

Cunningham King (NY)
 Davids (KS) Kirkpatrick
 Davis (CA) Krishnamoorthi
 Davis, Danny K. Kuster (NH)
 Davis, Rodney Lamb
 Dean Langevin
 DeFazio Larson (CT)
 DeGette Lawson (FL)
 DeLauro Lee (CA)
 Delgado Lee (NV)
 Demings Levin (CA)
 DeSaulnier Levin (MI)
 Deutch Lieu, Ted
 Dingell Lipinski
 Doggett Loebach
 Doyle, Michael Lofgren
 F. Lowenthal
 Engel Lowey
 Escobar Lujan
 Eshoo Luria
 Espallat Lynch
 Evans Malinowski
 Finkenauer Maloney
 Fitzpatrick Carolyn B.
 Fletcher Maloney, Sean
 Foster Mast
 Frankel Matsui
 Fudge McAdams
 Gabbard McBath
 Gallego McCollum
 Garamendi McEachin
 Garcia (IL) McGovern
 Garcia (TX) McKinley
 Golden McNerney
 Gomez Meeks
 Gonzalez (OH) Meng
 Gonzalez (TX) Moore
 Gottheimer Morelle
 Green, Al (TX) Moulton
 Haaland Mucarsel-Powell
 Harder (CA) Murphy (FL)
 Hastings Nadler
 Hayes Napolitano
 Heck Neal
 Higgins (NY) Neguse
 Himes Norcross
 Horn, Kendra S. O'Halleran
 Horsford Ocasio-Cortez
 Houlahan Omar
 Hoyer Pallone
 Huffman Panetta
 Jackson Lee Pappas
 Jeffries Pascrell
 Johnson (GA) Payne
 Joyce (OH) Perlmutter
 Kaptur Peters
 Keating Peterson
 Kelly (IL) Phillips
 Kennedy Pingree
 Khanna Pocan
 Kildee Porter
 Kim Pressley
 Kind Price (NC)

NAYS—171

Abraham Cole
 Aderholt Collins (GA)
 Allen Comer
 Amash Conaway
 Amodei Cook
 Armstrong Crawford
 Arrington Crenshaw
 Babin Crenshaw
 Baird Davidson (OH)
 Balderson DesJarlais
 Banks Diaz-Balart
 Barr Duncan
 Bergman Dunn
 Biggs Emmer
 Bilirakis Estes
 Bishop (NC) Ferguson
 Bishop (UT) Fleischmann
 Bost Flores
 Brady Fortenberry
 Brooks (AL) Foxx (NC)
 Brooks (IN) Fulcher
 Buchanan Gaetz
 Buck Gallagher
 Bucshon Gianforte
 Budd Gibbs
 Burchett Gohmert
 Burgess Gooden
 Byrne Gosar
 Calvert Granger
 Carter (GA) Graves (GA)
 Carter (TX) Graves (LA)
 Chabot Graves (MO)
 Cline Griffith
 Cloud Grothman

Quigley
 Raskin
 Reed
 Rice (NY)
 Richmond
 Rose (NY)
 Rouda
 Roybal-Allard
 Ruiz
 Ruppersberger
 Rush
 Ryan
 Sanchez
 Sarbanes
 Scanlon
 Schakowsky
 Schiff
 Schneider
 Schrader
 Scott (VA)
 Serrano
 Sewell (AL)
 Shalala
 Sherman
 Sherrill
 Slotkin
 Smith (NJ)
 Soto
 Spanberger
 Speier
 Stanton
 Stauber
 Stevens
 Suozzi
 Swailwell (CA)
 Takano
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Titus
 Tlaib
 Tonko
 Torres (CA)
 Torres Small
 (NM)
 Trahan
 Trone
 Underwood
 Van Drew
 Vargas
 Vela
 Velázquez
 Visclosky
 Wasserman
 Schultz
 Watson Coleman
 Welch
 Wexton
 Wild
 Yarmuth
 Young
 Zeldin

Luetkemeyer
 Marshall
 Massie
 McCarthy
 McCaul
 McClintock
 McHenry
 Meadows
 Meuser
 Miller
 Mitchell
 Moolenaar
 Mooney (WV)
 Murphy (NC)
 Norman
 Nunes
 Olson
 Palazzo
 Palmer
 Pence
 Posey
 Reschenthaler
 Rice (SC)

Cheney
 DelBene
 Green (TN)
 Grijalva
 Herrera Beutler
 Jayapal
 Johnson (TX)
 Kilmer
 Larsen (WA)
 Lawrence

Riggleman
 Roby
 Roe, David P.
 Rogers (AL)
 Rogers (KY)
 Rouzer
 Rutherford
 Scalise
 Schweikert
 Scott, Austin
 Sensenbrenner
 Shimkus
 Simpson
 Smith (MO)
 Smith (NE)
 Smucker
 Spano
 Stefanik
 Steil
 Steube
 Stewart
 Stivers
 Taylor

NOT VOTING—28

Lewis
 Marchant
 Mullin
 Newhouse
 Perry
 Ratcliffe
 Rodgers (WA)
 Rooney (FL)
 Rose, John W.
 Roy

□ 1131

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, on March 5, 2020, I was not able to cast my votes during the vote series due to a family emergency. Had I been in attendance, I would have voted:

1. YES on Amendment No. 7, CISNEROS (D-CA)—Requires the Secretary of Homeland Security to prioritize the hiring of veterans and related preference eligible individuals, including disabled veterans and widows or widowers of veterans, for positions within the Transportation Security Administration;

2. YES on Amendment No. 9, MUCARSEL-POWELL (D-FL) [on behalf of SCHRIER (D-WA)]—Would ensure the Administrator of TSA in coordination with the Director of CDC and NIAID shall ensure that TSA employees are provided the proper guidance regarding prevention and protections against coronavirus, including guidance and resources;

3. NO on Republican Motion to Recommit; and

4. YES on Final Passage of H.R. 1140—Rights for Transportation Security Officers Act of 2020.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to vote due to extenuating circumstances. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 87, "yea" on rollcall No. 88, "nay" on rollcall No. 89, and "yea" on rollcall No. 90.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I was not present at votes on Thursday, March 5, as I was travelling back to Washington state to meet with coronavirus response leaders. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on Roll Call No. 87 (Cisneros Amendment), "yea" on Roll Call No. 88 (Mucarsel-Powell/Schrier Amendment), "nay" on Roll Call No. 89 (Motion to Recommit), and "yea" on Roll Call No. 90 (Final passage of H.R. 1140) be-

cause the bill strengthens workplace rights for Transportation Security Officers, improving job conditions, and enhancing the security of the traveling public.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, from Monday, March 2, to Thursday, March 5, I was not able to make the recorded votes below. Had I been present, I would have voted: "yea" on rollcall No. 90, "yea" on rollcall No. 89, "yea" on rollcall No. 88, "yea" on rollcall No. 87, "yea" on rollcall No. 86, "yea" on rollcall No. 85, "yea" on rollcall No. 84, "yea" on rollcall No. 83, "yea" on rollcall No. 82, "yea" on rollcall No. 81, "yea" on rollcall No. 80, and "yea" on rollcall No. 79.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to indicate I was unavoidably detained in a committee hearing and unable to register my vote for the Cisneros amendment protecting veterans and having a focus of hiring veterans under the legislation H.R. 1140, Rights for Transportation Security Officers Act of 2020, I ask that my vote of "aye" be placed in the RECORD at the appropriate place.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Miss Kaitlyn Roberts, one of his secretaries.

ADJOURNMENT FROM THURSDAY, MARCH 5, 2020, TO MONDAY, MARCH 9, 2020

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. MALINOWSKI). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

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 my friend, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), who is the majority leader of the House, for the purpose of inquiring about the schedule for next week.

Mr. HOYER. 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, Mr. Speaker, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business, with last votes of the week expected no later than 3 p.m.

We will consider several bills under suspension of the rules. The complete list of suspension bills will be announced by the close of business tomorrow.

The House will consider H.R. 2214, the NO BAN Act. This bill would repeal the President's Muslim travel ban and prevent the administration from putting in place other discriminatory travel bans.

In addition, the House will consider H.R. 5581, Access to Counsel Act. This legislation would make certain that those held or detained while attempting to enter the United States are guaranteed access to legal counsel. That legal counsel, Mr. Speaker, would not be paid for by the government.

The current FISA authorization expires March 15, requiring action in this House. Conversations are ongoing, and I hope to bring legislation to the floor next week.

Lastly, following Senate passage of Senator KAINE's bipartisan War Powers resolution, it is possible that the House could also consider the resolution as early as next week.

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

In relation to the NO BAN Act, I understand there was a disagreement over whether or not the gentleman supported the President's ability to restrict travel from certain countries based, not on whether they were a Muslim country, but based on whether or not they were a country that was not in compliance with our Department of Homeland Security requirements and criteria to ensure that they are properly vetting people who come to our country for national security purposes and, specifically, to ensure that people who are known terrorists and people who have other known criminal backgrounds are not able to come into our country.

Most countries around the world, including a number of Muslim countries, are in compliance and, in fact, have a very good cooperative travel agreement between the United States and those countries, but there were a limited number of countries back in 2017 that the President ultimately determined, working through the Department of Homeland Security, were not in compliance.

He listed those countries. He added a few more to it later. I know a number of people on the majority side were in disagreement with that. Some took that to court. It ultimately went all the way to the U.S. Supreme Court. The Supreme Court upheld this travel ban.

But I would want to point out to the gentleman that the Department of Homeland Security has been very clear to these countries that if they comply with the basic reporting requirements—again, that every other country in the world that has that same travel agreement with the United States has—if they were to come into compliance, then they would be removed from the list.

In fact, Chad is one of the countries that was originally listed. Chad worked with us—as every country should—and said: We are going to comply. We want to make sure that we are properly sharing information so that people who are coming to the United States from Chad now are properly vetted for terrorism and other criminal activities.

They got removed from the list.

The other countries, by the way, have been invited to do that. They have chosen not to. Why they have chosen not to is a good question they should be asked. We should not criticize the President for using his executive authority to keep this country safe and to keep terrorists from coming into this country and ensuring that those nations that send people to the United States—as we send them to their countries—are in compliance with the requirements of the Department of Homeland Security.

So why would a bill like that be brought up, especially at this time when now with this coronavirus there are a number of countries that we have seen, starting with China, that have a serious outbreak that we are trying to prevent from coming into our country?

Under this bill that would be coming forward, not only does it limit the President's ability to protect us from having countries be able to send terrorists into our Nation, now it would limit the President's ability to respond to a health crisis like the coronavirus where there are some countries that are listed, like China and Iran, that have to be screened or can't send people from those countries if they have been in those countries in the last 14 days, it would tie the President's hands from even responding to that crisis.

We have seen just today the Governor of California—probably not somebody who is philosophically aligned with the President too often—just sent a cruise ship back into the Pacific Ocean and said the cruise ship can't come into San Francisco. And that is the Governor's power and authority to provide for the health and safety of his State.

Why would we want to tie the hands of the President of the United States when he wants to ensure the health and safety of the people of this country?

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

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

I will give a relatively short answer. First of all, there is nobody in this House on either side of the aisle—certainly none of the proponents of this legislation—who want to in any way limit the President's ability to protect America, whether it is from terrorists, whether it is from the coronavirus or some other threat that manifestly presents itself to the safety and well-being of the American people.

□ 1145

What the bill attempts to do is simply to preclude violating, in effect, the

Constitution of the United States in either making a religious test for admission to the United States of America, which, very frankly, a number of statements of the President would indicate that, in the past, that was what he intended to do and, in fact, was manifest in the very broad reach, unrelated to whether somebody was a terrorist but related to what their religion was or some other distinction unrelated.

Now, obviously, both the health and safety of the American people would not preclude the President from acting to protect that. I think we would all agree on that. But, clearly, we believe the President has, in fact, gone far beyond specific ways and means to protect the American people and simply preclude people, as I said, of a particular religion, a particular nationality, or some other broad base unrelated to the specific items to which you referred, with which I think most of us agree.

Of course, we will debate that next week.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, clearly, we will debate that because the Supreme Court has already addressed the constitutionality upholding it, but it has no genesis in religious tests. It has a genesis in the security of this country.

Again, if you go look at the nations that are listed in the ban, Chad went and did the things that the Department of Homeland Security said you needed to do to be in compliance, and they got removed from the list.

Every other country on that list has also been invited to go and just do basic sharing of information to ensure that the people coming from those countries are not terrorists, are not criminals, are not going to provide a security threat to our Nation.

It is a clear test. Every other country in the world already does it.

Why does Libya choose not to comply? I don't know, but they haven't.

Why does North Korea choose not to comply? I don't know, but they haven't.

Like Chad, go and address these deficiencies, and then you can be removed from the list. Chad has already done that. Every other country can.

We will debate it, but it does put additional red tape in front of the President that would preclude him in the health arena from responding to the nations that have a threat of the coronavirus, like the President was quickly able to do with China, quickly able to do with Iran. He would not be able to quickly respond in the future under the bill that is proposed.

Clearly, we will heavily debate that next week.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I want to assure the gentleman that it is our view that nothing in this legislation will preclude the President of the United States from acting, either on the basis of national security or the security of our people, either from threats of terrorism or from health, or

for some other identifiable threat to the American people.

This simply says that he cannot act based upon the generalization that somebody is a Muslim, somebody is from this country, somebody is from a different nationality or different religion, or some other arbitrary distinction. He has to focus on specific reasons.

In China's case, for instance, we know that China has a very large outbreak of coronavirus and that it poses a proximate threat to the health not only of the American people but of people around the world and that we need to take steps to ensure that that is contained.

So, we will debate that next week, but we certainly don't accept the premise that the gentleman has just stated, that somehow we will limit the President from protecting the American people for legitimate and necessary reasons.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, clearly, we do have disagreements on that. Hopefully, we can work through those in the debate next week.

There is another bill that is going to be, hopefully, coming up that we can get agreement on, and that deals with the renewal of components of the FISA law.

I know the Committee on the Judiciary earlier this week had a markup that they ultimately pulled back on. There are negotiations ongoing between Republicans and Democrats to try to come to an agreement on not only how to renew the FISA law, but also how to make the reforms that are critical and necessary to the FISA law, to address the abuses that we know happen.

I would ask the gentleman first if his side is in a position of identifying some of the areas we can find agreement on, on reforms, because I believe Ranking Member NUNES had submitted a number of specific reforms, and the gentleman's side is reviewing those.

Has the gentleman had a chance to review them? Does he have an alternative proposal? Because the reforms are critical to the renewal.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman to answer that.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to tell the gentleman that, this morning or late last night, we sent a response to your offer, and the committees now have that in their possession. I see they are shaking their heads that they may not think that we did it, but we did. We have already sent a response to your offer, with reference to the reforms.

As the gentleman knows, we have agreed on a number of items as, frankly, the person that dealt with the person who had your job previously, ROY BLUNT and I, with Senator Bond, also from Missouri, as is now-Senator BLUNT but then-Minority Whip BLUNT, and Jay Rockefeller from West Virginia. We worked on the reauthorization of FISA in 2008, and we received

broad bipartisan support. I am hopeful that we can do that.

This bill, as the gentleman knows, the authorization for section 215 expires on March 15. The Attorney General, as the gentleman knows, recommended that we pass a clean reauthorization.

Obviously, both sides felt that there were some things they wanted to deal with, and we are doing that now. Hopefully, we can get this done.

Mr. Speaker, I will assure the gentleman that, once we have agreement, I will bring that bill to the floor.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that the gentleman talked about a response. I haven't seen that response yet, but I look forward to working with our folks who are heavily involved in these negotiations to see if we can reach agreement because, in the past, the program has had many supporters, Republican and Democrat, but clearly some detractors on both sides as well.

It is a very critical tool in our national security. The FISA courts have been used to stop terrorist activity, to prevent other terrorist attacks, but there is clearly other weighing that goes back and forth on civil liberties and ensuring that the rights of Americans are protected.

It is a balance that was tested, frankly, in 2016, when we saw clear abuses of the FISA court. The first time we had seen those kinds of identified abuses, they were limited, but they were blatant. It is a dangerous affront to our Nation's national security if you have people at intelligence agencies who abuse their power.

In fact, the Horowitz report was very specific in outlining 17 different exact abuses of the FISA court. Some of this is still being investigated through the Durham investigation, which will, hopefully, yield a list of specific people.

I will just read from parts of the Horowitz report.

"As more fully described in Chapter 5, based upon the information known to the FBI in October 2016, the first application contained the following seven significant inaccuracies and omissions."

He goes on in this report: "In addition to repeating the seven significant errors contained in the first FISA application and outlined above, we identified 10 additional significant errors and three renewal applications, based upon information known to the FBI after the first application and before the renewals," where abuses of this FISA law occurred.

Now, I think, on both sides, we would agree that if somebody in a position of national security abuses their power deliberately, they need to be held accountable. One of the concerns we have is that the law does not allow strong enough penalties.

I am hopeful that, when the Durham report comes out, the people who were identified as abusing their power in 2016 ought to be held accountable and,

in fact, ought to go to jail for what they did because what they did not only undermined our electoral process, but it jeopardizes a law that has bipartisan support but has bipartisan opposition as well.

If somebody abused their power to taint that process, the FISA court, it undermines the integrity of the FISA court. We all need to work together to ensure that anyone who abuses their power is held fully accountable, not only to hold them accountable, but to ensure it doesn't happen again. No Republican, no Democrat candidate for President ought to be concerned that people in intelligence agencies are abusing their power to try to undermine an election.

If it happened, as we know it did—and the Horowitz report is very specific. Hopefully, the Durham investigation names names. Hopefully, those people are held accountable and go to jail so that nobody else does it again.

But as we know, there is the possibility for that to happen under current law. That is why it is so important that we get this agreement to make necessary critical reforms, to put guardrails in place; to keep the process available to our national security experts so that they can continue to stop future terrorist attacks; but to also ensure that if somebody abuses the process, it makes it harder for them to do it; but if they still cross the line, that there are strong criminal penalties in place for those who would violate that law.

I know we have laid those out. I am glad to know you have come back with a response. Hopefully, we can get that agreement in the next few days before this law expires. Clearly, there is strong support, hopefully, on both sides, for putting real reforms in place that fix and address the abuses that occurred in 2016, as identified by the Horowitz report.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman for anything else on that.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, somewhat like the recitation of the Mueller report that has been quoted—the Mueller report, of course, found substantial reason to believe that there was wrongdoing. It was projected by the Attorney General and others that the Mueller report was a conclusion that the President or others had not done something wrong. That was not the fact.

In any event, with respect to the gentleman's comments, with respect to what was done by the FBI, it should not have been done, obviously.

But the gentleman didn't read this very important sentence from the inspector general's report regarding the court's decision: "We did not find documentary or testimonial evidence that political bias or improper motivation influenced his decision," meaning the court's decision, the judge's decision.

The bill that we are talking about is reauthorizing section 215. None of this deals with section 215. It deals with metadata on which the parties have an

agreement. It also deals with business records and issues of lone wolves, who are not necessarily associated with a terrorist organization but present a danger to the United States.

There are reforms that we can pursue to ensure that the FISA court gets all the information that it needs and, in fact, has a representative who makes sure that they get that and who is not associated with, necessarily, the law enforcement officers or intelligence officers who are presenting information to the FISA court.

Unfortunately, and I want to say candidly, Mr. Speaker, the President's focus on the Page case and distracting from the issues that we are dealing with—Attorney General Barr recommended that we reauthorize the FISA section 215 as is. That is what the Attorney General recommended. I don't know what his present position is because he was criticized by the President in a tweet, so heaven knows what he did in response to the tweet.

But the fact of the matter is, the issues which the gentleman raises, we all want appropriate, honest disclosure from individuals who present to the FISA court. That is not an issue, and we ought to pursue reforms that lead to that end. But in this case, the focus on an issue unrelated to section 215, which we are really talking about, is slowing up this process. And I would hope that in the coming days, because the 15th is upon us, we come to an agreement.

As I said, we sent an offer back, Mr. Whip. Hopefully, we will hear back from you and, hopefully, reach agreement in the near term because this is an important thing to pass, to reauthorize for the security of our people.

The gentleman was talking about security before. We need to make sure that we act in a bipartisan way to ensure that the FISA process is working and working properly.

□ 1200

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, clearly, the gentleman from Maryland and I both agree that this FISA law has a strong role to play in our national security, but there is also acknowledgment that there were abuses that happened. Not only was there the Horowitz investigation, but now you do have the Durham investigation that will, hopefully, conclude and identify where those abuses took place and that those people would be held accountable.

We have had talks with the Attorney General, who recognizes, yes, he also agrees that this FISA law is critically important, wants to have this section renewed, but he does recognize that reforms can be made.

How exactly we can come to an agreement—just like with your side, we are having those negotiations. And so, if people do acknowledge that abuses occurred, I think it would be in all of our best interest, as we are addressing this law that has had detractors on both sides, that we strengthen

the integrity of the law, because it has been exposed now. It has been exposed that there were problems that occurred.

The other sections where those problems occurred are permanent law. This is not. This is coming up for renewal, but it is part of the FISA law. And, clearly, as we debate the FISA law, all of this becomes part of that debate, and, hopefully, all of it can get resolved within the debate on the components that expire March 15.

I am confident we can get this done because I have seen the bipartisan interest. We just need to make sure that what we bring to the floor addresses the problems that occurred so that it, hopefully, never happens again.

I will be happy to yield if the gentleman had anything else on that.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I don't have anything further to say.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I look forward to seeing the gentleman next week, and I yield back the balance of my time.

BIPARTISAN CORONAVIRUS LEGISLATION

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

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to praise my House colleagues for their swift and decisive action to attack the corona threat yesterday.

Members of both parties recognized that this disease is a national and public health crisis, that it will affect all Americans, regardless of political party. We came together to approve \$7.8 billion to protect the safety and well-being of all Americans. The Founding Fathers created this Chamber for exactly that reason.

In the spirit of bipartisan cooperation, I would like to discuss the Affordable Care Act. Like our coronavirus bill yesterday, the ACA attacked a public health crisis. It improved the health and security of millions of Americans, especially those with pre-existing conditions. It has saved money for American workers, and it has helped millions of American families provide care for their children.

If these attacks on the ACA are successful, at least 25 million Americans will be uninsured. We do not want them to avoid screenings for coronavirus or future viruses because they cannot afford it.

CONGRATULATING LINDSEY BORDAS

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Lindsey Bordas, a senior at Philipsburg-Osceola High School.

Recently, Lindsey accepted a fully qualified appointment to the United

States Military Academy in West Point, New York. Lindsey is a leader in the classroom and in her community. She is her senior class salutatorian and class president.

Lindsey is also an active member of her school's fly-fishing club and her church youth group. Her determination and drive will make her an excellent addition to the military academy, and I am confident she will rise to the occasion and excel during her education and in her service to our country.

I would like to thank Lindsey for her commitment and her willingness to serve, and I wish her all the best in this exciting new chapter.

RECOGNIZING BILL BALLEZA

(Ms. GARCIA of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. GARCIA of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today I recognize Bill Balleza, a KPRC 2 anchor, who, for nearly 50 years, has been a reliable source of daily news for our community.

Bill has been seen on TV screens across our city for years, where he reported on thousands of stories, did a weekly child segment from 1985 to 1995, and earned an Emmy Award for his reporting.

Not only has he served our community as a distinguished journalist and anchor, but he is also a proud Vietnam veteran. He is a common sight at the Veteran's Day celebration and parade every year.

We thank Bill for his service. In the days of fake news and attacks on the media, he has always been above the fray and a trusted source. We will miss seeing him on the TV screen when we tune into KPRC 2 for the daily news.

For now, he should enjoy his retirement. He has earned it. And God bless.

JOHN WESLEY UNITED METHODIST CHURCH CELEBRATES 180TH AN- NIVERSARY

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

Mr. VAN DREW. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize the John Wesley United Methodist Church in Cape May Courthouse in south Jersey on their 180th anniversary celebration this year.

John Wesley United Methodist Church is the oldest African American church in all of Cape May County. John Wesley founded the church in 1840 after escaping slavery in North Carolina in 1823.

The church also is home to a cemetery, where there are veterans from the Civil War all the way to the Vietnam war.

I was proud to attend the celebration event on Saturday, February 29. In addition to the celebration, the congregation is planning to hold an African