

Camp Lejeune in eastern North Carolina in my district. They were both killed in action while supporting Iraqi forces in clearing out a tunnel of ISIS fighters.

Given the current coronavirus situation, it is easy to lose sight of the sacrifices of our servicemembers and their families, but we absolutely cannot allow this condition to make us forget about our men and women in uniform here and abroad.

The deaths of these two brave marines are a somber reminder that our servicemembers and their families sacrifice so much for us each and every day, no matter the circumstances, so that we can live in peace and freedom.

My thoughts and prayers are with MARSOC, Navas' and Pongo's brothers in arms, and especially their families and loved ones.

RECOGNIZING CROSSROADS QUARTET'S 60-YEAR ANNIVERSARY

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

Mr. COMER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Crossroads Quartet for their 60th anniversary of vocalizing Southern Gospel music throughout Kentucky and other States.

Founded in 1960 in Russell Springs, Kentucky, this fine group of constituents has now been active within the music world for 60 consecutive years. They have traveled thousands of miles, worn out four Dodge vans, and touched numerous lives.

While some of the names and faces have changed, the inspiring mission of Crossroads Quartet has remained a constant. Today founding member Vernie McGaha, alongside Brian McGaha, Dave Powell, and Randy Hart, continues to fulfill the original calling of Crossroads Quartet.

I am proud to be their voice in Washington and am confident that their musical ministry will be active for many years to come. Their decades of contributions are certainly deserving of recognition by this entire body.

BROOKWOOD COMMUNITY

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

Mr. OLSON. Madam Speaker, I rise to invite the entire Congress and all my fellow Texans, especially my neighbors in Texas 22, to the biggest Texas-size birthday party of 2020.

This picture to my left is pure Brookwood. They are turning 35 years old this year. Since 1985, citizens at Brookwood with mental and physical challenges are taught real job skills. They are infused with pride, self-worth, and Christian love.

Brookwood was started by Yvonne Streit. Her 1-year-old daughter, Vicki, had severe brain damage. Yvonne had a

mission. From her backyard to churches to the current two campuses with 230 or more citizens, Brookwood is making their citizens in Texas better every single day.

Their official birthday party is April 3 at 11 a.m. The catering is done by the Brookwood Cafe. If you want a belly full of food and a heart full of Christian love, come see us in Brookwood.

CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF BONNIE DUVALL

(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. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Ms. Bonnie McWhorter Duvall. Bonnie recently lost her battle with cancer at just 61 years of age.

Bonnie was the matriarch of a strong farm family from Greensboro, Georgia. She was a member of the Green County Farm Bureau Women's Committee, a mother of four, and a wife to American Farm Bureau Federation President Zippy Duvall.

Bonnie and Zippy spent more than 40 years together, and she enjoyed traveling the country by his side to meet with many of our Nation's farmers over the years.

Though it is a comfort to know that Bonnie is no longer suffering, it is a great sadness that she was taken from her family and friends far too soon.

I would like to extend my deepest sympathies to Zippy and the rest of the Duvall family at this difficult time. They are, and will continue to be, in my prayers.

□ 1215

NATIONAL DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES AWARENESS MONTH

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

Mr. TAYLOR. Madam Speaker, today, I rise to recognize the 33rd Anniversary of National Developmental Disabilities Awareness Month.

This important commemoration serves to raise awareness and promote respect for those with intellectual and developmental disabilities, while also highlighting the importance of inclusion.

It is estimated there are over 4.6 million individuals in the United States, and over 250,000 individuals in North Texas alone, with intellectual and developmental disabilities. Texas' Third Congressional District is home to incredible organizations, including Cornerstone Ranch, My Possibilities, and LifePath Systems.

Madam Speaker, I am honored to recognize these dedicated organizations, staff, and volunteers serving as steadfast advocates fostering opportunity for these individuals to realize their full potential.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join me in thanking these organizations for their hard work and recognizing those with developmental disabilities.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S.J. RES. 68, DIRECTING THE REMOVAL OF UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES FROM HOSTILITIES AGAINST THE ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN THAT HAVE NOT BEEN AUTHORIZED BY CONGRESS; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 2486, FOSTERING UNDERGRADUATE TALENT BY UNLOCKING RESOURCES FOR EDUCATION ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 6172, USA FREEDOM REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2020; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 891 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 891

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 68) to direct the removal of United States Armed Forces from hostilities against the Islamic Republic of Iran that have not been authorized by Congress. All points of order against consideration of the joint resolution are waived. The joint resolution shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the joint resolution are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs; and (2) one motion to commit.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2486) to reauthorize mandatory funding programs for historically Black colleges and universities and other minority-serving institutions, with the Senate amendment thereto, and to consider in the House, without intervention of any point of order, a motion offered by the chair of the Committee on the Judiciary or his designee that the House concur in the Senate amendment with each of the two amendments specified in section 4 of this resolution. The Senate amendment and the motion shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except as specified in section 3 of this resolution.

SEC. 3. (a) The question of adoption of the motion shall be divided between the two House amendments specified in section 4 of this resolution. The two portions of the divided question shall be considered in the order specified by the Chair.

(b) Each portion of the divided question shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

SEC. 4. The amendments referred to in the second and third sections of this resolution are as follows:

(a) An amendment consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116-52.

(b) An amendment consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116-53.

SEC. 5. If only one portion of the divided question is adopted, that portion shall be engrossed as an amendment in the nature of a substitute to the Senate amendment to H.R. 2486.

SEC. 6. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 6172) to amend the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 to prohibit the production of certain business records, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided among and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary and the chair and ranking minority member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 7. On any legislative day during the period from March 13, 2020, through March 22, 2020—

(a) the Journal of the proceedings of the previous day shall be considered as approved; and

(b) the Chair may at any time declare the House adjourned to meet at a date and time, within the limits of clause 4, section 5, article I of the Constitution, to be announced by the Chair in declaring the adjournment.

SEC. 8. The Speaker may appoint Members to perform the duties of the Chair for the duration of the period addressed by section 7 of this resolution as though under clause 8(a) of rule I.

SEC. 9. Each day during the period addressed by section 7 of this resolution shall not constitute a legislative day for purposes of clause 7 of rule XV.

SEC. 10. It shall be in order at any time through the calendar day of March 22, 2020, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules as though under clause 1 of rule XV. The Speaker or her designee shall consult with the Minority Leader or his designee on the designation of any matter for consideration pursuant to this section.

SEC. 11. The requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII for a two-thirds vote to consider a report from the Committee on Rules on the same day it is presented to the House is waived with respect to any resolution reported through the legislative day of March 23, 2020.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. JUDY CHU of California). The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mrs. LESKO), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, on Monday, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule, House Resolution 891, providing for consideration of Senate amendment to H.R. 2486, S.J. Res. 68, and H.R. 6172.

The rules provide for consideration of two House amendments to the Senate amendment to H.R. 2486, which contained the text of the NO BAN Act and the Access to Counsel Act.

It also provides for consideration of S.J. Res. 68 under a closed rule, with 1 hour of general debate controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. It also provides the joint resolution with one motion to commit.

The rule also provides for consideration of H.R. 6172 under a closed rule, with 1 hour of general debate equally divided among and controlled by the chairs and ranking minority members of the Committee on the Judiciary and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

Lastly, this rule self-executes a manager's amendment from Chairman NADLER to H.R. 6172 and provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Madam Speaker, we are now 3 years into a policy that is the antithesis of what this country stands for: the President's shameful and un-American Muslim ban. President Trump chose Holocaust Remembrance Day, of all days, to sign his first executive order on this. That shut the door to thousands of refugees fleeing war—the very people who had seen America as a beacon of hope and were trying to build a better life.

Instead, this administration turned its back on innocent women, children, and families desperate to escape violence. That is callous, that is wrong, and it goes against everything America is founded on.

President Trump has claimed his Muslim ban is all about national security. But let's be honest here, it was never about that.

It is about a President trying to fulfill offensive campaign promises and further his harmful rhetoric about Muslims.

As a candidate for President, Donald Trump said he would certainly look at closing mosques in the United States. He floated the idea of creating a database for all Muslim Americans. And he even suggested that Muslims in America were cheering as the World Trade Centers fell on September 11. What an ugly, ugly thing to say.

Madam Speaker, I could go on and on and on. This is truly offensive stuff—ideas that should be left somewhere in the darkest corners of the internet.

Then, in December of 2015, he called for, “a total and complete shutdown of Muslims entering the United States.”

This ban is his attempt at turning that campaign rhetoric into actual policy, however cruel and unnecessary.

My colleagues, Representatives CHU, JAYAPAL, and ROSE, put its impact best when they wrote in a recent op-ed piece: “That means more grandchildren who will never be able to kiss their grandparents, more loved ones unable to say good-bye at a funeral, more graduations where the proud student has no beaming parents cheering for them in the crowd, and more families forced to make impossible decisions under the most trying circumstances.”

I have met people impacted by the Muslim ban, Madam Speaker. It is people like Benham Partopour, a chemical engineering student getting his Ph.D. at Worcester Polytechnic Institute in my home district in central Massachusetts.

He is an Iranian national who was in Iran when President Trump's executive order went into effect. He had a visa, but no airlines were willing to sell plane tickets that would allow him to return to the United States. So, like many other people across the globe, he was stranded.

My office worked with school officials and the ACLU Massachusetts every day until he was able to return home to the United States a week later.

This is who the President is afraid of, Madam Speaker, a bright young man trying to study at a top American university. He is just one of the roughly 135 million people impacted by this policy.

This isn't about crafting sound national security policy; this is about something much more sinister. That is shown by the fact that the President kept drafting versions of his Muslim ban until a watered-down version was able to pass legal muster with conservatives on the Supreme Court. But even they required the administration to grant waivers proving the ban had a “legitimate national security interest.”

Yet, the State Department has approved just 10 percent of all waivers so far, just 10 percent.

Madam Speaker, does this President really believe that 90 percent of Muslims from impacted countries are terrorists? There is absolutely no evidence of that.

And it gets worse. According to reports, this administration is now considering expanding its travel ban to even more countries. Enough is enough.

Our country already had one of the strongest vetting systems anywhere in the world. We don't need any arbitrary and offensive bans. We can tell the difference between a real threat and the student traveling back to college.

That is why this underlying measure will reverse the bans the President has put in place over the last 3 years, and it will ensure people at ports of entry can seek legal advice during the screening process.

The principle that our diversity is our strength, and the idea that our country is strengthened by immigration, these are core values of this

Democratic majority. That is why we have made this a clear choice and provided a clean up-or-down vote. No stalling tactics. No partisan gimmicks. And I think it is an appropriate process because I want to prevent cynicism and ugliness from being celebrated here on the House floor.

The administration's rhetoric and, quite frankly, so many people here on this floor have often demonized immigrants. It is offensive, and it is not worthy of a debate.

Either you believe we are a nation defined by the Statue of Liberty welcoming immigrants or one that uses religious discrimination in immigration decisions. I think this is an easy call.

Also included in this rule, Madam Speaker, is a reauthorization of the USA FREEDOM Act, as well as a War Powers Resolution led by Senator KAINE that would require a vote in Congress authorizing the use of force before the President escalates hostilities in Iran.

Madam Speaker, this Democratic majority promised to take it up if it passed the Senate, and I am proud that it did, with broad bipartisan support. This is not a partisan measure. Eight Republicans joined with Senator KAINE in supporting this War Powers Resolution.

Passage here would send the Kaine resolution directly to the President's desk.

□ 1230

Madam Speaker, I don't support the FISA reauthorization bill. I appreciate the bipartisan work that went into trying to fashion a compromise, but in the final analysis, I, in good conscience, can't support it.

But on the other matters, make no mistake: This is a historic opportunity. Congress has a chance to reassert its constitutional authority over matters of war and peace; to live up to its Article I responsibility; and to truly respect our troops by giving them the debate on the future that they deserve, should tensions with Iran escalate again.

I hope all my colleagues seize it, and I urge a strong vote for this rule.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I thank Representative MCGOVERN for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Madam Speaker, the rule before us today, the Senate amendment to H.R. 2486, contains the text of two pieces of legislation, H.R. 2214 and H.R. 5581, along with the Senate version of the Affordable Prescriptions for Patients Act of 2019 as a pay-for.

Also included are S.J. Res. 68, a resolution to direct the removal of United States Armed Forces from hostilities against the Islamic Republic of Iran, and H.R. 6172, the USA FREEDOM Reauthorization Act.

By combining all of these bills together, Democrats have prohibited the

minority, meaning the Republicans, the ability to offer a motion to recommit on the floor. The only thing I can think of is that I guess they are afraid we might pass our seventh MTR, as we passed one last week.

H.R. 2214 eviscerates the President's ability, under the law, to limit who may legally enter the United States. President Trump has utilized existing law to determine which countries fail to meet international standards of information sharing or identity management, or were at a high risk of terrorism or public safety concern, and the executive orders he issued reflected that determination. The majority is now seeking to prevent the President from ever using that authority again.

The bill terminates the executive orders currently in place and ceases "all actions taken pursuant to any proclamation or executive order terminated" by the bill, which means that all information sharing on terrorists, criminals, and other security threats would cease.

The seven countries specifically targeted with travel restrictions in Executive Order 13769 were actually countries that were determined by Congress and the Obama administration to be countries of particular concern for terrorism activity.

This bill contains onerous reporting and consultation requirements that would effectively prevent the President from acting quickly in the event quick action would be needed.

For example, H.R. 2214 requires consultation between only the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Homeland Security. However, this does not cover many emergencies the President needs to respond to.

For example, in the event of a disease outbreak, including the novel coronavirus, the Centers for Disease Control would need to be consulted with respect to suspending entry of certain populations.

The combined rule also includes H.R. 5581. This legislation would require the Department of Homeland Security to ensure that every individual who is subject to a secondary inspection would be guaranteed access to counsel or anyone of their choosing within an hour.

This definitely would have serious logistical and practical consequences for CBP's ability to quickly and efficiently screen travelers and carry out the mission of facilitating unlawful trade and travel. CBP conducts over 17 million secondary inspections each year.

Can you imagine that, for every car, a CBP officer is looking at a screen, when there is the X-ray machine of the car, and they radio over to the CBP officer at the port of entry and say: "Hey, look in the trunk"? Then, they would have to wait an hour if the person objects and says, "Oh, I want counsel," or, "I want my relative to come within an hour." I mean, this is just way onerous.

This combined rule also contains S.J. Res. 68, a resolution to direct the removal of the United States Armed Forces from hostilities against the Islamic Republic of Iran.

First, I want to note that Secretary Pompeo testified in front of the House Foreign Affairs Committee that "we are not" engaged in hostilities against Iran. Thus, the joint resolution is unnecessary.

While Congress has a constitutional duty to authorize the use of military force, we should not be issuing blanket prohibitions without taking the time to develop an appropriate Authorization for Use of Military for the Middle East.

The net effect of the bill may be to make many U.S. counterterrorism operations in the Middle East illegal. Rather than handcuffing our Armed Forces, we should be providing them with the tools they need to effectively combat terrorism against America and Americans abroad.

Lastly, this rule contains H.R. 6172, the USA FREEDOM Reauthorization Act. This bill reauthorizes expiring provisions necessary to defend the United States, while also including significant reforms to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act to restore accountability.

In order to ensure that past FISA abuses, like those against Carter Page, never happen again, numerous reforms are included to protect the American people from both terrorist threats and government overreach.

For example, the bill requires the Attorney General to transmit rules to ensure that FISA applications are accurate and complete. The Attorney General would also be required to approve, in writing, a FISA investigation of an elected official or a Federal candidate.

Also, the FISA court will now transcribe hearings, with DOJ giving FISA applications and relevant materials to Congress in a timely manner, to ensure we can conduct appropriate oversight.

It also creates a new division within DOJ, a compliance officer, that will specifically look at these FISA applications to make sure they are accurate.

Although I am pleased with much of the FISA reform bill, it is unfortunate that it is included with a lot of other bills in this rule, controversial bills that I don't like. Therefore, I urge opposition to the rule, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, for the record, I want my colleagues to know that pandemics and instances like the coronavirus are already covered by the legislation. Nothing in this bill prohibits the President from using authority under section 212(f) to contain the coronavirus.

This bill allows the President to suspend the entry of a class of individuals if it is determined that they would undermine the security or public safety of

the United States or the preservation of human rights, democratic processes or institutions, or international stability.

But out of an abundance of caution, the Judiciary Committee added a clarification clause on page 7 of the NO BAN Act, which clearly states that the term “public safety” includes efforts necessary to contain a communicable disease of public health significance, as defined in section 34(2)(b) of title 42, Code of Federal Regulations.

So, this has nothing to do with coronavirus. We are taking action on this bill basically to end the President’s discriminatory travel bans.

Madam Speaker, I am quoting from a letter from the ACLU that I will include in the RECORD.

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION,
March 10, 2020.

VOTE “YES” ON NO BAN ACT, VOTE “NO” ON
ANY AMENDMENTS OR OTHER CHANGES

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU), and our more than 8 million members, supporters, and activists, we write to express our support for the NO BAN Act, though we have concerns about language that has been added. As the NO BAN Act is scheduled for a floor vote this week, it is essential that no further changes be made to the bill—so that this authority cannot be used to ban whole communities.

We urge you to vote “YES” on the NO BAN Act in its current form and vote “NO” on any amendments or other changes. The ACLU will score this vote.

The ACLU continues to support the version of the NO BAN Act scheduled for a floor vote this week. However, we have concerns about recent language included in the bill defining public safety to address “communicable disease” in response to the current climate and fear around COVID-19 (coronavirus). These changes are unnecessary and further stigmatize immigrant communities where many are facing discrimination in the United States given the Trump administration’s stereotypes about communities of color and immigrants—including in reference to coronavirus. There is a long history in the United States of inaccurate connections between health risks and immigrants, which has resulted in irrational immigration policies and discrimination; we are not interested in repeating the mistakes of our past. Any restrictions related to coronavirus, such as those regarding China and Iran, must be based in science and public health, not politics or xenophobia.

The NO BAN Act continues to achieve the ultimate goals of the legislation, which are to rescind the Muslim ban, refugee Muslim ban, and asylum ban, and make critical changes to the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA) by putting in place a more stringent standard for presidents invoking any similar suspension or restriction. During the House Judiciary Committee markup, the bill was amended to rescind the President’s recently expanded Muslim ban which was issued on January 31st, and targets more African countries, and requires visa reporting related to this ban.

Under current law, the executive branch claims the authority to bar the entry of large groups of people without effective accountability and without regard for the policies codified in other parts of the INA. The NO BAN Act would strengthen limitations on this authority by raising the standard for invoking it. Rather than the current broad

and undefined standard, the proposed bill would require the executive branch to meet a more stringent standard—based on “specific and credible facts” that any suspension or of restriction from entry must be connected to “specific acts” that have actually occurred. Furthermore, the bill requires that any such suspension or restriction meet a compelling government interest and that the government use the least restrictive means in doing so.

The NO BAN Act would also establish a system of checks and balances whereby Congress would be routinely notified and briefed on the status, implementation and constitutional and legislative authority of the executive branch’s actions. Finally, the proposed legislation would expand the non-discrimination provision of the INA to prohibit discrimination based on religion. While language connecting these two critical changes to the INA has been removed, the bill now includes a rule of construction indicating that the President, Secretary of State, and Secretary of Homeland Security cannot use this authority to act in a manner that is inconsistent with other policy decisions in immigration law.

This bill is a significant step forward for Muslim communities and other communities that could be targeted discriminatorily or without good reason. By creating substantive standards and accountability, it greatly reduces the possibility of future bias-based bans.

The ACLU urges you to vote “YES” on the NO BAN Act in its current form and vote “NO” on any amendments or other changes. Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

RONALD NEWMAN,
National Political Director.

MANAR WAHEED,
Senior Legislative and Advocacy Counsel.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, one of the things they point out here, which I want to agree with, is that they say: “There is a long history in the United States of inaccurate connections between health risks and immigrants, which has resulted in irrational immigration policies and discrimination; we are not interested in repeating the mistakes of our past. Any restrictions related to coronavirus, such as those regarding China and Iran, must be based in science and public health, not politics or xenophobia.”

What a radical idea, to actually base some of these decisions on science. Yet, we know that this administration doesn’t have any regard for science.

Madam Speaker, I will also include in the RECORD a May 20 Washington Post article titled “I think Islam hates us”: A timeline of Trump’s comments about Islam and Muslims.”

[From the Washington Post, May 20, 2017]

I THINK ISLAM HATES US: A TIMELINE OF
TRUMP’S COMMENTS ABOUT ISLAM AND MUSLIMS

(By Jenna Johnson and Abigail Hauslohner)

President Trump is in Saudi Arabia this weekend to meet with Arab leaders, visit the birthplace of Islam and give a speech about religious tolerance with the hope of resetting his reputation with the world’s 1.6 billion Muslims. But it’s unclear if a two-day visit is enough to overshadow his past statements about Islam and its faithful, with his rhet-

oric becoming more virulent as he campaigned for president.

Here’s a look back at some of the comments that he has made:

March 30, 2011: For years, Trump publicly questioned then-President Barack Obama’s religious beliefs and place of birth. As he debated running for president in the 2012 election, Trump said in a radio interview: “He doesn’t have a birth certificate, or if he does, there’s something on that certificate that is very bad for him. Now, somebody told me—and I have no idea if this is bad for him or not, but perhaps it would be—that where it says ‘religion,’ it might have ‘Muslim.’ And if you’re a Muslim, you don’t change your religion, by the way.” (Obama is a Christian, and state records show he was born in Hawaii.)

Sept. 17, 2015: At a campaign town hall in New Hampshire, a man in the audience shouted out: “We have a problem in this country; it’s called Muslims. We know our current president is one.” The man mentioned Muslim “training camps” and asked: “When can we get rid of them?” Trump responded: “We’re going to be looking at a lot of different things. You know, a lot of people are saying that, and a lot of people are saying that bad things are happening out there. We’re going to be looking at that and plenty of other things.”

Sept. 20, 2015: On NBC News, Trump was asked if he would be comfortable with a Muslim as president; he responded: “I can say that, you know, it’s something that at some point could happen. We will see. I mean, you know, it’s something that could happen. Would I be comfortable? I don’t know if we have to address it right now, but I think it is certainly something that could happen.”

Sept. 30, 2015: At a New Hampshire rally, Trump pledged to kick all Syrian refugees—most of whom are Muslim—out of the country, as they might be a secret army. “They could be ISIS, I don’t know. This could be one of the great tactical ploys of all time. A 200,000-man army, maybe,” he said. In an interview that aired later, Trump said: “This could make the Trojan horse look like peanuts.”

Oct. 21, 2015: On Fox Business, Trump says he would “certainly look at” the idea of closing mosques in the United States.

Nov. 16, 2015: Following a series of terrorist attacks in Paris, Trump said on MSNBC that he would “strongly consider” closing mosques. “I would hate to do it, but it’s something that you’re going to have to strongly consider because some of the ideas and some of the hatred—the absolute hatred—is coming from these areas,” he said.

Nov. 20, 2015: In comments to Yahoo and NBC News, Trump seemed open to the idea of creating a database of all Muslims in the United States. Later, he and his aides would not rule out the idea.

Nov. 21, 2015: At a rally in Alabama, Trump said that on Sept. 11 he “watched when the World Trade Center came tumbling down. And I watched in Jersey City, N.J., where thousands and thousands of people were cheering as that building was coming down.”

Nov. 22, 2015: On ABC News, Trump doubled down on his comment and added: “It was well covered at the time. There were people over in New Jersey that were watching it, a heavy Arab population, that were cheering as the buildings came down. Not good.” (While there were some reports of celebrations overseas, extensive examination of news clips turn up no such celebrations in New Jersey.)

Nov. 30, 2015: On MSNBC, a reporter asked Trump if he thinks Islam is an inherently peaceful religion that’s been perverted by a small percentage of followers or if it is an inherently violent religion. Trump responded:

"Well, all I can say . . . there's something going on. You know, there's something definitely going on. I don't know that that question can be answered." He also said: "We are not loved by many Muslims."

Dec. 3, 2015: The morning after Syed Rizwan Farook and Tashfeen Malik killed 14 people in San Bernardino, Calif., Trump called into Fox News and said: "The other thing with the terrorists is you have to take out their families, when you get these terrorists, you have to take out their families." (Killing the relatives of suspected terrorists is forbidden by international law.) Later, in a speech to the Republican Jewish Coalition, Trump criticized Obama for not using the phrase "radical Islamic terrorism" and commented: "There's something going on with him that we don't know about."

Dec. 6, 2015: On CBS News, Trump said: "If you have people coming out of mosques with hatred and death in their eyes and on their minds, we're going to have to do something." Trump also said he didn't believe the sister of one of the San Bernardino shooters who said she was crestfallen for the victims, saying: "I would go after a lot of people, and I would find out whether or not they knew. I would be able to find out, because I don't believe the sister."

Dec. 7, 2015: Trump's campaign issued a statement saying: "Donald J. Trump is calling for a total and complete shutdown of Muslims entering the United States until our country's representatives can figure out what is going on." Trump read this statement aloud at a rally in South Carolina.

Dec. 8, 2015: On CNN, Trump quoted a widely debunked poll by an anti-Islam activist organization that claimed that a quarter of the Muslims living in the United States agreed that violence against Americans is justified as part of the global jihad. "We have people out there that want to do great destruction to our country, whether it's 25 percent or 10 percent or 5 percent, it's too much," Trump said.

Dec. 13, 2015: On Fox News, Trump was asked if his ban would apply to a Canadian businessman who is a Muslim. Trump responded: "There's a sickness. They're sick people. There's a sickness going on. There's a group of people that is very sick."

Jan. 12, 2016: At a rally in Iowa, Trump shared his suspicions about Syrian refugees and then read the lyrics to Al Wilson's 1968 song "The Snake," the story of a "tender woman" who nursed a sickly snake back to health but then was attacked by the snake. Trump often read these lyrics at rallies.

Feb. 3, 2016: Trump criticized Obama for visiting a mosque in Baltimore and said on Fox News: "Maybe he feels comfortable there . . . There are a lot of places he can go, and he chose a mosque." (It was Obama's first visit to a mosque during his presidency, and it was made in an effort to encourage religious tolerance in light of growing anti-Muslim sentiment.)

Feb. 20, 2016: After Obama skipped the funeral of Supreme Court Justice Antonin Scalia, Trump tweeted: "I wonder if President Obama would have attended the funeral of Justice Scalia if it were held in a Mosque? Very sad that he did not go!" (Obama did pay his respects when Scalia's body lay in repose in the Supreme Court.) That night at a rally in South Carolina, Trump told an apocryphal tale that he would return to repeatedly about U.S. Gen. John J. Pershing fighting Muslim insurgents in the Philippines in the early 1900s and killing a large group of insurgents with bullets dipped in pigs' blood.

March 9, 2016: On CNN, Trump said: "I think Islam hates us. There's something there that—there's a tremendous hatred there. There's a tremendous hatred. We have to get to the bottom of it. There's an unbelievable hatred of us."

March 22, 2016: Soon after three suicide bombings in Brussels tied to a group of French and Belgian Muslims, Trump told Fox Business: "We're having problems with the Muslims, and we're having problems with Muslims coming into the country." Trump called for surveillance of mosques in the United States, saying: "You have to deal with the mosques, whether we like it or not, I mean, you know, these attacks aren't coming out of—they're not done by Swedish people."

On NBC News, Trump added: "This all happened because, frankly, there's no assimilation. They are not assimilating . . . They want to go by sharia law. They want sharia law. They don't want the laws that we have. They want sharia law."

March 23, 2016: In an interview with Bloomberg TV, Trump said that Muslims "have to respect us. They do not respect us at all. And frankly, they don't respect a lot of the things that are happening throughout not only our country, but they don't respect other things."

March 29, 2016: During a town hall in Wisconsin, CNN's Anderson Cooper asked Trump: "Do you trust Muslims in America?" Trump responded: "Do I what?" Cooper again asked: "Trust Muslims in America?" Trump responded: "Many of them I do. Many of them I do, and some, I guess, we don't. Some, I guess, we don't. We have a problem, and we can try and be very politically correct and pretend we don't have a problem, but, Anderson, we have a major, major problem. This is, in a sense, this is a war."

May 20, 2016: On Fox News, Trump said this of Muslims: "They're going to have to turn in the people that are bombing the planes. And they know who the people are. And we're not going to find the people by just continuing to be so nice and so soft."

June 13, 2016: The day after the mass shooting at a gay nightclub in Orlando, Trump declared in a speech in New Hampshire that "radical Islam is anti-woman, anti-gay and anti-American." He criticized his Democratic rival, Hillary Clinton, for refusing to use the term "radical Islam" and for speaking positively of Islam. "Hillary Clinton's catastrophic immigration plan will bring vastly more radical Islamic immigration into this country, threatening not only our society but our entire way of life. When it comes to radical Islamic terrorism, ignorance is not bliss. It's deadly—totally deadly," Trump said. Later he added: "I want every American to succeed, including Muslims—but the Muslims have to work with us. They have to work with us. They know what's going on."

June 14, 2016: At a rally in North Carolina, Trump noted that the Orlando shooter's parents are Muslim Americans who immigrated from Afghanistan. "The children of Muslim American parents, they're responsible for a growing number for whatever reason a growing number of terrorist attacks," he said, adding that immigration from Afghanistan has increased five-fold. " . . . Every year we bring in more than 100,000 lifetime immigrants from the Middle East and many more from Muslim countries outside of the Middle East. A number of these immigrants have hostile attitudes."

June 15, 2016: On Fox News, Trump said this of Muslims who immigrate to the United States: "Assimilation has been very hard. It's almost—I won't say nonexistent, but it gets to be pretty close. And I'm talking about second and third generation. They come—they don't—for some reason, there's no real assimilation."

July 21, 2016: In accepting the Republican Party's presidential nomination, Trump focused heavily on "brutal Islamic terrorism" and promised: "I will do everything in my

power to protect our LGBTQ citizens from the violence and oppression of a hateful foreign ideology."

July 24, 2016: On NBC News, Trump defended his proposal for a Muslim ban, despite some of his aides insisting he had rolled it back. "People were so upset when I used the word Muslim. 'Oh, you can't use the word Muslim,'" Trump said. " . . . But just remember this: Our Constitution is great, but it doesn't necessarily give us the right to commit suicide, okay? Now, we have a religious—you know, everybody wants to be protected. And that's great. And that's the wonderful part of our Constitution. I view it differently. Why are we committing suicide? Why are we doing that?"

Aug. 11, 2016: At a meeting of evangelical leaders in Orlando, Trump said: "If you were a Christian in Syria, it was virtually impossible to come into the United States. If you were a Muslim from Syria, it was one of the easier countries to be able to find your way into the United States. Think of that. Just think of what that means."

Aug. 18, 2016: During a rally in North Carolina, Trump said that "all applicants for immigration will be vetted for ties to radical ideology, and we will screen out anyone who doesn't share our values and love our people."

Sept. 19, 2016: At a rally in Florida, Trump reacted to explosions over the weekend in New York and New Jersey and said: "There have been Islamic terrorist attacks in Minnesota and New York City and in New Jersey. These attacks and many others were made possible because of our extremely open immigration system, which fails to properly vet and screen the individuals and families coming into our country. Got to be careful."

Jan. 27, 2017: Within a week of becoming president, Trump signed an executive order blocking Syrian refugees and banning citizens of seven predominantly Muslim countries from entering the United States for 90 days. This order goes into effect immediately, prompting mass chaos at airports, protests and legal challenges. Rudolph W. Giuliani, a close adviser to the president, later said on Fox News: "So when [Trump] first announced it, he said, 'Muslim ban.' He called me up. He said, 'Put a commission together. Show me the right way to do it legally.'"

Feb. 28, 2017: Despite urging from some of his Cabinet members, Trump continues to use the term "radical Islamic terrorism," including in a speech to a joint session of Congress.

March 6, 2017: Trump issues a new travel ban for citizens from six majority-Muslim countries, which is also challenged in the courts.

April 29, 2017: At a rally celebrating his 100th day in office, Trump once again dramatically read "The Snake."

May 17, 2017: At a commencement ceremony, Trump previewed his upcoming overseas trip and said: "I'll speak with Muslim leaders and challenge them to fight hatred and extremism and embrace a peaceful future for their faith. And they're looking very much forward to hearing what we, as your representative, we have to say. We have to stop radical Islamic terrorism."

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, the President's comments and tweets about Muslims are truly, truly offensive, and I could list everything he said here today, but it is a long, long list. I think repeating those words would be a mistake because they are unworthy of this floor.

President Trump's Muslim ban continues a sad and unfortunate history of

policies that used immigration law to target people based on their backgrounds. We have had policies in our history that targeted immigrants from China, Japan, and Asia, and laws that qualified people of White descent for naturalization at the expense of everyone else.

Those policies are wrong. They are shameful. And they went against everything this country stands for. President Trump's Muslim ban belongs right beside them, in the dustbin of history, as well.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE), my good friend.

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Arizona, my good friend, for yielding time. And frankly, I want to associate myself with her remarks about the underlying legislation.

My remarks, Madam Speaker, will focus on the manner in which the bills that are before us are being brought to the floor.

It is, frankly, very disappointing to me, Madam Speaker, that this even needs to be said. But given the grave consequences of what the majority is proposing to do procedurally, I cannot condemn today's rule strongly enough.

In today's measure, what the majority is proposing amounts to a de facto change to the House rules, one that will trample on the rights of the minority and deny any opportunity to amend the bill on the floor.

Rather than bringing up the two immigration items as the standalone bills that they actually are, the majority has instead chosen the procedural gimmick of using a Senate-amended House bill to package these items together. This has the same effect of denying the minority the more than 100-year-old right to make a motion to recommit, or MTR, as they are commonly known, before moving to final passage.

This is because, under House rules, the minority is not allowed to offer an MTR on any House measures that have been amended by the Senate. Of course, for the majority, the denial of the minority's traditional rights to an MTR is the whole point of this procedural exercise. These underhanded procedural shenanigans are specifically intended to deny the minority the right to an MTR on these bills.

Before my friend, the chairman, responds with the number of times a Republican majority used this procedure, let me be perfectly clear. As he knows, we never, never did that as a means to deny the minority an MTR. In fact, we did it in consultation with the minority and with the sole goal of accelerating passage of key bipartisan legislation in the Senate.

So, why does the Democratic majority insist on these procedural gymnastics? I can think of only one reason: The majority is embarrassed that the minority has now passed an MTR six

times in this Congress, including one just last week.

Madam Speaker, this is now the second time in the past 6 weeks that the majority is explicitly adopting a procedure to deny the minority our rights.

□ 1245

I think that if the majority is really so frightened of the motion to recommit and they really want to do away with MTRs, then they should change the standing rules of the House, and that needs to happen on a vote on the House floor so that everyone can see what the majority is actually doing and how it operates.

When Republicans were in the majority, the thought of limiting the use of the MTR to silence minority voices never once crossed our minds, and that is because we recognized the importance of the MTR to this institution. It has been around since the very beginning of the institution, and it has been in its present form since 1909.

In fact, in 1919, Representative Abraham Garrett of Tennessee was quoted as saying: "The motion to recommit is regarded as so sacred it is one of the few things protected against the Committee on Rules by the general rules of the House."

Evidently, not anymore.

The present majority is not content with that state of affairs, which is why they are trying, once again, to do an end run around the House rules and adopt a procedural gimmick specifically to stop the minority from exercising its right to an MTR. It is beyond disappointing, Madam Speaker.

It is shocking that the majority would feel the need to rig the entire system to shut us up. My goodness, they have a 35-seat majority. But we all know why that is. It is because the majority cannot effectively defend its own policies.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. COLE. So, today, Madam Speaker, I call on all Members to vote "no" on this rule. I ask that my colleagues, regardless of party, reject this rigged process, reject this rule, and act to protect the rights of every Member of this Chamber. The future of the institution depends on it.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I have high regard for my ranking member, Mr. COLE, and I know he and I both share enormous respect for this institution, but I am going to say for the Record that this process that we are using is not unusual. It is a process that was used by Republicans numerous times during their majority, including 15 times during the past two Republican-led Congresses, to send bills over to the Senate for their expedited consideration.

And I will say, with respect to the gentleman, he mentioned that we were

consulted about these processes in the past. I was never consulted when the Republicans used this process. In fact, I remember a time when the Republicans basically hijacked a Democratic bill to attach something to it, without even consulting the sponsor of the bill. So I am not sure what the gentleman was alluding to, and I don't know what my friend's intentions were when they utilized this process.

Madam Speaker, I can't speak to the motivations of the previous majority when they used this process over a dozen times, but what I can speak to is the impact. Each time this process was used by the Republican majority, the Democratic minority was unable to offer a motion to recommit. That is just a fact.

Republicans used this process 15 times over the past two Congresses, and, you know, I get it. My Republican friends want to have an opportunity to try to politicize this debate even more around immigration. But I just want to remind everybody why we are here.

The offensive things that this President has said about immigrants and about Muslims are unconscionable. These travel bans serve no purpose other than to discriminate against Muslims and people from predominantly Muslim countries.

President Trump issued these baseless travel bans under the guise of national security. But we all know what they are really about. They fulfill Trump's offensive campaign promise calling for a "total and complete shutdown of Muslims entering the United States."

Those are the President's words.

These discriminatory bans have a real impact on real people's lives and have already affected more than 135 million individuals. So that is why we are debating whether to terminate the travel bans and to stand up against discrimination and hate without any distractions, without any political gimmicks.

I know my friends are not happy with that, but we are going to do the right thing. We are going to stand up to hate and bigotry and discrimination, and we are going to move this legislation forward, and everybody will have an up-or-down vote.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, before I yield time to my friend, I want to point out again that Mr. COLE has been here a long time, and when he says to the public on the floor that when Republicans used this process of combining the bills together in a rule that it was to expedite it over to the Senate, I believe him. And so I believe that their motivation is different, and that is to prevent the minority from having a motion to recommit.

Madam Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL), my good friend.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend from Arizona for yielding.

I want to stipulate, Madam Speaker, that I have seen the gentleman from Massachusetts, the leader of our committee, do some things on that committee that no one else has tried to do.

I was in this institution for a decade as a chief of staff, now a decade as a Member of Congress, and he has done some amazing things that I believe will serve this institution and serve the committee, not just this Congress, but next Congress and for decades to come. And I applaud him and his very capable team for pushing those initiatives forward.

But, today, Madam Speaker, we are talking about the exact opposite side of that coin, things that are done in the name of expediency today that may well do damage to this institution, not just this Congress and next Congress, but for decades to come. Habits happen in this institution, Madam Speaker. Habits happen.

My friend from Massachusetts used to work for a great leader in this institution, Mr. Joe Moakley. In fact, his picture hangs on the wall as a former chairman of the Rules Committee.

I used to work for a great Member of this institution as well, Madam Speaker, Mr. John Linder, out of the great State of Georgia. He also served on the Rules Committee.

As we come down to the floor today, for my friends of the majority to defend for the second time in 6 weeks taking away the minority's right to have any input on the process whatsoever, I thought I would go back 20 years from today, back to the year 2000, when the gentleman from Massachusetts' former boss and my former boss sat in these very same chairs.

At that time, Madam Speaker, Republicans were in the majority. I will go back to October 3 of 2000 when Mr. Linder took to the floor and said:

And the rule provides a motion to recommit, as is the right of the minority.

Republicans were in control, complete control, of this institution. They could jam anything through that they wanted to jam through. But it was the right of the minority to have at least a final voice and a final opportunity to amend the bill.

October 12, a week later, Mr. Linder and Mr. Moakley were on the floor again. Mr. Linder says:

And, finally, the rule provides for one motion to recommit, as is the right of the minority.

Again, Madam Speaker, October 19 of that same year, just a week after that, Mr. Linder and Mr. Moakley on the floor again:

The rule provides a motion to recommit, as is the right of the minority.

We will go a week after that, Madam Speaker. Same two gentlemen on the floor again, same Republican majority in charge. Mr. Linder, on the floor:

Resolution . . . as is the right of the minority.

A week after that, Madam Speaker:

Motion to recommit, with or without instructions, as is the right of the minority.

I will go on and on and on. Because 20 years ago, it was not a question of whether or not the minority would have a single voice. Remember, Madam Speaker, these bills that the gentleman from Massachusetts is talking about, these immigration bills, went through committee, no Republican amendments were adopted; went to the Rules Committee, no Republican amendments were made in order. There has been absolutely no minority input of any kind on these bills he is talking about. There is so much more in this underlying bill. But 20 years ago, the habit was we would recognize that the minority has a right.

In fact, I don't even need to go back 20 years, Madam Speaker. I serve on the Select Committee on Modernization. That is a bipartisan committee here in the House that is designed to look at the current rules and organization of the House and talk about how it is that we can do better.

I don't have to go back 20 years, Madam Speaker. I can go back to last year, March 13, 2019, a press release from the Speaker of the House, NANCY PELOSI, on the remarks that she made in front of that joint select committee looking at modernizing the institution. And she said: Some people have talked about changing the motion to recommit, this or that. But she said:

I am a big respecter of the rights of the minority in the Congress of the United States, and I believe as Speaker of the whole House that initiatives you put forth must come from the whole House.

We are looking at how to make the motion to recommit better, Madam Speaker. I will take us back to a prescription drugs bill just a few short weeks ago, where the minority traded away its right to a motion to recommit in favor of a complete substitute.

Let's debate the issues instead of the motion to recommit. The motion to recommit that passed last week, Madam Speaker, said let's not allow violent convicted criminals to serve as TSA agents.

This is what the majority is protecting America from: amendments from the minority that would protect TSA employees from working side by side with violent convicted felons. This isn't an adversarial idea, Madam Speaker. This is an idea that we all agreed on, which is why it passed with great bipartisan support.

You never know when the bad habits you get into are going to stick.

I will take you back to a time when my friend, Mr. MCGOVERN, and my ranking member, Mr. COLE, were on the floor just few short years ago, and my friend from Massachusetts said this. He said:

Mr. Speaker, I have nothing but the highest respect for my colleague from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE), and I know he wants this House to run better. But the fact of the matter is I feel bad that he has to defend this lousy, restrictive, indefensible process. That is our job on the Rules Committee sometimes.

And I want to say to my friend from Massachusetts, as he said to our friend

from Oklahoma: I have nothing but the highest respect for my colleague from Massachusetts, and I know that he wants this House to run better. But the fact of the matter is I feel bad that he has to defend this lousy, restrictive, indefensible process.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, let me just say for the record, nobody is changing the MTR. We are using a process that my Republican friends used over a dozen times in the past, in the last Congress.

Yes, the Rules Committee has an obligation to try to make sure that we bring important legislation to the floor in a fair and reasonable process, and we are doing that.

But we also have an obligation—

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I would prefer not to be interrupted. I am in the middle of—Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia, because he keeps on interrupting me.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I don't think of it as interrupting. I apologize to Chairman MCGOVERN. I think of it as elucidating.

What my friend has said is absolutely right. This process has been used before, just not for this purpose, which is why Politico ran—

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I reclaim my time.

Do you know what? The result, when my friends used this process, is the same. We were not allowed to offer an MTR to any of the bills when they utilized this process.

□ 1300

And so, I just state that that is just a fact. But the Rules Committee also has an obligation, and I believe everybody in this House has an obligation to stand up against bigotry and hate and racism and religious discrimination, and that is what these underlying bills deal with.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD a February 16, 2020, The Guardian article, titled; "Trump is deciding who is American": how the new travel ban is tearing families apart."

[From the Guardian, Feb. 16, 2020]

TRUMP IS DECIDING WHO IS AMERICAN: HOW THE NEW TRAVEL BAN IS TEARING FAMILIES APART

(By Sean Levin)

It started out as a joyous day for Olumide. On 31 January, the 32-year-old Nigerian American learned in an email that the US was finally processing the visa applications of his wife and daughter in Nigeria.

Hours later, Donald Trump shattered their celebration, announcing that he was adding six countries to the travel ban, including Nigeria. The decision cuts off pathways to permanent US residency for Nigerians, throwing Olumide's case into limbo at the final stage of the process. It leaves his wife and 11-year-old girl stuck across an ocean with little hope of making it to the US.

"This is inhuman," said Olumide, a systems analyst and US military veteran who

served in Afghanistan and lives in Washington DC. He asked to use his middle name out of fear he might jeopardize his case. "As a soldier, I understand the need to protect the country. But to completely shut the doors . . . it's just plain wrong."

MILLIONS OF AFRICANS NOW BANNED: 'WE ARE NOT CRIMINALS'

Trump's January order builds on the 2017 travel ban that has continued to target five Muslim-majority countries, and significantly restricts permanent residency for nationals from Eritrea, Kyrgyzstan, Nigeria and Myanmar. It also blocks people from Tanzania and Sudan from obtaining green cards through the "diversity visa" lottery.

Just like the 2017 restrictions, it blocks permanent immigration from the targeted countries, making limited exceptions if applicants prove that denials would cause "undue hardship" and that granting them visas would support "national interest".

The original ban already resulted in denied visas for more than 42,000 people, the majority from Iran. The addition of the new countries has doubled the number of Muslims targeted across the globe to roughly 320 million, advocates estimate. Roughly one-quarter of all Africans are now affected. The restrictions now apply to 13 countries, including Nigeria, home to Africa's largest population and economy. It cuts off countries where some are fleeing violence. Some estimate the new ban, which goes into effect on 21 February, could hinder more than 12,000 immigrants seeking to resettle in the US and reunite with family in the next year.

The restrictions are a signature component of Trump's aggressive anti-immigrant agenda, which has included curbs on legal migration, a destruction of the American asylum system, an all-time low cap on refugees, expanded detention and mass deportations.

"Trump started out by scapegoating Muslims in 2017," said Javeria Jamil, attorney with Asian Americans Advancing Justice's Asian Law Caucus, who has been fielding calls from families affected by the new ban. "Now, it's not just the Muslim ban. It has turned into an African ban."

The Trump administration has claimed that the ban, which blindsided some diplomats, is a national security measure, and that the added countries failed to meet US security and information-sharing standards.

But immigrant rights groups said the policy is a political maneuver amid Trump's reelection campaign—and one that will have profound consequences.

"People are in turmoil," said Audu Kadiri, a 43-year-old community organizer who left Nigeria in 2014. He had planned to bring his mother to the US, but the ban may make that impossible. The activist, who now lives in the Bronx, hasn't yet told his mother about Trump's order, because he doesn't know how to break the news. "There is so much collateral damage, it's hard to quantify."

In Nigeria, Kadiri was an LGBTQ+ rights advocate who worked on HIV prevention and other human rights issues. He was forced to flee due to his activism and sought asylum in the US. It's now unsafe for him to return to Nigeria, which is why he wants his 68-year-old mother to come to the US.

He hasn't seen her since 2014 and, if Trump is re-elected, he fears it will be at least another five years before they reunite. She'll probably miss the birth of his third child.

"Nigerians have contributed to the development of this country, like every immigrant community," he said. "We are not criminals."

TORN APART, WITH DWINDLING OPTIONS

Before the January announcement, the Trump administration had already clamped

down on travel from Africa, including hikes in visa fees, and new obstacles and increased denials for Nigerians seeking approval for short-term visits. The US further suspended visitor visas from Eritrea in 2017.

That means families have been fighting for years to use the dwindling avenues available to them to reunite, and for those who have invested significant time and money into the process, the sudden news of an outright ban was particularly brutal.

"There's nothing you can do, and it makes you feel so helpless," said Olumide, the veteran. Olumide arrived in the US from Nigeria when he was 10 years old. He met his wife in Nigeria in 2012 after he left the military, and the two got married last year.

US Citizenship and Immigration Services approved the petition for his wife and daughter in January, just before the announcement of the ban. But they don't yet have their visas—and the ban may make it impossible to get them.

Olumide had hoped they would be starting their lives together in the US by now, and said he was pained by feelings of guilt: "I made promises to her." The couple hasn't fully processed the news, he added: "We don't want to think about not being together."

He noted that his daughter has typhoid and his wife has malaria, and he constantly fears for their health and safety.

Hana Mohamed, a 20-year-old student in San Diego, who grew up in Sudan, said she was eager for her grandparents to come to the US, especially so her grandmother could get medical care in California: "It's just so sad and frustrating. They are getting older, and I want to see them before anything happens."

Mohamed said it was difficult to accept that the US was banning large groups of Muslims in the name of safety while seeming to do little about the ongoing terror threat of American mass shootings: "It's just so shocking that we have come to this day where a whole nation of people are getting discriminated against. Isn't the purpose of the United States to stand up for everyone who is getting hurt and treat them right?"

One Eritrean American who works as an engineer in Silicon Valley, and requested anonymity for fear of hurting his family's case, has petitioned for his mother to come live with him in the US and was hoping she would soon get an interview date at the embassy. Then the new ban was unveiled.

"We've waited our turn. We've followed the law. I'm a tax-paying citizen contributing to the economy," he said, noting that his mother is 69 years old and lives alone in Eritrea. "This is just pure evil."

He said he felt Trump was implementing the ban as a "soundbite for the campaign" while disregarding that it would leave Eritreans like his mother with no options: "This was our only hope to get her here."

For Eritreans, the ban comes as the Trump administration has ramped up deportations of Eritrean asylum seekers, despite the US government's own acknowledgment of the torture and arbitrary detention Eritreans are currently facing.

Abraham Zere, an Eritrean journalist who was granted asylum in the US and now lives in Ohio, said it seemed some Eritreans were reluctant to speak out about the ban and live in fear of potential repercussions from both governments: "People are scared to even discuss it."

Zere's own family is affected: his mother is still in Eritrea, separated from her children. She can't even video chat with her family because of the poor internet in Eritrea, which means she never gets to see her granddaughter, an eight-year-old she hasn't yet met, he said.

Some warn the ban may have life-or-death consequences. For queer and transgender migrants in the targeted countries, it could lead them to embark on perilous journeys to escape to the US as they run out of options, said Zack Mohamed, who is Somali American and a member of the Black LGBTQIA+ Migrant Project: "This is a big 'not welcome' sign in front of our faces."

In response to questions about the impact on migrants fleeing violence, a US state department spokesperson said the ban was not meant to "limit the ability of an individual to seek asylum", adding: "Our first priority remains national security. We continue to work with our dedicated consular officers in the field to identify and expedite those individuals with urgent travel needs."

Asked about charges that the ban is discriminatory, the spokesperson said the restrictions are based on "nationality" and "visa category" and that "consular officers do not adjudicate based on religion". The spokesperson said there were specific criteria to determine which countries are restricted and noted that Chad was on the original list but removed in 2018.

FIGHTING TO END THE BAN

With the first travel ban upheld by the US supreme court, there are few recourses left to challenge the policy. Advocates are hoping a Democratic president will immediately repeal the ban and have also recently renewed the push for Congress to pass the No Ban Act, which would end the ban and prevent discriminatory immigration policies.

Until then, Trump will continue to use his executive power to try to redefine what it means to be a citizen, advocates warned.

"The president of the United States, the US government is explicitly trying to decide who gets to be an American," said Eric Naing, who is Burmese American and works with Muslim Advocates, a group that has challenged the ban. His family would not have been able to come to the US if the ban on Myanmar had been in place. "He's saying I shouldn't be American. My parents shouldn't be American. It's deeply upsetting."

Olumide noted that the ban was punishing countless American citizens like him: "It's hurting the exact people you're trying to protect."

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, the President's travel ban isn't just bad policy, it is cruel. And it is tearing families apart.

That includes veterans who have served our Nation, some of whom were in the middle of the process of bringing their families to America when this policy came down. Now they worry their loved ones may never be able to join them here in the United States, all because of a completely arbitrary Muslim ban.

One veteran said in this piece, "As a soldier, I understand the need to protect the country. But to completely shut the doors . . . it's just plain wrong."

These veterans aren't trying to endanger our country, Madam Speaker, they put their lives on the line to protect it. But this is the kind of real-life impact we are seeing. The President's ban is not just offensive, it is actively separating loved ones, including those who have served this country on the battlefield. I mean, it is time to say: "Enough."

My friends like to talk about how they support our troops and our veterans. Well, this policy is adversely impacting so many of our veterans.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD a February 2, 2020, New York Times article, titled, "New U.S. Travel Ban Shuts Door on Africa's Biggest Economy, Nigeria."

[From the New York Times, Feb. 2, 2020]

NEW U.S. TRAVEL BAN SHUTS DOOR ON AFRICA'S BIGGEST ECONOMY, NIGERIA

(By Ruth Maclean and Abdi Latif Dahir)

The newlyweds had already been apart for half their yearlong marriage. Miriam Nwegbe was in Nigeria. Her husband was in Baltimore, and until she could join him, everything was on hold: finding a home together, trying for their first baby, becoming an American family.

Then, on Friday, their lives were thrown into disarray by the expansion of President Trump's ban on immigration to include six new countries, including four in Africa. Nigeria, the continent's most populous nation, was one of them.

"America has killed me," Ms. Nwegbe's husband, Ikenna, an optometrist, texted her when he heard. "We are finished."

A year after the Trump administration announced that a major pillar of its new strategy for Africa was to counter the growing influence of China and Russia by expanding economic ties to the continent, it slammed the door shut on Nigeria, the continent's biggest economy.

The travel restrictions also apply to three other African countries—Sudan, Tanzania, and Eritrea—as well as to Myanmar, which is accused of genocide against its Muslim population, and Kyrgyzstan, a former Soviet state.

The ban will prevent thousands of people from being able to move to the United States.

The initial ban, which was put into effect in 2017, restricted travel from some Muslim-majority countries as part of Mr. Trump's plan to keep out "radical Islamic terrorists." It has already affected more than 135 million people—many of them Christians—from seven countries.

With the new expansion, the ban will affect nearly a quarter of the 1.2 billion people on the African continent, according to W. Gyude Moore, a visiting fellow at the Center for Global Development, a research group, potentially taking a heavy toll on African economies—and on America's image in the region.

"Chinese, Turkish, Russian, and British firms, backed by their governments, are staking positions on a continent that will define the global economy's future," he said, adding, "One hopes that the United States would follow suit and fully engage with the continent—but that hope fades."

The rationale for the new restrictions varies depending on country, but the White House announcement said that most of the six countries added to the list did not comply with identity-verification and information-sharing rules.

And Nigeria, it said, posed a risk of harboring terrorists who may seek to enter the United States. The country has been hit brutally by the Islamist group Boko Haram, though the extremists have shown little sign that they have the capability to export their fight overseas.

Critics, many of whom also denounced the initial ban, saw something far more venal at play.

"Trump's travel bans have never been rooted in national security—they're about discriminating against people of color," Sen-

ator Kamala Harris, the former Democratic presidential candidate, declared on Sunday. "They are, without a doubt, rooted in anti-immigrant, white supremacist ideologies."

Two Democrats still in the race also weighed in. Elizabeth Warren described the measure as a "racist, xenophobic Muslim ban." Former Vice President Joseph R. Biden Jr. called it "a disgrace."

And Nancy Pelosi, the house speaker, said Democratic lawmakers would push ahead with a measure to forbid religious discrimination in immigration policy.

Beyond those people who may now never make it across American borders, the new ban could also affect millions who have no plans to travel to the United States themselves but may have benefited from the billions of dollars in remittances visa holders send home each year.

The United States may also emerge a loser, studies suggest. Nigerians are among the most successful and highly educated immigrants to America. (Mr. Trump, demanding to know why immigration policies did not favor people from countries like Norway, once disparaged those from Africa and Haiti, and said Nigerians would never go back to their "huts" if they were allowed in.)

Hadiza Aliyu lives in Borno, the Nigerian state at the epicenter of the Boko Haram crisis that has left tens of thousands dead. But she thought she had found a way out.

Ms. Aliyu was preparing to apply to move to the United States, where she once studied and where her two brothers live.

She was furious when she heard about the extended ban.

"Trump has been looking for a way to get at us Africans for a very long time, and finally got us," Ms. Aliyu said. "To hell with Republicans and their supremacist ideas."

Mika Moses moved to Minnesota from Nigeria nine years ago to join his mother and siblings, who were allowed entry after the family was attacked in religious riots in their northern city of Kaduna in 1991. His wife, Juliet, and their daughter were planning to join him, but are stuck in Kaduna, where Ms. Moses sells soda in a small store.

She said they were heartbroken by the news that the move would now be impossible.

"I have been struggling to raise our daughter alone," she said. "Why would Trump do this to us, after we have waited for nine years?"

Nigerians already living in the United States have been calling lawyers to try to figure out whether they will have to leave. Marilyn Eshikena, a biomedical research ethicist, has lived in the United States for the past seven years, but her visa expires this year. Her employer sponsored her application for a green card.

"If it turns out that everything needs to stop, they will feel cheated, because they spent a lot of money on this process," Ms. Eshikena said. "I will also feel cheated, because all the time that I spent working here will ultimately be for nothing. I can't even imagine what packing up and leaving will mean for me."

Her departure may also have serious consequences for her brother, who is studying in Canada. Ms. Eshikena has been sending part of her earnings to help pay his rent.

Some Nigerians praised Mr. Trump for his decision, arguing it might make it more difficult for those responsible for stealing government money back home to find cover in the United States, and force the country's leaders to be more honest and work harder to develop Nigeria.

In 2018, 7,922 immigrant visas were issued to Nigerians. Of these, 4,525 went to the immediate relatives of American citizens, and another 2,820 to other family members. An

estimated 345,000 people born in Nigeria were living in the United States in 2017, according to the census bureau.

If the visas are coveted in Nigeria, they are just as prized in African countries like Eritrea, where government repression is rampant and those who try to leave face obstacles and danger. With more than 500,000 refugees living outside the country, Eritrea was the ninth-largest source of refugees in the world in 2018, according to the United Nations, but fewer than 900 Eritreans received immigrant visas to the United States that year.

Abraham Zere, a journalist who moved to the United States from Eritrea in 2012, had dreamed of living in the same country as his mother since leaving home. On Saturday, he said his plans to bring her to the United States had been thrown into disarray. His family has been in constant communication on the messaging platform WhatsApp trying to understand what the ban will mean for them.

"This decision complicates everything and creates fear," said Mr. Zere, 37, a doctoral candidate at the School of Media Arts and Studies at Ohio University.

Mr. Zere and other Eritreans say they can't go back. They fear they will be punished for criticizing the government or leaving without approval.

"If I can't be reunited with my mother," Mr. Zere said, "it nullifies the whole notion of protection and punishes innocent citizens for reasons they had no slightest part in."

With nine siblings scattered across Europe, Africa, and the United States, Mr. Zere said their family has never had a full family portrait taken.

The economic consequences of the ban could be far-reaching, experts said.

"Being cut off from the largest economy in the world systematically is problematic," said Nonso Obikili, a Nigerian economist.

The biggest impact, he said, could be on remittances.

Nigerians abroad send home billions of dollars each year, \$24 billion in 2018 alone, according to the accounting firm PwC. With Nigeria's economy highly dependent on oil and its unemployment rate at 23 percent, this money provides a lifeline for millions of its citizens.

The new restrictions come at a time when the United States says it wants to jockey for power in Africa, particularly through its "Prosper Africa" initiative announced last summer, which aims to double two-way trade and investment.

"If on the one hand you're trying to make a push into Africa, and on the other hand you're barring the largest African country by population from moving to your country, then it does send mixed signals," Mr. Obikili said.

In January 2017, Mr. Trump's travel ban targeted several other African nations, including Chad, Libya, and Somalia. Chad was later removed from that list, but the executive order halted the plans of thousands of Somali refugees living in camps in Kenya who were about to travel to the United States and start new lives.

According to the United States Department of Homeland Security, nearly 30,000 Nigerians overstayed their nonimmigrant visas in 2018. The number of Nigerians visiting the United States dropped sharply after the Trump administration made it harder for visitors to obtain visas last summer.

The new restrictions affect those who want to move to the United States, not visit it.

The six countries newly added to the immigration ban are not easily categorized together by religion. Nigeria, for example is thought to be home to more than 200 million people, roughly half of them Muslim and half Christian. Of the four African countries

newly singled out, only Sudan has a significant majority of Muslims.

The United States has left Sudan on a list of state sponsors of terrorism, even as the country works to reverse decades of authoritarian rule under President Omar Hassan al-Bashir, who was deposed in April.

"This ban contributes to the overall impression that Sudan remains a very fragile state," said Cameron Hudson, a senior fellow with the Atlantic Council, a research group.

Many people from the countries newly targeted by the ban said the uncertainty was the hardest thing to bear. Ms. Nwegbe, the newlywed, who works as the chief operating officer of a tourism company that tries to encourage people to visit Africa, said the ban came as she and her husband were building their future.

"We're in limbo and our relationship is suffering," she said. "This is unnecessary hardship."

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, the President's ban is not about national security, it is about targeting immigrants from predominantly Muslim countries.

In 2017, the President issued an executive order that banned foreign nationals from seven Muslim-majority countries from entering the United States. Then earlier this year, he went even further, expanding the travel ban to six more countries.

This is affecting over 300 million people on the African Continent and refugees from Myanmar, where the Muslim minority is facing a genocide—genocide, Madam Speaker.

This administration is closing the door on the very people who are struggling to survive. That is not the America that I know. That is not an American value. We need to act to defend our values.

Madam Speaker, I just want to point out to my colleagues that what is in place right now, what this White House has done, I think by any objective or reasonable measure, is wrong. It reflects badly on who we are as a country. It is not just. It is not fair. It is so wrong.

And we all—I don't care what our political persuasion may be, I don't care whether you support the President in his reelection bid or not—I mean, we have to do what is right for our country. This is doing great damage to who we are. It represents the kind of closed-mindedness, and the kind of bigotry that we should all be fighting against.

Madam Speaker, I hope my friends will vote for the rule and vote for this legislation. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY).

Mr. MCCARTHY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding. And I apologize if I jumped ahead in any way, shape, or form. I appreciate the opportunity to speak.

Madam Speaker, with all that is going on this week, Democrats have still found time for their favorite pastime, voting on partisan legislation that would actually make our country weaker.

Democrats could not have picked a worse week to try to undermine American travel restrictions.

President Trump's quick decision to restrict travel to countries like Iran and China; now that was smart. It was a smart response, and it is helping to keep America safe. The President's actions, then and now, are clearly within his rights.

But today, I want to talk about the rights of this Congress, of this body, and how Democrats want to take those away.

For the second time this Congress, the House is considering two important pieces of legislation by attaching them to completely unrelated shell vehicles, thereby preventing the minority from offering a motion to recommit.

Now, the last time this occurred, Representative RO KHANNA actually admitted the maneuver was intentionally designed to silence dissenting opinions. He didn't just admit it, he bragged about it, that they would be able to deny the voice of Congress.

And now, with last week's passage of the sixth motion to recommit this Congress, Democrat leadership is once again choosing to restrict debate on an issue of national security. It is not only that this is bad for America, it is bad for the tradition of fairness and free debate that, you know what, Democrats promised to uphold.

Don't take my word for it. I listened to my friend, Chairman MCGOVERN of the Rules Committee say, in September 2018, and I quote, Madam Speaker, he boasted on this very floor: "If Democrats are trusted with the majority, we will have a more accommodating process. This place will be run like professionals. Ideas will be allowed to come forward, and the House of Representatives will actually debate again."

If there is one thing we know about this Democrat majority, it is that they overpromise and under-deliver. Today is no exception.

The right that Democrats want to take away is an important right, maybe one of the most important in all of Congress. It is the last chance for a minority party to offer amendments on legislation. It is called the motion to recommit.

As you know, the motion to recommit has been a hallmark of the House for more than 100 years. It was created to give the minority party the right "to have a vote upon its position upon great public questions."

I have got to be very clear. Eliminating this would be a nuclear option.

That is why I sent a letter—actually two letters—to Democrat leadership to stop this madness. Unfortunately, my last letter to Leader HOYER on this subject went unanswered, so did my letter this week to Leader HOYER and Chairman MCGOVERN.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD both of the letters at this time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, January 27, 2020.

Hon. STENY H. HOYER,
Majority Leader of the House,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MAJORITY LEADER HOYER: I am writing to request that you suspend consideration of this week's Iran-related legislation until basic and essential rights of the minority are observed.

As we both can agree, the decision to go to war is the most significant choice Congress can make, followed only by impeachment. No matter what one thinks of the 2002 AUMF, there are weighty consequences—both real and symbolic—when the House debates overturning military authorization and possibly cutting funding for American troops serving in a volatile theater. I would hope that such an extraordinary step would be taken with a careful eye towards promoting full and thorough deliberation.

Unfortunately, the manner in which you intend to bring these measures to the floor is anything but full and thorough. Specifically, by attaching these items to an unrelated Gold Medal bill, you purposefully eliminated the last opportunity afforded to the minority party to amend legislation—the Motion to Recommit—a maneuver Representative Ro Khanna recently admitted was intentionally designed to silence dissenting opinions.

Simply put, this is wrong—and I believe you know it to be in bad faith. In fact, we are unaware of the House ever debating matters of war and peace in such an unprecedented, irregular, and restrictive way.

From its inception in 1909, the Motion to Recommit was created with the stated purpose of giving the minority party the right "to have a vote upon its position upon great public questions." Certainly, the issue before us this week meets the standard of a great public question.

More recently, you, yourself, stated: "More members, from across the ideological spectrum, need to have input into the work we do." I would respectfully ask that we strive towards that standard and immediately remedy this overreach so the minority may be allowed to offer input on the legislation before us, as has been tradition for over one hundred years in the House.

It had been my hope that in this new year, we would begin to move on from the numerous abuses or power we witnessed on the part of the House majority during the impeachment proceedings. If, however, we can no longer count on fundamental safeguards to minority rights being guaranteed, I fear your decision this week will only serve to further erode trust, fairness, and comity in this institution moving forward.

I look forward to your response on this critical matter.

Sincerely,

KEVIN MCCARTHY,
House Republican Leader.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 9, 2020.

Hon. STENY H. HOYER,
Majority Leader of the House,
Washington, DC.

Hon. JIM MCGOVERN,
Chairman, House Committee on Rules,
Washington, DC.

LEADER HOYER AND CHAIRMAN MCGOVERN: I am writing to request that you suspend consideration of this week's Judiciary legislation until basic and essential rights of the minority are fairly observed.

For now the second time this Congress, it appears the House will consider two pieces of legislation by attaching them to a completely unrelated shell vehicle, thereby precluding the minority from offering a motion to recommit.

The last time this occurred, Representative Ro Khanna admitted the maneuver was intentionally designed to silence dissenting opinions. Coming on the heels of the 6th motion to recommit being adopted this Congress, it serves to reason that Democrat Leadership is once again willfully choosing to restrict debate, rather than promote a full and thorough deliberation of these measures.

My last letter to Leader Hoyer on this subject regrettably went unanswered. Given the gravity of this new precedent you are setting for our institution, I believe all members deserve a public response to the following questions:

Will you commit to ending this practice, which has been pursued without any consultation or sign-off from our side of the aisle?

If not, are you contemplating using any Republican-sponsored vehicles in this ploy, which presumably would be done without their approval?

What is the status of the request by freshmen Democrats to consider ending the use of the motion to recommit entirely?

As you both know, the motion to recommit has been a hallmark of the House for over one hundred years. It was created with the stated purpose of giving the minority party the right "to have a vote upon its position upon great public questions."

In my view, eliminating the motion to recommit would be akin to the "nuclear option" in the House. I sincerely believe neither of you seeks to have that ignominious distinction on your resumes. However, your actions thus far in the 116th Congress sadly do not inspire confidence.

Though we may not serve in the majority at present, our members still represent millions of Americans across the country who lend us their voice and count on us to fight for their priorities in Washington. In that spirit, I would respectfully ask that we not proceed on these measures until the minority is allowed to offer meaningful input on the matters before us through a motion to recommit, as has been tradition in the House since 1909.

We look forward to your response on this critical matter.

Sincerely,

KEVIN MCCARTHY,
House Republican Leader.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Madam Speaker, I believe the Members of this House deserve a public response about this situation. Will Democrats commit to ending this abusive practice, or do they plan to follow the lead of their freshmen and end the use of the motion to recommit entirely, to end a 100-year history of the body of this House?

MTRs not only promote full and thorough deliberation, but they also improve legislation. Think for a moment, just within this Congress, 6 out of 60 MTRs have been adopted by this Congress. Think about that.

That means a bipartisan majority of this House felt the need to improve 10 percent of the bills put forward on which MTRs were offered. That should show you how vital the last amendment is and always should be.

Madam Speaker, though we may not serve in the majority right now, our Members still represent millions of Americans who lend us their voice and count on us to fight for their priorities in Washington.

Madam Speaker, the last 8 years this House had a different majority. I hap-

pened to have the privilege of serving as majority leader. Not once did we ever consider taking away the MTR, because we believed in the minority's rights and the traditions of the institution in which we are privileged to serve.

We believed that the power of the idea should win. We believed in the promises that we made and that is why we kept them. We would not make promises while in the minority, and when we captured the majority, in less than a year, break them time and again. We would not go unanswered, a question from the minority as well.

There is something bigger than politics. It is the voice of the American public—to use the sheer power of politics to silence millions of Americans is just wrong; to change a tradition that has been around more than 100 years; to make sure a bill cannot become better simply because you want the partisan side; or to be so afraid of the debate to deny it to happen, we are so much better than that—the rights and the traditions of this institution in which we have always been privileged to serve. I wish I could say the same for this new Democrat majority.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I just want to remind the distinguished minority leader that in the last Congress my Republican friends used this exact same process 15 times, and it ended up denying us a motion to recommit.

But I also want to say, I don't need any lectures about how this House should be run from the distinguished gentleman from California. I remind my friends on both sides of the aisle that in the last Congress when the Republicans were in charge, it was the most closed Congress in the history of the United States of America.

No other Congress in our history had more closed rules where Members were denied the ability to offer anything on the House floor. And my friends somehow take that as a great sign of—I don't want to go back to those days.

Madam Speaker, I will just say one other thing. The distinguished minority leader made the statement that somehow this bill that we are trying to bring forward somehow would make this country less safe.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD an article that appeared in the New York Times, titled "Trump's Travel Ban, Aimed at Terrorists, Has Blocked Doctors."

[From the New York Times, Feb. 6, 2017]

TRUMP'S TRAVEL BAN, AIMED AT TERRORISTS,
HAS BLOCKED DOCTORS

(By Donald G. McNeil Jr.)

The Trump administration has mounted a vigorous defense of its ban on travel from seven majority-Muslim nations, saying it is necessary to prevent terrorists from entering the United States. But the ban, now blocked by a federal judge, also ensnared travelers important to the well-being of many Americans: doctors.

Foreign-born physicians have become crucial to the delivery of medical care in the United States. They work in small towns where there are no other doctors, in poor urban neighborhoods and in Veterans Affairs hospitals.

Foreign-born physicians "are the doctors in small towns in Maine and Iowa," said Dr. Patricia F. Walker, the associate director of the University of Minnesota's Global Health Pathway, which helps refugee doctors practice in the United States.

"They go to the places where graduates of Harvard Medical School don't want to go," she said.

Across the United States, more than 15,000 doctors are from the seven Muslim-majority countries covered by the travel ban, according to The Medicus Firm, a firm that recruits doctors for hard-to-fill jobs. That includes almost 9,000 from Iran, almost 3,500 from Syria and more than 1,500 from Iraq.

Dr. Hooman Parsi, an oncologist so talented that he has an O-1 visa granted to individuals with "extraordinary ability or achievement," was to start seeing patients on Wednesday in San Bernardino, Calif.

A federal judge in Seattle lifted the administration's travel ban on Friday, and a federal appeals court has declined to restore it. Yet Dr. Parsi is still stuck in Iran, waiting for a delayed visa amid the confusion while his American employer fumes.

"We need him desperately," said Dr. Richy Agajanian, the managing partner of the Oncology Institute of Hope and Innovation, which had just hired him. "We had an office completely constructed—we spent three months on it, and it was supposed to open Feb. 1. Now we can't open it. This is really sad and frustrating."

The 30-doctor practice does a lot of work in the Inland Empire, in San Bernardino and Riverside Counties, Dr. Agajanian noted. "It's very sparse in doctors out there—many miles between oncologists," he said. "The patients he would be seeing have to travel another 25 miles now. Our doctors are already overworked, and now they'll have to be on call more often."

The United States has a persistent doctor shortage, even though 31 new medical schools have opened since 2002 and many existing ones have increased class sizes, according to Merritt Hawkins, a Dallas-based medical recruiting firm.

It also noted that there are 22 percent more residencies available each year than there are American graduates to take them. Graduates of foreign medical schools now fill that gap; the largest number come from India, followed by Pakistan, China, the Philippines, Iran and Israel.

(Iran is on Mr. Trump's exclusion list; Pakistan, a Muslim-majority country with a history of internal and external terror attacks, is not.)

Many foreign graduates have J-1 visas, which give them about three years to complete their residencies. "They must pass licensing exams and they must do a residency to practice here, even if they're superstars where they come from," said Phillip Miller, a Merritt Hawkins spokesman.

Foreign-born graduates have often worked at world-class institutions and have published academic papers, so they have higher average scores than American graduates on the medical knowledge portions of the licensing examinations, according to Merritt Hawkins research—though most initially score lower on the clinical skills portions, which include English and communication skills.

"I had to work my butt off to get here," said Dr. Abdelghani el Rafei, a first-year resident at the University of Minnesota. "They only take the top graduates from schools in countries like mine."

Such foreign-born graduates must return home when their visas expire, but they can get extensions if they agree to work in an area that the Department of Health and Human Services considers “medically underserved,” which is roughly defined as having less than one primary care doctor for every 3,000 people.

Those who practice in an underserved area for several years can apply for green cards. “After that, they can practice anywhere, but at least you’ve had three or four years of a physician in your town, and that’s pretty significant,” Mr. Miller said.

Citing figures from the Iowa Board of Medicine, The Des Moines Register reported last week that 172 doctors practicing in Iowa were from the seven countries subject to Mr. Trump’s travel ban, and that 23 percent of the state’s 13,000 practicing doctors were born outside the United States.

Andrea Clement, a spokeswoman for Medicus, said that 76 percent of the foreign doctors it placed last year had gone to areas with fewer than 25,000 people or to small to medium-size cities of 25,000 to 500,000.

It placed more foreign doctors in Wisconsin than in any other state, she said, followed by California, Texas, Maryland, Oregon, Missouri, Tennessee, Ohio and Arizona.

Some urban areas are medically underserved, too. While Manhattan’s Upper East Side has five times the number of doctors it needs to be adequately served under federal guidelines, parts of the Bronx and Brooklyn have acute doctor shortages.

More than 150,000 residents of Brooklyn’s Bedford-Stuyvesant section, for example, are rated as medically underserved under federal guidelines. One of the doctors stranded overseas last week, according to Pro Publica, was Dr. Kamal Fadlalla, an internal medicine specialist from Sudan who is a second-year resident at Interfaith Medical Center, which serves Bedford-Stuyvesant and Crown Heights.

Many foreign-born doctors, experts said, go into family medicine, pediatrics, internal medicine, general surgery and other frontline specialties where they see thousands of patients a year, including many on Medicare and Medicaid, rather than pursuing lucrative urban specialties like plastic surgery.

As an oncologist, Dr. Parsi was an exception. He moved to the United States in 2007 for postdoctoral work in molecular biology. Then, after passing his medical exam, he completed his residency at the University of Cincinnati and a fellowship in hematology and oncology at the University of Pittsburgh Medical Center.

Because he had to leave the country to get his new visa stamped into his passport, he had flown to Dubai, in the United Arab Emirates. He cleared a security vetting there, he said, but had to wait a few days for the visa, so he flew to Tehran to see his father.

But the new court ruling affects only those who had current visa stamps in their passport, so even though he is being issued a new visa, he still cannot return to the United States, he said on Saturday.

“Everyone, including me, would like to keep the bad people out,” said Dr. Naeem Moulki, a Syrian citizen who is finishing his medical residency in Minneapolis and plans to begin a cardiology fellowship in Chicago in the fall. “But this is not the best way to do it. If I have to leave, it affects my patients.”

Dr. El Rafei said that the ban, which means he cannot go home to see his family, had depressed him.

“I felt like I was back in Syria again,” he said. “You feel hunted there, as if you did something wrong, even if you didn’t. Now I feel the same way here.”

He sees patients one day a week at the V.A. Hospital in Minneapolis, where he is sometimes asked where he is from.

“One of my patients, he was a veteran in his 60s, said to me, ‘Why do you people hate us?’” he said. “I told him about Syria. I said: ‘We don’t hate you. The bad people you see on TV are the same people who make us suffer, too.’”

“I love this country,” he added. “There’s a time in our residency when we can work in Africa or someplace. I want to work in a small American town, to show people that we’re not all bad. The U.S. gives us a lot, so we want to give back what we can.”

Correction: Feb. 6, 2017

An earlier version of this article misattributed a quotation about the preparation necessary for a foreign doctor to get work in the United States. It was said by Dr. Abdelghani el Rafei, a first-year resident at the University of Minnesota, not Dr. Naeem Moulki, a Syrian citizen who is finishing his medical residency in Minneapolis.

Correction: Feb. 25, 2017

An article on Feb. 6 about the effect of the Trump administration’s ban on travel from seven majority-Muslim nations on foreign-born doctors in the United States described incorrectly the physicians seeing patients in rural settings. Forty-two percent of doctor visits in these areas are handled by family physicians, not by foreign-born physicians. (The figure for foreign-born physicians is not known.)

Mr. MCGOVERN. It says: “Foreign-born physicians have become crucial to the delivery of medical care in the United States. They work in small towns where there are no other doctors, in poor urban neighborhoods and in Veterans’ Affairs hospitals.”

It also says: “Across the United States, more than 15,000 doctors are from the seven Muslim-majority countries covered by the travel ban, according to The Medicus Firm, a firm that recruits doctors for hard-to-fill jobs. That includes almost 9,000 from Iran, almost 3,500 from Syria, and more than 1,500 from Iraq.”

I didn’t hear a single word about that. I didn’t hear a single word about how denying doctors the ability to come here is somehow in our national interest. Not a single word objecting to the hate-filled rhetoric coming out of this White House denigrating Muslims.

We have a President who bragged about trying to put in place a Muslim ban. I mean, we have a lot of talk on this floor about the need for religious freedom and to speak out against discrimination against individuals based on their religion, and yet, not a word about that.

So, what we are doing by bringing these bills to the floor, we are standing up for American values, we are rejecting bigotry, we are rejecting hate, we are rejecting intolerance.

Madam Speaker, I hope all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will support our effort.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY).

Mr. MCCARTHY. Madam Speaker, my dear friend raised an issue that is very interesting, because he knows

this. At any time that it was used it was in consultation with the minority. Even when it was taken away, you know what we did, we added back an amendment so you could have the debate on the floor. It was only during appropriations consultation with you to be able to move something in a timely manner. He understands that.

Madam Speaker, my only question to my friend on the other side is: Will the gentleman answer the letter? When the minority leader of the House sent the Rules Committee chairman a letter—the simple question is—with three simple questions: Will the gentleman take this opportunity to answer the letter? That is all I ask.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the distinguished minority leader’s question. I would just say to him that the letter that he referred to, I read about it in the press. I didn’t receive it until last night.

I will also say to him, again, this consultation that he talks about is something that none of us have any recollection of.

In fact, I remember when the Republicans hijacked the Democratic bill to basically deny us a motion to recommend. We were never consulted about that.

I would simply say to my friends on the other side of the aisle that this is about whether or not we are going to stand and tolerate a policy that I think by any measure is bigoted and, quite frankly, undermines our values.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1315

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

We have obviously had a heated debate today, and it has been interesting. Of course, we disagree on a number of things.

Madam Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will amend the rule to immediately bring to the floor Leader MCCARTHY’s bill, H.R. 6177, which would require Members of Congress to disclose delinquent tax liabilities and wage garnishments.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS) to further explain the amendment and the leader’s bill.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As my friend said, if we defeat the previous question, we will offer H.R. 6177. Leader MCCARTHY’s bill, H.R. 6177, is simple. It requires Members of Congress to disclose unpaid tax liabilities

and garnishments in their annual financial disclosure reports.

As we approach tax season, where, under a penalty of fine or prison, we expect every American to file their taxes, those same hardworking Americans deserve to know whether their Representatives are doing the same.

And, like the American public, if a Member of this body fails to meet their tax obligations, my bill requires their pay be placed into escrow until their tax obligation is met. This is responsible governing that informs the public and holds all of us accountable.

The House should advance this legislation today.

This bill falls under the jurisdiction of the Committee on House Administration, and, as ranking member, I am prepared to work with the Chief Administrative Officer to execute this legislation. Also, as ranking member of the committee, I have seen legislation run through this committee that tried to use the tax dollars of hardworking Americans to fund their own congressional campaigns. Every member of the majority in this room, in this Chamber, cosponsored that bill when it was introduced.

This 6-to-1 small dollar match of campaign dollars would have created a mandatory donation from the American taxpayer to each congressional candidate, meaning, for every \$200 donated to a campaign, the Federal Government—the taxpayers—would give \$1,200 to that Member of Congress' campaign.

Imagine if every Member of Congress—not counting all the candidates in each congressional race, just the current 435 Members—received just \$1 million in matched funds from the Federal Government, from the taxpayers. That is close to half a billion dollars going just to the campaigns, the political coffers of Members of Congress.

If it is the position of the majority party to force Americans to support politicians with their tax dollars and raise the taxes of hardworking families, we should at least let those same Americans know which of us in this body are even paying their own taxes.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. In addition to the NO BAN bill, there is also a War Powers Resolution bill that will be made in order if this rule passes.

I include in the RECORD a February 14 New York Times article, titled: "White House Memo Justifying Suleimani Strike Cites No Imminent Threat."

[From The New York Times, Feb. 14, 2020]

WHITE HOUSE MEMO JUSTIFYING SULEIMANI STRIKE CITES NO IMMINENT THREAT

(By Catie Edmondson)

WASHINGTON.—The White House told Congress on Friday that President Trump authorized the strike last month that killed Iran's most important general to respond to attacks that had already taken place and deter future ones, contradicting the president's claim that he acted in response to an imminent threat.

In a legally mandated, two-page unclassified memo to lawmakers, the White House asserted that the strike that killed Maj. Gen. Qassim Suleimani was "in response to an escalating series of attacks in preceding months" by Iran and Iran-backed militias.

"The purposes of this action were to protect United States personnel, to deter Iran from conducting or supporting further attacks against United States forces and interests, to degrade Iran's and Quds Force-backed militias's ability to conduct attacks, and to end Iran's strategic escalation of attacks," said the report, which was transmitted on Friday to the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

The document confirmed what lawmakers had privately suspected as the Trump administration has offered a shifting set of justifications for the strike against General Suleimani in Baghdad—taken with no congressional consultation—which brought the United States and Iran to the brink of war.

"This official report directly contradicts the president's false assertion that he attacked Iran to prevent an imminent attack against United States personnel and embassies," Representative Eliot L. Engel of New York, the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, said in a statement. "The administration's explanation in this report makes no mention of any imminent threat and shows that the justification the president offered to the American people was false, plain and simple."

In the days after the strike that killed General Suleimani, administration officials gave a variety of rationales for the action as they confronted questions about why the president undertook such a provocative move that could incite an escalation with a dangerous rival. Mr. Trump and other top officials, including Secretary of State Mike Pompeo, said the strike was conducted in response to imminent threats to American lives, but they declined to provide any evidence, leaving lawmakers in both parties irate.

Pressed over several days, Mr. Pompeo conceded that the United States did not have specific intelligence on where or when an attack would take place. Mr. Trump claimed that four American embassies had been targeted for attacks, but under questioning during a television interview, Mark T. Esper, the secretary of defense, said he had seen no evidence of that.

Mr. Trump later insisted on Twitter that General Suleimani had, in fact, been planning an imminent attack on United States forces, but added, "It doesn't really matter because of his horrible past!"

Representative Michael McCaul of Texas, the top Republican on the Foreign Affairs Committee, said in a statement that "U.S. intelligence indicated Soleimani was plotting more attacks on Americans and he was an authorized target in Iraq because of the ongoing threat he posed to Americans there."

"The administration would have been 'culpably negligent' if they hadn't acted," Mr. McCaul said, quoting Gen. Mark A. Milley, the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. "It is unfortunate that Democrats continue to criticize the president for a successful U.S. military strike of this brutal terrorist with American blood on his hands."

The report on Friday came a day after the Senate passed a resolution aimed at restraining Mr. Trump's war-making powers with Iran. The rare bipartisan vote illustrated the depth of the skepticism in both parties about the president's strategy, and lawmakers' frustration with the administration's refusal to consult Congress on military matters. The House is expected to pass the measure soon, sending it to the president's desk. Mr. Trump's advisers have said he will veto it.

The White House infuriated lawmakers in early January when it sent Congress a formal notification of the drone strikes required under the War Powers Act. Lawmakers had expected it to lay out a legal justification for the strike, but the entire document was classified, and officials who read it said it contained no information on future threats or an imminent attack.

Lawmakers were further angered by a series of briefings delivered by top administration officials that they described as insulting and demeaning, complaining that they were dismissed for questioning the administration's strategy.

Friday's report also only discussed previous acts of aggression by Iran. It cited as a legal framework the president's constitutional powers as commander in chief and the authorization for the use of military force in Iraq that Congress passed in 2002, using two justifications the administration has previously mentioned.

"Iran's past and recent activities, coupled with intelligence at the time of the airstrike, indicated that Iran's Quds force posed a threat to the United States in Iraq," the report said.

Congressional Democrats have coalesced behind a new push to repeal the 2002 law, which was passed to authorize a military response to Saddam Hussein and his government. They said Mr. Trump's broad reading of it illustrated how the statute has been stretched and distorted to accommodate missions that Congress never envisioned when it was debated.

"To suggest that 18 years later this authorization could justify killing an Iranian official stretches the law far beyond anything Congress ever intended," Mr. Engel said.

The House last month voted to repeal the 2002 law, with lawmakers in both parties arguing that the authorization had become outdated and been abused by presidents as a blank check to circumvent Congress in taking military action. During negotiations on the annual defense policy bill, the White House, focused on creating the Space Force as the sixth branch of military and maintaining the ability to divert military construction funds to pay for the border wall, was initially open to repealing the 2002 law, but the Pentagon intervened.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, Congress has been clear, we did not authorize the President's, in my opinion, reckless actions, nor have we provided any authorization for the use of force against Iran.

What we are hearing from the administration, on the other hand, has been about as clear as mud. Initially, President Trump and other administration officials claimed the January strike was in response to an imminent threat.

Now we have confirmed through a legally mandated report to Congress from the administration that that was not the case.

This report made no mention of imminent threat, confirming the fact that President Trump was legally required to come to Congress for approval before carrying out the strike.

The President may not like it, but the Constitution is clear: The President must seek specific authorization from Congress for any use of force against Iran, period.

And I would just simply say that this shouldn't be controversial because, whether you support the President extending military operations against

Iran or not, we should all agree that Congress has a constitutional responsibility here.

I want to commend my friends in the Senate for passing the Kaine resolution, and I thank the eight Republicans who stood up for the institution and for Congress' constitutional authorities. I point that out, as well, and I hope that my colleagues will support the rule and support the Kaine resolution when it comes up for a vote.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

In closing, I urge my Democratic colleagues to bring to the floor border security measures that will help us help those who are truly in danger and in need of asylum. We can all agree these are issues that need to be fixed. Now let's work together for all our constituents to get things fixed.

Madam Speaker, I urge "no" on the previous question, "no" on the underlying measure, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, my friends on the other side of the aisle want us to get lost on the process, but we can't lose sight of the policy. This is about whether Congress should repeal President Trump's Muslim ban, and we don't agree—I would say, respectfully, to my colleague—on the Rules Committee.

This is about whether we should prevent this administration from putting in place more discriminatory travel bans in the future, whether individuals deserve access to legal advice during the screening process at ports of entry, and whether Congress should vote before any escalation in hostilities with Iran.

That is what is before us in the rule today. These are incredibly important issues. They go to the heart of what America is supposed to be about.

Now, some on the other side are upset that they can't use certain parliamentary procedures to debate all kinds of divisive issues. Instead, they want to make this debate about anything other than the President's reckless foreign policy. I get that, but we are not going to get distracted here.

This President is already looking at expanding his cruel travel ban. His approach abroad is totally unpredictable, and either you are going to stand up for America and stand up for our values, or you are going to stand by the President. That is the choice before us.

For us, the choice is clear. I have constituents who have been adversely impacted, whose lives have been ripped apart by this President's immigration policies. It is heartbreaking. It is not who we are. And, for whatever reason, the President continues down this road

of dividing this country along racial lines, along religious lines, I mean, you name it—constant division.

Enough. Enough. We are better than that. We are better than that.

I hope that there is a strong bipartisan vote in support of the No Muslim Ban Act. This is not who we are. We can't let this be who we are.

I strongly urge a "yes" vote on the rule.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, when the Committee on Rules filed its report (H. Rept. 116–415) to accompany House Resolution 891, the Committee was unaware that the waiver of all points of order against consideration of the H.R. 6172 included a waiver of Clause 9 of rule XXI, which requires a list of all earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits contained in the measure, or a certification that the measure does not contain any of those items. However, per Chairman SCHIFF's statement submitted for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on March 11, 2020, the provisions that warranted a referral to the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence in H.R. 6172 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in Clause 9 of rule XXI.

The text of the material previously referred to by Mrs. LESKO is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 891

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 12. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall resolve into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 6177) to require Members of Congress to disclose delinquent tax liabilities and wage garnishments, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on House Administration. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. When the committee rises and reports the bill back to the House with a recommendation that the bill do pass, the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 13. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 6177.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on:

Adoption of the resolution, if ordered; and

The motion to suspend the rules and pass S. 760.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 226, nays 186, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 95]

YEAS—226

Adams	Golden	O'Halleran
Aguilar	Gomez	Ocasio-Cortez
Allred	Gonzalez (TX)	Omar
Axne	Gottheimer	Pallone
Barragán	Green, Al (TX)	Panetta
Bass	Grijalva	Pappas
Beatty	Haaland	Pascarell
Bera	Harder (CA)	Payne
Bishop (GA)	Hastings	Peters
Blumenauer	Hayes	Peterson
Blunt Rochester	Heck	Phillips
Bonamici	Higgins (NY)	Pingree
Boyle, Brendan	Himes	Pocan
F.	Horn, Kendra S.	Porter
Brindisi	Horsford	Pressley
Brown (MD)	Houlihan	Price (NC)
Bustos	Hoyer	Quigley
Butterfield	Huffman	Raskin
Carbajal	Jackson Lee	Rice (NY)
Cárdenas	Jayapal	Richmond
Carson (IN)	Jeffries	Rose (NY)
Cartwright	Johnson (GA)	Rouda
Case	Johnson (TX)	Roybal-Allard
Casten (IL)	Kaptur	Ruiz
Castor (FL)	Keating	Ruppersberger
Castro (TX)	Kelly (IL)	Rush
Chu, Judy	Kennedy	Ryan
Ciulline	Khanna	Sánchez
Cisneros	Kildee	Sarbanes
Clark (MA)	Kilmer	Scanlon
Clarke (NY)	Kim	Schakowsky
Clay	Kind	Schiff
Cleaver	Kirkpatrick	Schneider
Clyburn	Krishnamoorthi	Schroder
Cohen	Kuster (NH)	Schrier
Connolly	Lamb	Scott (VA)
Cooper	Langevin	Scott, David
Correa	Larsen (WA)	Serrano
Costa	Larson (CT)	Sewell (AL)
Courtney	Lawrence	Shalala
Cox (CA)	Lawson (FL)	Sherman
Craig	Lee (CA)	Sherrill
Crist	Lee (NV)	Sires
Crow	Levin (CA)	Slotkin
Cuellar	Levin (MI)	Smith (WA)
Cunningham	Lieu, Ted	Soto
Davids (KS)	Lipinski	Spanberger
Davis (CA)	Loebach	Stanton
Davis, Danny K.	Lofgren	Stevens
Dean	Lowenthal	Suozy
DeFazio	Lowe	Swalwell (CA)
DeGette	Luján	Takano
DeLauro	Luria	Thompson (CA)
DelBene	Lynch	Thompson (MS)
Delgado	Malinowski	Titus
Demings	Maloney,	Tlaib
DeSaulnier	Carolyn B.	Tonko
Deutch	Maloney, Sean	Torres (CA)
Dingell	Matsui	Torres Small
Doggett	McAdams	(NM)
Doyle, Michael	McBath	Trahan
F.	McCollum	Trone
Engel	McEachin	Underwood
Escobar	McGovern	Vargas
Eshoo	McNerney	Veasey
Espallat	Meeks	Vela
Evans	Meng	Velázquez
Finkenauer	Moore	Visclosky
Fletcher	Morelle	Wasserman
Foster	Moulton	Schultz
Frankel	Mucarsel-Powell	Waters
Fudge	Murphy (FL)	Watson Coleman
Gabbard	Nadler	Welch
Gallo	Napolitano	Wexton
Garamendi	Neal	Wild
Garcia (IL)	Neguse	Wilson (FL)
Garcia (TX)	Norcross	Yarmuth

NAYS—186

Abraham Gooden Olson
Aderholt Granger Palmer
Allen Graves (LA) Pence
Amash Graves (MO) Perry
Amodei Green (TN) Posey
Armstrong Griffith Reed
Arrington Grothman Reschenthaler
Babin Guest Rice (SC)
Bacon Guthrie Rigglesman
Baird Hagedorn Roby
Balderson Harris Roe, David P.
Banks Hartzler Rogers (AL)
Barr Hern, Kevin Rogers (KY)
Bergman Herrera Beutler Rose, John W.
Biggs Hice (GA) Rouzer
Bilirakis Higgins (LA) Roy
Bishop (NC) Hill (AR) Rutherford
Bishop (UT) Holding Scalise
Bost Hollingsworth Schweikert
Brady Hudson Scott, Austin
Brooks (AL) Huizenga Sensenbrenner
Brooks (IN) Hurd (TX) Shimkus
Buchanan Johnson (LA) Simpson
Buck Johnson (OH) Smith (MO)
Bucshon Johnson (SD) Smith (NE)
Budd Jordan Smith (NJ)
Burchett Joyce (OH) Smucker
Burgess Joyce (PA) Spano
Byrne Katko Stauber
Calvert Keller Stefanik
Carter (GA) Kelly (MS) Steil
Carter (TX) Kelly (PA) Steube
Chabot King (IA) Stewart
Cheney King (NY) Stivers
Cline Kinzinger Taylor
Cloud Kustoff (TN) Thompson (PA)
Cole LaHood Thornberry
Comer LaMalfa Timmons
Conaway Lamborn Tipton
Cook Latta Turner
Crawford Lesko Upton
Crenshaw Long Van Drew
Curtis Loudermilk Wagner
Davidson (OH) Lucas Walberg
Davis, Rodney Luetkemeyer Walden
DesJarlais Marchant Walker
Diaz-Balart Marshall Walorski
Duncan Massie Waltz
Dunn Mast Watkins
Emmer McCarthy Weber (TX)
Estes McCaul Webster (FL)
Ferguson McClintock Wenstrup
Fitzpatrick McHenry Westerman
Fleischmann McKinley Williams
Flores Meuser Wilson (SC)
Foxx (NC) Mitchell Wittman
Fulcher Moolenaar Womack
Gallagher Mooney (WV) Woodall
Gianforte Murphy (NC) Wright
Gibbs Newhouse Yoho
Gohmert Norman Young
Gonzalez (OH) Nunes Zeldin

NOT VOTING—17

Beyer Graves (GA) Perlmutter
Brownley (CA) Lewis Ratcliffe
Collins (GA) Meadows Rodgers (WA)
Fortenberry Miller Rooney (FL)
Gaetz Mullin Speier
Gosar Palazzo

□ 1348

Mr. KINZINGER changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mrs. MOORE changed her vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 223, nays 188, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 96]

YEAS—223

Adams Garcia (TX) O'Halleran
Aguilar Gomez Omar
Allred Gonzalez (TX) Pallone
Axne Gottheimer Panetta
Barragán Green, Al (TX) Pappas
Bass Grijalva Pascarell
Beatty Haaland Payne
Bera Harder (CA) Perlmutter
Bishop (GA) Hastings Peters
Blumenauer Hayes Peterson
Blunt Rochester Heck Phillips
Bonamici Higgins (NY) Pingree
Boyle, Brendan Himes Pocan
F. Horn, Kendra S. Porter
Brindisi Horsford Pressley
Brown (MD) Houlahan Price (NC)
Bustos Hoyer Quigley
Butterfield Huffman Raskin
Carbajal Jackson Lee Rice (NY)
Cárdenas Jayapal Richmond
Carlson (IN) Jeffries Rose (NY)
Cartwright Johnson (GA) Rouda
Case Johnson (TX) Roybal-Allard
Casten (IL) Kaptur Ruiz
Castor (FL) Keating Rush
Castro (TX) Kelly (IL) Ryan
Chu, Judy Kennedy Sánchez
Cicilline Khanna Sarbanes
Cisneros Kildee Scanlon
Clark (MA) Kilmer Schakowsky
Clarke (NY) Kim Schiff
Clay Kind Schneider
Cleaver Kirkpatrick Schrader
Clyburn Krishnamoorthi Schrier
Cohen Kuster (NH) Scott (VA)
Connolly Lamb Scott, David
Cooper Langevin Serrano
Correa Larsen (WA) Sewell (AL)
Costa Larson (CT) Shalala
Courtney Lawrence Sherman
Cox (CA) Lawson (FL) Sherrill
Craig Lee (CA) Sires
Crist Lee (NV) Slotkin
Crow Levin (CA) Smith (WA)
Cuellar Levin (MI) Soto
Cunningham Lieu, Ted Spanberger
Davids (KS) Lipinski Stanton
Davis (CA) Loeb sack Stevens
Davis, Danny K. Lofgren Suozzi
Dean Lowenthal Swallowell (CA)
DeFazio Lowey Takano
DeGette Luján Thompson (CA)
DeLauro Luria Thompson (MS)
DelBene Lynch Titus
Delgado Malinowski Tlaib
Demings Maloney, Tonko
DeSaulnier Carolyn B. Torres (CA)
Deutsch Maloney, Sean Torres Small
Dingell Matsui (NM)
Doggett McBath Trahan
Doyle, Michael McCollum Trone
F. McEachin Underwood
Engel McGovern Vargus
Escobar McNeerney Veasey
Eshoo Meeks Vela
Español Meng Velázquez
Evans Moore Visclosky
Morelle Morelle Wasserman
Moulton Schultz
Mucarsel-Powell Waters
Murphy (FL) Welch
Nadler Wexton
Napolitano Wild
Neal Wilson (FL)
Neguse Yarmuth
Norcross

NAYS—188

Brady Comer
Aderholt Brooks (AL) Conaway
Allen Brooks (IN) Cook
Amash Buchanan Crawford
Amodei Buck Crenshaw
Armstrong Bucshon Curtis
Arrington Budd Davidson (OH)
Babin Burchett Davis, Rodney
Bacon Burgess DesJarlais
Baird Byrne Diaz-Balart
Balderson Calvert Duncan
Banks Carter (GA) Dunn
Barr Carter (TX) Emmer
Bergman Chabot Estes
Bilirakis Fitzpatrick Ferguson
Bishop (NC) Fleischmann
Bishop (UT) Cloud Flores
Cole

Foxx (NC) LaMalfa Schweikert
Fulcher Lamborn Scott, Austin
Gallagher Latta Sensenbrenner
Gianforte Lesko Shimkus
Gibbs Long Simpson
Gohmert Loudermilk Smith (MO)
Golden Lucas Smith (NE)
Gonzalez (OH) Luetkemeyer Smith (NJ)
Gooden Marchant Smucker
Granger Marshall Spano
Graves (LA) Massie Stauber
Graves (MO) Mast Stefanik
Green (TN) McAdams Steil
Griffith McCarthy Steube
Grothman McCaul Stewart
Guest McClintock Stivers
Guthrie McHenry Taylor
Hagedorn McKinley Thompson (PA)
Harris Meuser Thornberry
Hartzler Mitchell Timmons
Hern, Kevin Moolenaar Tipton
Herrera Beutler Mooney (WV) Turner
Hice (GA) Newhouse Upton
Higgins (LA) Norman Van Drew
Hill (AR) Nunes Wagner
Holding Ocasio-Cortez Walberg
Hollingsworth Olson Walker
Hudson Palmer Walorski
Huizenga Pence Waltz
Hurd (TX) Perry Watkins
Johnson (LA) Posey Weber (TX)
Johnson (OH) Reed Webster (FL)
Johnson (SD) Reschenthaler Wenstrup
Jordan Rice (SC) Westerman
Joyce (OH) Rigglesman Williams
Joyce (PA) Roby Wilson (SC)
Katko Rodgers (WA) Wittman
Keller Roe, David P. Womack
Kelly (MS) Rogers (AL) Woodall
Kelly (PA) Rogers (KY) Wright
King (IA) Rose, John W. Yoho
King (NY) Rouzer Young
Kinzinger Roy Zeldin
Kustoff (TN) Rutherford
LaHood Scalise

NOT VOTING—18

Beyer Gosar Murphy (NC)
Biggs Graves (GA) Palazzo
Brownley (CA) Lewis Ratcliffe
Collins (GA) Meadows Rooney (FL)
Fortenberry Miller Ruppersberger
Gaetz Mullin Speier

□ 1358

So the resolution was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUPPORT FOR VETERANS IN EFFECTIVE APPRENTICESHIPS ACT OF 2019

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 760) to enable registered apprenticeship programs to better serve veterans, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Nevada (Mrs. LEE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 412, nays 0, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 97]

YEAS—412

Abraham Allen Armstrong
Adams Allred Arrington
Aderholt Amash Axne
Aguilar Amodei Babin