

FAIR Act, which would eliminate forced arbitration clauses in employment, consumer, and civil rights cases, restoring the rights of consumers, workers, and small businesses to go to court.

This is about respecting the Seventh Amendment, the constitutional right to a trial by jury, the right of every single American to get their day in court.

This is also about public accountability. This is about ending the ability of bad corporate actors to shield their wrongdoing and patterns of violation from public scrutiny.

Let me be perfectly clear: Forced arbitration clauses, which are often buried in the fine print in confusing legal jargon, put the interests of powerful corporations over American workers and consumers.

This impacts every single one of us. Every person in this room at some point has unknowingly ceded their rights away when entering into a contract to buy a new car, to start a new job, or sign up for a new credit card. This is hurting real Americans, from the elderly people who are mistreated in nursing homes, or employees working overtime but not getting paid, to servicemembers who are fired or not rehired after returning from Active Duty. Very few of them are actually getting justice.

In the last 5 years, the number of consumers who have won a monetary award from forced arbitration averages to 382 people a year. Let me put this into perspective: On average, more Americans get struck by lightning every year than win a monetary award from an arbitration.

When corporations know that they can get away with such bad behavior and shield that bad behavior from coming to light, there is absolutely nothing incentivizing them to follow the law and treat consumers well.

It should go without saying, but this legislation is overwhelmingly popular. Research shows that 84 percent of Americans oppose forced arbitration.

I urge every single one of my colleagues to vote "yes" for the FAIR Act and restore vital rights to American consumers, workers, and small businesses.

WHAT IS GOING ON IN THIS COUNTRY

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

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the privilege of being recognized here to speak on the floor of the United States House of Representatives. I come to the floor this morning, Mr. Speaker, to address a topic, and most of the words that I say will be from an article written by Roger Scruton, who is an author from Great Britain. He is commenting on a new book by Douglas Murray, titled "The Madness of Crowds: Gender, Race and Identity."

Some of this hits home so much, and it has so much to do with America, that I thought it was important I address this here this morning.

He says: "In every period of history, therefore, there have been opinions and customs that are dangerous to question . . . but our situation in Western democracies today is a novel one. . . . The old customs have been torn asunder by a culture of repudiation, which encourages people to shape their lives according to an 'identity' of their own."

Socialization no longer means what it used to mean. It means now becoming who you are without regard to the framework that existed in the civilization and the culture prior. "The punishments for saying, thinking, or implying the wrong thing . . . are real, serious, and largely impossible to deflect."

That means that "the archive of your crimes is stored in cyberspace, and however much you may have confessed to them and sworn to change, they will pursue you for the rest of your life, just as long as someone has an interest in drawing attention to them. And when the mob turns on you, it is with a pitiless intensity that bears no relation to the objective seriousness of your fault. A word out of place, a hasty judgment, a slip of the tongue, whatever the fault might be, it is sufficient, once picked upon, to put you beyond the pale of human sympathy."

This is reflected in the book "The Madness of Crowds."

"The emerging world of censorship is a world without forgiveness . . . in which the real virtues and vices that govern our conduct are ignored altogether" or are decided to be irrelevant.

"The crimes for which we are judged are existential crimes. Through speaking in the wrong way, you display one of the phobias or isms," or they presume that is the case, "that show you to be beyond acceptable humanity. You are a homophobe, an Islamophobe, a white supremacist, or a racist, and no argument can refute these accusations once they have been made."

Even "your accusers are not interested in your deeds; they are interested in is "whether or not you are 'one of us,'" meaning actually one of them. "Your faults cannot be overcome by voluntary action, since they adhere to the kind of thing that you are, and you reveal what you are in the words that define you," as defined by your critics.

"These words may be taken out of context, even doctored to mean the opposite of what you said"—that is true with the author and certainly true with me—"but this will not affect the verdict, since there is no objective trial, no 'case for the defense,' no due process. You are accused by the mob, examined by the mob, and condemned by the mob, and if you have brought this on yourself, then," they say, "you have only yourself to blame. For the mob is by nature innocent. It washes

its own conscience in a flow of collective indignation, and by joining it, you make yourself safe," which is one of the reasons we see an epidemic of virtue signaling here in this Congress, Mr. Speaker.

"The spirit of the mob has entered not only the language of public debate but also the sources of information and the institutions of decisionmaking. Censorship begins in the media themselves."

Cyberspace is censored and is controlled by about four major companies. George Orwell predicted this, but I think it has eclipsed even his magnificent imagination and the reality that we are dealing with today.

"Murray gives riveting examples of the way in which"—I will use this example—"whiteness has become a moral fault in the eyes of identity warriors on the American campus." They now openly "condemn people for the color of their skin," provided that it is white. The art of taking offense, "whole sections of the university curriculum are devoted to explaining to students that words, arguments, comparisons, even questions," rhetorical or not, "are 'offensive,' regardless of the intention with which they are used," or, actually, the language, the precise definition of the language.

"Invariably, the offense is given by the old majority culture and is taken on behalf of some privileged minority."

Mr. Speaker, this is a shorthand version of what is going on in this country, what is going on in this Congress, what is going on in the media.

And I submit this, that we don't any longer have an objective news media. That center that used to be the truth has been completely, almost completely, vacated. Much of it has gone to the left. Some has gone to the right. And that peace of being able to pick up a newspaper and read it and believe that it is true today is no longer true today. And the American civilization must come to grips with this and go to original sources, come to our own conclusions, adjust our civilization and our culture. If we fail to do so, we will be pitted against each other for a long time to come.

STOP GUN VIOLENCE IN OUR NATION

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

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, let me begin by saying I certainly and clearly disassociate myself from the remarks of the previous speaker. I absolutely, wholeheartedly disagree with him and do not concur with him.

Mr. Speaker, in 1999, my son Huey became a victim of gun violence when he was murdered in an aborted robbery attempt as he was bringing groceries into his apartment on the South Side of Chicago.

Tragically, Mr. Speaker, my son's death was not unique because literally