisiana delegation but also a great part of what makes this House work.

Mr. Speaker, while we will miss Virgil, I wish him well on his new life ahead, a lot of exciting times. I continue to look forward to seeing you in New Orleans at our great restaurants.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

□ 1130

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the House will meet at 12 p.m. for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business, with votes postponed until 6:30 p.m.

On Tuesday and Wednesday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate and 12 p.m. for legislative business.

On Thursday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business, with last votes no later than 3 p.m.

We will consider several bills under suspension of the rules. A complete list of suspensions will be announced by the close of business today.

The House will also consider H. Con. Res. 24, expressing the sense of Congress that the report of Special Counsel Mueller should be made available to the public and to Congress.

Mr. SCALISE. I thank the gentleman for walking through the schedule, and I would like to ask the gentleman from Maryland about the process that we have had so far this Congress in terms of amendments that have been submitted on the House floor on legislation and the way that it has been incredibly closed, especially in a partisan way to Republican amendments.

If you look just at the bill we debated a few minutes ago, H.R. 1, only 11 percent of Republican amendments were made in order. More than 60 amendments of Democrat amendments were made in order. And if you look at the entire Congress so far this year, there were only 16 percent of Republican amendments made in order while 73 percent of Democrat amendments were made in order, which does reflect poorly on the promise that this would be a more open process.

I would ask the gentleman from Maryland, can you address at least in the future to make this a more fair and open process so that you are not closing out opportunities over and over again for Republican amendments to be made in order?

And I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his question. I want to put it in context.

For the first time in history, we started this Congress with a government shutdown. For the first time in history. The business was not completed, the government was not fully funded, and it was necessary for us, as we began this session, to have numerous votes to open up the government. We didn't get a lot of help from your side of the aisle on doing that, and it was not about a debate; we had considered six bills that essentially had been

agreed to. There was clearly a disagreement on Homeland Security.

But let me remind you, on H.R. 1, the largest bill that we considered during the last Congress, you brought that to the floor and you had no committee hearings. Not a single committee hearing. You had no witnesses. No member of the public was able to testify. It was a closed rule, and zero amendments were made in order.

Now, let me make a comparison for you on H.R. 1, the bill we just passed. This bill had five hearings across several committees, 19 witnesses testified, the primary committee of jurisdiction had markup, and 72 amendments were made in order.

Now, H.R. 1, last Congress, zero Democratic amendments made in order. Now of course there were no Republican amendments made in order either because it was a closed rule, no amendments at all, no hearings, no committee hearings, no witnesses.

So that we have, as we said we would, had a process, opportunity for the public to testify, opportunity for amendments to be made in order. I forget exactly how many amendments you said, Republican amendments, but that is, whatever that number was, whether it was 10 or 15 or 25 or 35, more than we had in order.

As the gentleman knows, the last Congress was the most closed Congress in history. In history. We did not see a single open rule, not one under Speaker Ryan, not one. I am committed to ensuring, however, that we have a limited amount of closed rules.

Again, the gentleman is correct, the government was shut down and we had rules that we put forward to get the government open. It was not an amendment to say partially open this. It was, let's get it open.

So that my answer to the gentleman is we said what we were going to do on bills. We had 72 amendments on this bill. The proportion of amendments, the gentleman's concerned about, certainly want to make sure that we have substantive amendments considered from both sides of the aisle; that was done here. The gentleman thinks not enough, but as I said, it was, as opposed to zero, a substantial increase.

Mr. SCALISE. Well, I thank the gentleman. I would like to point out, of those 72 amendments that you identify that were made in order, only nine were Republican amendments. So when we talk about a fair and open process, the government shutdown has nothing to do with the fact that your side committed to having a more open process, and it is not. In fact, it is the reverse of what we saw last Congress.

If you look at the entire last Congress, the entire 2-year period, there were more Democrat amendments made in order under a Republican Congress than there were Republican amendments made in order. In fact, if you look at the numbers for the entire 2-year period, 38 percent of Republican amendments were made in order; 45

percent of Democrat amendments were made in order. In the overall number, 752 Democrat amendments made in order, 752. There were only 640 Republican amendments made in order. So more Democrat amendments were made in order under our majority than Republican amendments.

In this Congress so far, it is been a harshly partisan process through the Rules Committee. Again, the entire year, only 16 percent of Republican amendments made in order; 73 percent of Democrat amendments made in order.

And just looking at H.R. 1 again, we had on our side a colleague of ours, Representative FITZPATRICK. He actually led the FBI's agency on campaign finance and election crimes enforcement. He actually put people in jail who committed voter fraud, and this is a voter bill, a bill on voting rights, and you have a Member of Congress who actually worked with the FBI to put people in jail for voter fraud. He submitted seven different amendments to clean up some of the corruption that was in your bill that you just passed. Not one of his amendments was made in order. This is an FBI agent who actually put people in jail for voter fraud, not a partisan issue, and yet not one of his amendments was made in order.

So you want to talk about a closed process, let's also talk about the policy that is being closed out, and if you want to shut out efforts to clean up voter fraud, that is your prerogative, but ultimately it is not what you promised when you took the majority and if you compare it to the last Congress. Again, the entire 2-year period, more Democrat amendments were made in order than Republican amendments were made in order under our Republican majority.

I would hope in the future this process is less partisan and more fair, as it was promised to be.

On that note, I would like to ask the majority leader about a word that is swirling around regarding changes to the motion to recommit. Now, when you look at the history of Congress, this motion to recommit is more than 100 years old. It had been a custom. It had been a custom where the majority party brings a bill to the floor under a rule, and regardless of all the amendments that are allowed, at the very end of that process, the minority party gets an opportunity to make a final amendment to the bill. That is the motion to recommit.

It wasn't in the rules for a long time. And then towards the end of the Democrat majority, right before the 1994 revolution, there were efforts to take that away from the minority. So when the Republicans took over in 1994, the Newt Gingrich majority, they actually put in the rules the motion to recommit. Again, it was a custom going back 100 years. They formalized it. As the majority, they gave the minority that right in the rules. And it has always been there. It was cleaned up a little

bit over the years, but it is a tool that has been always allowed to the minority.

We are hearing—and it is rumor maybe—I would like to ask the majority leader to clarify, are there any efforts or attempts being made to change and diminish the motion to recommit? And I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding. Of course, we both know, certainly since the time I have been here, that motions to recommit, on both sides of the aisle, have been gotcha amendments. They have been amendments to use for political ads to talk about partisanship. Both sides did that, understand.

So is there consternation about them? There is. Did you have an MTR today? You did. It was a difficult MTR. Of course, it dealt with a problem that does not exist at the Federal level, and it said so in the resolution, that there was not a problem that they were solving, just a sort of a sense that local communities ought to be directed what to do.

Having said that let me go back to the gentleman's question again. You said you had nine amendments. We had zero. So you could say it was 900 percent, 9,000 percent, but whatever you want to say, on H.R. 1 in your Congress and H.R. 1 in our Congress and all those figures, I think, are probably lost on the public, but what is not lost on the public or the press that has covered it extensively, last Congress was the most closed Congress in history, just as the Government being shutdown at the beginning of this Congress was the first time that happened in history, because you didn't get your job done.

But I would tell the leader, I understand the rights of the minority. We want to honor the rights of the minority, and, yes, there is a lot of discussion, but as you know, nothing has been done, and I am sure those discussions will continue.

But I understand the gentleman's point. We used the motion to recommit. You have used the motion to recommit. There is no proposed change currently under consideration.

Mr. SCALISE. I thank the gentleman for clarifying that. And I hope that tradition continues on, that this motion to recommit stays in order, because there are some Members that, if the motion to recommit passes, would vote for final passage. So that is one of the tools that are used. And if you cite, as you did, the motion to recommit that we had on H.R. 1 just a little while ago, it actually was identifying a serious problem.

It mentioned in that motion to recommit what happens in some communities where they are allowing illegals to vote, people that are here illegally, to vote in elections, whether it is school board elections or any other, and then you have a process where somebody has an ID, they are automatically sent to the voter registration files. And it creates a process

where corruption can occur, where people who are here illegally can get on voting rolls and maybe you catch it at the local level and maybe you don't, but it creates that opportunity. So we had a motion to prevent that from happening, and, unfortunately, that motion to recommit failed. But again, that is a tool that has been available for any minority to use.

And in fact, when you bring up H.R. 1 from last Congress, our bill to cut taxes for working families so that we can rebuild our middle class, which we are finally doing now because we cut taxes for everybody, people are seeing more money in their pockets; higher wages because of that bill. Heavily debated in committee; lots of amendments in committee on both sides. When it came to the floor, yes, there were no amendments on your side or on our side, but you did have a motion to recommit. So you had an amendment opportunity that we didn't have on that bill. But at the end of the day, obviously all Members on your side voted "no."

But you can see how the economy has taken off and how families actually have more money in their pockets and wages are up for working families because we cut those taxes.

So I would point that out as we move forward, hopefully, those rules don't change in a way that would try to diminish even further the opportunities that both sides have to bring amendments to the floor.

Finally, I would like to ask about the resolution that we had on the floor yesterday, the resolution to condemn all forms of bigotry, hatred. Unfortunately many of our Members felt it fell short of the objective that was stated by the majority at the beginning of the week, that there would be a resolution brought forward to actually condemn comments that were made, that were anti-Semitic by one of our Members.

And I would like to ask the gentleman, is there going to be any action taken, especially as it relates to the Foreign Affairs Committee, to remove the Member that we are talking about? And I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. I tell the gentleman, I have heard that question raised before.

You removed Mr. KING from the committees after 10 years of comments, speeches, and support for groups that did not comport with what we said yesterday in terms of rejecting bigotry and prejudice and hate. Ten years.

□ 1145

We have now twice taken action to make clear that hate and prejudice and bigotry are not the policies of this Congress, of this country, and should not be the policy of any of our Members, rhetorically.

Debating policy, having differences of opinion are clear. I don't know whether the gentleman heard my speech on the floor, but I could not, I think, have articulated more forcefully that anti-Semitism is unacceptable,

that anti-Semitism has led to grievous results, unacceptable results, the Holocaust, of course, being the most horrific.

I made that very clear. The resolution made that very clear. And yes, it did include other forms and other objects of hate and prejudice and bigotry.

And I was disappointed that 23 of your Members voted against it. Every one of my Members, without exception, voted for that resolution. So that resolution, I thought, that got over 400 of us, spoke very strongly to our opposition to anti-Semitism, to racism, to sexism, to Islamophobia.

And I haven't seen any resolution on the floor of the House when you were in charge that responded to the President of the United States stoking Islamophobia.

I saw no resolution. I saw no resolution on the floor when the President of the United States made a comment that, well, there are bad people on both sides, in Charlottesville—those holding Swastikas; those who were saying we are not going to allow the Jews to take over; those who had racist epithets and who, in fact, of course, killed one of the participants. I saw no resolution. We ultimately did get to a resolution.

But I would say to my friend, frankly, those of us on our side of the aisle think that the President too often uses words and actions that undermine the sentiment of the resolution that I voted for, that you voted for, and the overwhelming majority of the House voted for saying that is not and should not be the policy of the United States.

I won't go into more specifics, but the gentleman, I am sure, knows that I could.

What is positive is that yesterday some 400-plus of us voted to say to America and to each of our citizens and those who view America as a beacon of liberty and justice that we reject out of hand any comments, any actions that would be recognized by most people as stoking bigotry and prejudice and hate.

So, yes, that language you are talking about, as introduced, was not a final product. The final product came about through a lot of discussions and addressing the hate and bigotry and prejudice that is directed at too many people who are somehow viewed as different.

The remarks to which the gentleman referred were pointed out very clearly as being remarks which had been used through the millennia as ways to diminish the integrity of Jewish citizens and to imply that somehow their support for Israel was an indication of their lack of loyalty to their country. You and I both know that was used for centuries, millennia, to marginalize Jewish citizens and to make them feel unwelcomed and rejected.

So I think the resolution was a good thing for us to do. It passed overwhelmingly. I am sorry that 23 of your Members decided not to vote for it.

Let me go back to the MTRs.

We had a very strong statement that your side offered on anti-Semitism.

And you all voted for it; we all voted for it. Not a single Democrat voted against it. And when it came for final passage, I don't recall how many Republicans, but it was the overwhelming majority of your caucus voted against it.

So offering an amendment, having the amendment adopted, which we accepted because we thought that it was important to make that powerful statement against anti-Semitism, we adopted it.

Unfortunately, when it came to the real vote—not the political gotcha vote, but when it came to the real vote—your side all voted against it—or if not all, pretty close.

Mr. SCALISE. And as we disagree with the underlying bills, we all agree that anti-Semitism is wrong. We have been very vocal in rejecting anti-Semitism and any form of bigotry.

The issue with the resolution that was brought forward—first of all, as the gentleman, over months, has promised a 72-hour rule where there would be 72 hours to review legislation, as you acknowledged, that resolution continued to change over and over again. By the time it was filed, before Members had the opportunity to vote, there wasn't a 72-hour rule. In fact, there wasn't even a 72-minute rule. There was less than an hour to review the legislation.

As Members went through it, it included some things that we all agree should be rejected. But many Members—and I would refer the gentleman from Maryland to the statements made by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN), who eloquently stated why that resolution fell short at its original objection: to equivocate anti-Semitism, to refuse to acknowledge that as Members spew anti-Semitism. If we can say that anti-Semitism is unacceptable—and I agree. If we say that we should reject those policies, the dual citizenship question, which is anti-Semitic, the money influence, which was offensive and anti-Semitic, we keep coming back to this because these statements continue to be made.

But if that is unacceptable, if you agree that anti-Semitism is unacceptable and bad policy, then why do you continue to leave a Member who is anti-Semitic on the committee that deals with the policy of the foreign policy of this Nation?

It is a high-profile committee. The Foreign Affairs Committee is a plumb spot. Many Members on both sides want to get on that committee because it is so important at stating our foreign policy to the world, at standing with our allies.

When you go to other countries and meet with officials, if you say you are on the Foreign Affairs Committee, it is a higher level of respect and acknowledgment that implies that your views represent the views of the United States Congress.

That is the concern where the resolution fell short.

And so many of our Members said: How many times are we going to have to keep voting on resolutions that talk generally but don't act specifically to address the problems?

And if you want to talk about the President, President Trump has been very clear and vocal, speaking out against anti-Semitism.

You saw him, just a few weeks ago, from this podium, in his State of the Union Address so eloquently bringing members to the gallery, people to the gallery: the three men who stormed Normandy Beach on D-day to liberate France and to defeat Nazis; the gentleman from Pittsburgh, the Holocaust survivor, over 90 years old, who survived the Pittsburgh shooting, who also was at Dachau.

And then for the President to so eloquently refer to one of our heroes who stormed Normandy Beach and then a year later help liberate Dachau, what a special moment for this House to see how hatred and bigotry is evil but how the might and power of the United States stands up against it.

We should all speak out against it, but we should also take the actions that, if somebody is continuing to exhibit those kind of beliefs in this Congress, they shouldn't be making policy on the committee that has jurisdiction. That has been the concern.

I hope we don't have to come back to it. I hope we don't have to keep coming back to address this problem. It shouldn't be a growing problem.

We should all stand up against it when we see it. And hopefully, we don't see it anymore because we are so clear—not just in our words, but clear in our actions.

So as we continue to, hopefully, find common ground—and there is common ground to be found. This wasn't a good week for the United States Congress to see the kind of divisions, to see it take days to come up with a simple resolution that should have taken minutes to stand up clearly against anti-Semitic actions.

So, hopefully, next week we can return to making policy where we are able to come together in a bipartisan way to address concerns and problems of this Nation.

And I know I look forward to working with the gentleman if we find that common ground. And we will, we ultimately will.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. First of all, Mr. Speaker, let me say I reject out of hand the premise that we didn't speak directly to anti-Semitism in the resolution that was adopted yesterday, period. It spoke strongly to that.

Not only did it speak strongly, but if the gentleman heard my remarks, they were very strong with respect to an absolute rejection of anti-Semitism.

Now, apparently, the problem is we also spoke against racism. We also spoke against xenophobia.

I mentioned the President on xenophobia, the denigration of the dignity

of immigrants who have been so important to this country at the highest levels of our government, the allegations of widespread criminal activity in a broad bush. That resolution yesterday spoke to that.

It spoke about Islamophobia. It spoke about hatred of immigrants, of LGBT members of our society. It spoke against discrimination and hate. And, yes, it spoke directly about anti-Semitism, as it should have.

As I was absolutely committed, and the Members of this House were absolutely committed—save 23. I don't know why that 23 voted against it, but they did, not on our side of the aisle.

And I agree with the gentleman. Hopefully, we can continue to not use this as a political football, as I think it is being used.

And I am not going to cite some of the remarks of the minority leader with respect to Mr. Soros, Mr. Steier or others, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. KING. There was a difference, Mr. Speaker. We didn't wait 10 years.

Initially, we acted—the entire Democratic leadership—with a very pointed and direct letter that anti-Semitism was not acceptable, period. No confusion.

And within days, we put a suspension bill—which, by the way, the rules are waived on suspension bills. As the gentleman knows, you don't necessarily have to give 72 hours. But there were 72 hours that that was being discussed, and people knew it was being discussed, and the leader—and the whip has referred to that.

□ 1200

But I hope that nobody would diminish what we said yesterday about anti-Semitism, or racism, or any other kind ofism.

Let us not diminish what we did yesterday. I think this was a good week, Mr. Speaker, for the House of Representatives. We spoke about making sure that voting rights were protected for every American, and not only that, protected, but facilitated, made easier to register and to vote so that all Americans could express their opinion on the policies of their country and their State, and their municipality, or whatever office they were voting for.

It was a good day to say that we are going to have redistricting which is not run by the politicians, and I have been one of them that has done it so everybody understands that. Every State, not just a few, would have to have a redistricting process that was fair and balanced, and not just the politicians drawing their own districts.

It was a good day, Mr. Speaker. It was a good week, because we also spoke about making sure that we have campaign finance that discloses to everybody who the contributors are. It is ironic, Mr. Speaker, that I was here when we considered McCain-Feingold and the Republican leadership in the House and the Senate both said: "You don't need caps. You don't need to

limit spending. What you need is disclosure. Let people know who is contributing."

Well, of course, Citizens United undermined that pretty substantially, and we have millions and millions of dollars nobody knows where it comes from, so this bill did that.

This bill also said that we ought to have better ethics. We ought to not be serving on boards of profit-making corporations while we are making policies that affect them in this House. And, yes, it said the President of the United States, as every President since I have been a Member of Congress which has been since 1981, should disclose their tax returns so that the people know, are they acting in their own interest, or in the people's interest.

We called this bill the For the People Act, for voting rights, for fair registration, for campaign finance that is honest and above board and transparent, and for good ethical behavior by us and by the President.

So I disagree with my friend, the minority whip. I think this was a good week. In some ways, it was a tough week, but it was a good week. I am very pleased that not only did we adopt that resolution against hate, and prejudice, and bigotry against all, including and very pointedly, starting out with anti-Semitism.

We also adopted a bill that will give more trust and faith to the American people in their government and more access to the ballot box. It was a good bill. It was a good week.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, if we talk about H.R. 1, what the gentleman fails to mention is that bill gives billions of dollars of taxpayer money to politicians. Many have called it the "For the Politicians Act." Most Americans across this country are hard-working. I don't want to see their taxpayer dollars go to some politician that they strongly disagree with so that they can run negative attack ads, things that people don't like to see on TV.

If somebody wants to contribute to a campaign, that is their prerogative, but no taxpayer should be forced to give billions of dollars of their taxpayer money to politicians, whether they agree or disagree with them, by coercion from the Federal Government. That is in the bill. It has felons voting. Many States have laws against felons voting.

For example, somebody brought this up and we weren't even able to get a clear answer. If somebody was convicted of child molestation in a State that prohibited them from going to schools, under your bill if they go to a school to vote—because now as a felon, as a child molester, even though that State bars them from voting, and that State bars them from going into a school—the bill gives them a hall pass to go into that school as a child molester, who, otherwise, under their State law, would be prohibited from going into that school where children are.

So there are obviously a lot of other things in that bill that concern many Americans across the country.

Getting back to the anti-Semitism debate we are having. The gentleman brought up the minority leader and other Members. The minority leader has been very vocal against anti-Semitism. Clearly, when you saw people giving outside money, over \$100 million of their own money to influence campaigns, of course, that is a subject people talk about.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I will yield on that point, but I would like to make the point that the minority leader has been very vocal against anti-Semitism, and I just wanted to make sure that the gentleman wasn't inferring anything different in his comments.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, why in his comment did he mention three Americans of Jewish descent but didn't mention the Koch brothers, and by the way, didn't mention the gentleman from Nevada?

Mr. SCALISE. Who is also Jewish.

Mr. HOYER. Exactly. The three Jews that were mentioned were all Democrats, and the Koch brothers were not mentioned.

Mr. SCALISE. We have supporters on both sides that, regardless of their faith, give lots of money to politics.

Mr. HOYER. I agree with that.

Mr. SCALISE. Now, if the criticism was that there were big donors to Democrats, of course, that is who was being mentioned. Regardless of their faith, those were the people who were giving large amounts, tens of millions of dollars each. As you have criticized, or brought up the name of the gentleman from Nevada, nobody questions that you are making a comment about his religious faith.

Mr. HOYER. Of course not.

Mr. SCALISE. And neither should the assertion be made to anyone who brings up the three gentlemen who were mentioned.

Reclaiming my time, the bigger issue is, it is interesting that the gentleman mentioned a bunch of names. He mentioned a lot of names, but the one name he didn't mention is Ms. OMAR, who, at the beginning of this week, that was initially what the resolution was going to be, trying to address the comments made by Ms. OMAR.

Ultimately, the resolution went much further and left out that key component that many of us wanted to see addressed, many of us expected to see addressed, but a lot of people found it real interesting.

For example, in section 7 of the resolution, it condemns death threats received by Jewish and Muslim Members of Congress. Why, interestingly, were death threats to other Members of Congress left out? I surely can speak to that as so many others of our colleagues can.

All death threats against Members of Congress are wrong. Why did the resolution fall short in so many areas? Because it was so hastily put together. That is not the way we should address an issue this important.

It was supposed to be a narrow resolution. Clearly, on your side, you had a lot of division over it. There shouldn't have been division over it. This is what we ended up with, and so, yes, many of our Members felt that while we have been very clear in rejecting anti-Semitism or anti-racism, or any kind of bigotry, that the resolution fell short of what its original objective was.

Again, I hope we don't have to come back to this. I hope it doesn't continue. We can continue speaking about this, but let's be clear about who is speaking out against it, and who is continuing to engage in it.

I yield to the gentleman from Maryland, if he would like to comment further.

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

I urge both sides, when the leader of our Government says things that clearly offend minority groups of all stripes that we speak out. I think that is a good thing for us to do, and I am sure that we can be joined together to do exactly that.

I would also ask the gentleman to perhaps observe the extraordinary diversity representing all of America on this side of the aisle. You ought not to be surprised that in representing that diversity, they bring forward issues that we tried to also address in a resolution that said hate, bigotry, and prejudice is wrong. It is un-American.

Unfortunately, none of us have ancestors today that were free from pursuing hateful policies. We ought not to be, as I said on the floor, too sanctimonious. We are a Nation that allowed slavery and went through an extraordinary Civil War to eliminate that blot on "We hold these truths to be self-evident."

So, yes, we have a lot of diversity on our side of the aisle, and that diversity is representing its people. They are Americans, but they represent a number of Americans who are perceived as different than other Americans for some designation, either because of race, gender, color, sexual orientation, or immigrant. You name it.

Yes, we have a lot of diversity on this side of the aisle, and we tried to respect that diversity and make sure that every American knew when they read this resolution; we are against discrimination against anybody.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, we appreciate the diversity that we have. We obviously strive to be even more diverse, but the most important diversity that we have and that we are proud of is our diversity of thought.

We are proud to respect people of all faiths. This was a Nation founded under a deep belief in God, but we don't have an established religion. We appreciate and respect people of all religious backgrounds.

One of the things I love most about going to Israel as a Catholic is that so much of the history of my faith of Jesus Christ is represented there in Israel, where you can walk the streets of Jerusalem and literally walk in the steps of Jesus. The fact is that Jewish people in Israel respect that diversity; they respect people of all faiths. And that is one of the proud, crowning achievements of the Jewish state of Israel.

If you look at where we are as a Nation, clearly, slavery is one of the stains, probably the greatest stain, of this Nation. The country struggled with it in its founding, and, ultimately, President Lincoln—the first Republican President—President Lincoln gave his life fighting to end slavery. It was in this Chamber, newly built, where they had that great debate to finally pass the 13th Amendment, one of the proudest moments of our Nation.

It was very contentious, but, ultimately, it was a struggle that had finally come to a head. Again, President Lincoln gave his life for that fight, and we still honor and respect him. In fact, we have a room right down the hall, the Lincoln Room where Abraham Lincoln as a House Member in the 1840s spent time, and we can all go, literally, sit or talk in the same place that Abraham Lincoln sat and talked as he was starting to build coalitions to end slavery, which he was ultimately able to secure.

So we continue to fight. It was wonderful to see JOHN LEWIS on the floor, a true hero, not just a hero of this Congress. We had the honor to serve with Sam Johnson, who was a great hero. He spent 7 years in the Hanoi Hilton.

It is a true honor to serve with JOHN LEWIS. And whether we disagree sometimes on politics, to be able to sit and talk with somebody who truly lived some of the toughest history of our Nation, and has the scars to prove it, and, yet, he still has love in his heart. He exhibits that love and that passion, so we are honored to be able to celebrate that diversity.

Ultimately, it is a diversity of thought that we all should fight to achieve, equality and opportunity for all men and women in this great Nation.

I yield to the gentleman, if he has anything else.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his yielding and his comments.

Let me simply add, we can honor that by our words and our actions today, and tomorrow, and every day thereafter.

Mr. SCALISE. I agree. We should continue to honor all of those goals with our words and our actions.

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

ADJOURNMENT FROM FRIDAY, MARCH 8, 2019, TO MONDAY, MARCH 11, 2019

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the

House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday next, when it shall convene at noon for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TRONE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland? There was no objection.

□ 1215

DENOUNCING ANTI-SEMITISM

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I first want to acknowledge the passing of a dear friend, Congressman Ralph Hall, who was a great leader and a great Texan.

But I also rise today, Mr. Speaker, to ensure that the American people know what we did this week; and that is condemning anti-Semitism as hateful expressions of intolerance that are contradictory to the values and aspirations that define the United States of America. This is the strongest, most definitive denouncing of anti-Semitism that the United States Congress has ever voted on—407 votes.

This summer I will be in my almost 30th year of sending young people to Israel in a kibbutz program named after former Congressman Mickey Leeland.

We understand the value of applauding all people, and, yes, we don't want Americans who happen to be Muslims to be discriminated against or associated with the burning towers, Muslims who have served in the United States military or white nationalists who will be willing to talk about the hatefulness against African Americans, Latinos, Native Americans, Asians, and Pacific Islanders.

Mr. Speaker, this is an important statement, and I am glad to have been associated with it. We should applaud all those who voted for it.

RECOGNIZING JOE M. STEELE OF THE STEELE CANNING COMPANY

(Mr. WOMACK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WOMACK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the life and legacy of the late Joe Steele, the founder of Steele Canning Company in Arkansas.

Joe grew up in northwest Arkansas and eventually enrolled at the University of Arkansas. To cover his tuition, he began canning tomatoes. This side job quickly turned into the Steele Canning Company.

The business continued to grow and relocated to Springdale. There Joe made history by shipping the first trainload of canned food in the United States and introducing Popeye brand spinach. During World War II, 70 percent of Steele's products were sent to our brave troops. One soldier even commented on the beans, saying that the