

HONORING THE LEGACY OF
FRANK LOSONSKY

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

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor the legacy of the last remaining AVG Flying Tiger, Frank Losonsky, who passed away last week at 99 years of age.

Mr. Losonsky was one of 300 men who comprised the American Volunteer Group, which sailed to China in 1941 to defend against the Imperial Japanese in World War II.

Mr. Losonsky was the crew chief of the Hell's Angels Squadron, where he was responsible for maintaining three to four, maybe five, aircraft at a time.

The Flying Tigers were a unique unit because most of their pilots and support personnel were enlisted in the United States Army Air Corps, the U.S. Navy, and the U.S. Marine Corps, but they flew under Chinese colors.

This elite group was devised and commanded by Louisianian and LSU graduate Lieutenant General Claire Chennault. On his recommendation, President Franklin Roosevelt signed an order allowing American regulars to be lent to the Chinese Air Force. They first flew combat 12 days after Pearl Harbor on December 20, 1941.

Mr. Losonsky's legacy lives on at the Chennault Aviation and Military Museum in Monroe, Louisiana, and we are proud to host it.

Please join me in honoring the contributions of Frank Losonsky and the rest of the AVG Flying Tigers to the liberation of the Pacific from Imperial Japan.

STARTING OVER ON THE EQUAL
RIGHTS AMENDMENT

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

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, we will soon be voting on H.J. Res. 79, which attempts to remove the deadline for ratification contained in the equal rights amendment, which passed Congress in 1972.

Over the decades, we have made great strides in our Nation in promoting and protecting women's rights. This year, we are celebrating the 100th anniversary of the 19th Amendment, which guaranteed women the right to vote across our country.

A few months ago, I visited the Susan B. Anthony Birthplace Museum in Adams, Massachusetts. It is a small but powerful museum that tells the story of Susan B. Anthony and her work, along with other suffragists, for the right to vote and for other rights for women.

When talking about how far we have come in equal rights for women, I can't help but think of my own mother, who is now in her eighties. When I graduated from eighth grade, she fulfilled

her goal of graduating from college, which she had never had a chance to do. When I went off to college, she fulfilled a lifelong dream and went to law school; and, in 1988, she graduated from Georgetown University Law School with her law degree. It took her a long time to finally have these opportunities, but she persevered and succeeded.

So I am thinking about my mother as well as my wife, who is an actuary, and my sister, who is an attorney. I think about them when I work on protecting women from discrimination and harassment in the workplace, when I work for legislation for equal pay for women and for other bills to guarantee equal treatment for women.

The equal rights amendment, as we now consider it, was passed by Congress in 1972. There was a 7-year deadline placed by Congress on States for ratification, just as there had been on a number of other constitutional amendments. At the deadline, three-fourths of States had not ratified it.

This week, Congress will be considering H.J. Res. 79, which retroactively removes the deadline for ratification. There is much controversy over whether this is constitutional. In addition, H.J. Res. 79 also requires a simple majority to pass.

Article V of the Constitution gives Congress the power to propose constitutional amendments but requires a two-thirds vote in both the House and the Senate. The original resolution introduced in the House this year to remove the ERA deadline, H.J. Res. 38, required a two-thirds vote in both the House and the Senate.

In addition, we know that the Senate is highly unlikely to take up this resolution. So, if Congress is interested in the equal rights amendment being added to the Constitution, we should be considering H.J. Res. 35, which would restart the process.

Just a couple of days ago, Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg, a longtime supporter of the ERA, said Congress should do just this. Justice Ginsburg said:

I would like to see a new beginning. I'd like to start over.

She added:

There is too much controversy about latecomers. Plus, a number of States have withdrawn their ratification. So, if you count a latecomer on the plus side, how can you disregard States that have said "we've changed our minds"?

H.J. Res. 35, which would restart the process, could go through committee, where it could be debated, potentially amended, and then brought to the floor for further debate and possible amendment. In doing so, we can clear up any points of contention about the impact of the ERA and raise a consensus.

If we truly want to support the addition of the equal rights amendment to the Constitution, this is what we should do. I support doing this. Otherwise, we are simply casting a message vote.

This week when we vote on H.J. Res. 79, my message is yes. I will be voting

"yes" to demonstrate my support for protecting equal rights for my wife, my mother, my sister, and for all women.

HONORING BRANDON RENZ

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness that I rise today to recognize the departure of a long-term servant of the House, Brandon Renz.

Brandon has served the House of Representatives for nearly two decades and has been a trusted leader of my staff for well over a decade. Most recently, he has worked with me and fellow Members on the Education and Labor Committee as Republican staff director and has provided trustworthy counsel and excellent organizational prowess.

He also served as my chief of staff during my time in leadership as House Republican Secretary and was a respected liaison for me and other Members, staff, and House offices over my eventful time in that office.

While Brandon has been a tremendous asset and key contributor in all those significant positions, he did some of his best work in the same trenches that many of our staff do, in positions and in rooms that do not receive attention from C-SPAN or grab headlines.

Brandon started as a staff assistant for a Member from his home State of Iowa, Representative STEVE KING, reluctantly coming to Washington on the recommendation of a friend and only after committing to himself that he would stay only 1 year.

In less than 3 years on Capitol Hill, Brandon earned a reputation as an astute legislative mind with bedrock conservative principles and became my legislative director. In him, I found a partner who shared my commitment to accurate, grammatically correct documents of all types.

He labored with me on constituent letters and on many important legislative projects, including providing the Puerto Rican people with an opportunity to express all their preferences when considering their territory's future, developing legislation to lessen unfunded mandates, and expressing Congress' disapproval of the bailout funds expended on the TARP program.

He also worked as a rules associate with the House Rules Committee, sitting through interminable hearings at all hours of the day and night. He did important work there, ensuring Members' voices were heard and that the House could work its will on legislation considered on the House floor.

After several years guiding my legislative staff and agenda, he accepted my request to serve as chief of staff and used his terrific skills to benefit constituents and ensure my offices paid back the trust given to them by America's taxpayers.

□ 1015

After seeing his success there, it was easy to entrust the responsibilities of staff director to him when I became the chairwoman of the House Education and Workforce Committee.

Both then and now in the minority, Brandon has been a leader on the issues before the committee, including education and regulatory reform, government accountability, and this week on the issue of surprise medical billing.

It has been a joy to work with and learn from Brandon as a colleague and as an individual. While his parents clearly reared him right, his wise, beautiful wife, Kate, has been a key part of his recent life. She was, herself, a fine staff member in both the U.S. House and Senate and is here today. It is comforting to know they are passing on their principles to their sons, Cole and Hunter. Brandon and Kate are an example to us all.

As Brandon leaves the service of the House to embark on new responsibilities in the private sector, I thank him deeply for his years of dedication to the work of the House, to me and my constituents, and to our Nation.

He truly has lived up to the oath he swore when he first started with the U.S. House of Representatives, to “support and defend the Constitution of the United States,” and to “well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter.”

Mr. Speaker, I know he will continue to faithfully discharge the duties of his future offices, as he did so honorably for me. So, sadly, I discharge him to that work, so help him God.

TRUMP'S VISION FOR AMERICA'S FUTURE IS BLEAK

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the Trump administration released its budget proposal for fiscal year 2021. It was titled “A Budget for America’s Future,” but its vision for that future is bleak.

Its vision of the future is the true American carnage that President Trump described in his inaugural address. It envisions an America that is less than it can or should be.

It envisions an America where working families are left to struggle while the wealthy continue to prosper. Rather than expanding economic opportunity to all, it would force families to choose between food and other essentials by cutting nutrition assistance by \$182 billion so more children and more people would go hungry in America, the richest nation on the face of the Earth.

It would completely eliminate the Community Development Block Grant, which helps local communities keep millions out of poverty.

Rather than ensuring healthcare is accessible to all, this budget cuts Medi-

caid by \$900 billion and slashes Medicare by half a trillion dollars, even though the President promised he would never touch the program’s funding from that podium just a few days ago.

It would also cut research into life-saving cures at the National Institutes of Health by \$3.3 billion—penny-wise, pound-foolish. It cuts the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention by more than half a billion dollars, at a moment when we need to protect our people against the coronavirus and other public health threats.

Mr. Speaker, a true budget for America’s future wouldn’t increase the cost of attending college, as this budget does, by cutting student loan programs by \$170 billion. The education of our young people is our greatest investment in a successful future.

This budget discourages those who want to serve their communities by eliminating the Public Service Loan Forgiveness program. It would slash the Department of Education’s budget by \$5.6 billion this year alone, while eliminating after-school programs for kids. Kids would be less safe, less educated.

Ignoring another of his pledges, this time on infrastructure, President Trump’s budget proposes cutting the Department of Transportation by 13 percent this year and reducing funding for the Army Corps of Engineers by 22 percent, both agencies that deal with infrastructure.

It proposes a future devoid of innovation, as well, eliminating several programs that fund and promote research and innovation to support advanced manufacturing, new energy technologies, and entrepreneurship. On all of those, the President’s budget sounds the trumpet of retreat.

This budget promotes a future that is less secure by reducing funding for public diplomacy and foreign aid. For 3 years now, and in our fourth year, our public diplomacy has been put at risk.

Moreover, this budget extends the 2017 tax cuts for the wealthy, while once again asserting the debunked and discredited theory that the tax cuts pay for themselves. They didn’t do it in 1981; they didn’t do it in 2001 and 2003; and they haven’t done it now.

The evidence is clear: The President’s tax cuts for the wealthy did not provide the trickle-down benefits that he promised or give our economy the kind of boost he said that it would. Yet, the administration is back again, promoting the notion that if we give tax cuts for the wealthy one more try, they will produce growth well above what every mainstream economist projects, period.

This budget is not a serious proposal, nor is it fiscally sustainable. Budgets are about priorities. The priorities in this budget, giving tax cuts to the wealthy while cutting the programs that help working Americans get ahead, are the wrong priorities for our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, there is a lot of talk about who is going to offer a budget. The President has offered a budget, and we have offered a budget. And that budget, Mr. Speaker, was incorporated in the appropriations bills signed by the President of the United States.

We now have an agreement on what the level of discretionary expenditures will be. So I want to tell my friends not only on the Republican side of the aisle, but I want to tell everybody in America that we have a budget. We have set forth our priorities, and those priorities were in the bills that we passed last year and the President signed.

The marginal increase in those is very, very small this year. That was the deal that was made between Secretary Mnuchin and Speaker PELOSI. We will pass our appropriations bills consistent with those priorities that we have already articulated at the numbers agreed upon, unlike the President of the United States who sent us a budget that completely abandoned the agreement we made in July, just 8 months ago, 7 months ago.

What is the point of making an agreement if it is looked at as a ceiling? It is like going and bargaining on a house and saying, “I will pay you \$100,000,” and then coming to the settlement table, and saying, “Well, I am really going to pay you \$90,000. That \$100,000 was just a ceiling.”

Mr. Speaker, we are going to pass through this House and send to the Senate appropriations bills that will represent the priorities of the American people, and that budget will be for the people. I am hopeful that, one more time, we can adopt those priorities, have them signed by the President, and have no drama about shutting down government, as we did not this past year. That is our responsibility. That is our duty to the American people.

CONGRATULATING LIBERTY CLARK ON MEDICAL DEVICE INNOVATION

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

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Liberty Clark in Elk River, Minnesota, for receiving an award from Enterprise Minnesota for attaining their ISO 9001:2015 certification.

Liberty Clark specializes in precision pad printing for medical device and industrial manufacturers, and this certification verifies to their clients that they are a reliable producer of high-quality products.

The medical device industry in Minnesota employs over 30,000 Minnesotans, driving our State’s economy by producing devices that save lives. Recently, I was able to tour Liberty Clark and see firsthand how remarkable this company is and how it is contributing to the marketplace.

Liberty Clark’s ISO certification, paired with the end-of-the-year repeal