

Please join me in congratulating Dr. Richard Michel on his lifelong career as a doctor, mayor, cattle rancher, and airman.

HAPPY BIRTHDAY, BELLA

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

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, 2020 was a big year for a young lady who lives six houses from me. Her name is Isabella Johnson, Bella, to friends.

Bella had a special birthday in April. She was going to be 10 years old, but her plans for her 10th birthday changed dramatically when her school closed because of the COVID-19 pandemic crisis.

Now, her birthday may have only been with a few friends at her home—Bella is okay with that—but her mom, Juli; dad, Andy; family; and friends would not let that suffice. They would not let COVID-19 mar Bella's special day.

So around 5 o'clock on April 20, they started lining up on the street outside of my house. Then the signs came out, the horns started honking, and a parade of 30 cars crawled by Bella's house.

Bella was full of joy, as you can see.

Happy, happy, happy 10th birthday, Bella. We all love you.

HONORING LESLIE LAMAR WILKES, JR., MD

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember and honor the life of Dr. Leslie Lamar Wilkes, Jr., who went to be with the Lord on April 4.

Les and I attended church together at Wesley Monumental United Methodist Church in Savannah, Georgia, and he was always a devoted member who took every opportunity he could to serve for over 40 years.

He was born and raised in Georgia and eventually received his MD degree from the Medical College of Georgia in 1965, before becoming a surgeon for the U.S. Navy.

Dr. Wilkes was an amazing person with a true passion for the medical field, being one of the first surgeons in Georgia to perform arthroscopic knee surgery and, all in all, performed about 15,000 operations.

He received numerous accolades throughout his life, including the Savannah's Best Doctor Award numerous times, and the Georgia Medical Society awarded him the Health Care Hero Award in 2010 as well as the Lifetime Achievement Award in 2012. He was active in various medical organizations as well as community service organizations, like the Savannah Rotary Club.

Dr. Wilkes embodied what it means to be a steadfast and humble servant.

He used every area of his life to help others, including his patients, community, fellow church members, friends, family, and his country.

His family, friends, and all those impacted by him will be in my thoughts and prayers during this most difficult time.

RECOGNIZING COLONEL BRIAN LAIDLAW

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

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize an exceptional Air Force leader for his outstanding service. Colonel Brian Laidlaw is the commander of the 325th Fighter Wing at Tyndall Air Force Base.

In 2018, as Hurricane Michael descended on us, Colonel Laidlaw accomplished the evacuation of Tyndall Air Force Base in just 22 hours. His decisive leadership saved over 11,000 airmen, their families, and over \$21 billion in Air Force assets.

After the storm, Colonel Laidlaw personally forged the "base of the future" vision for rebuilding Tyndall to the President of the United States. For his outstanding leadership, the Air Force Association awarded him the Waterman Award for the single most significant contribution to the Air Force during the past year.

Colonel Laidlaw reflects the highest standards of leadership and conduct and is a credit to the United States military. I wish him and his family the best of luck as they proceed to their next assignment.

□ 1015

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 51, WASHINGTON, D.C. ADMISSION ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1425, STATE HEALTH CARE PREMIUM REDUCTION ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5332, PROTECTING YOUR CREDIT SCORE ACT OF 2019; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 7120, GEORGE FLOYD JUSTICE IN POLICING ACT OF 2020; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 7301, EMERGENCY HOUSING PROTECTIONS AND RELIEF ACT OF 2020; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 90, PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF RULE SUBMITTED BY OFFICE OF THE COMPTROLLER OF THE CURRENCY RELATING TO "COMMUNITY REINVESTMENT ACT REGULATIONS"; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1017 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1017

Providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 51) to provide for the admission of the State of Washington, D.C. into the Union; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1425) to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to provide for an Improve Health Insurance Affordability Fund to provide for certain reinsurance payments to lower premiums in the individual health insurance market; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5332) to amend the Fair Credit Reporting Act to ensure that consumer reporting agencies are providing fair and accurate information reporting in consumer reports, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 7120) to hold law enforcement accountable for misconduct in court, improve transparency through data collection, and reform police training and policies; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 7301) to prevent evictions, foreclosures, and unsafe housing conditions resulting from the COVID-19 pandemic, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 90) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency relating to "Community Reinvestment Act Regulations"; and for other purposes.

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 51) to provide for the admission of the State of Washington, D.C. into the Union. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. An amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116-55, modified by the amendment printed in part A of 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 and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Oversight and Reform; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 1425) to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to provide for an Improve Health Insurance Affordability Fund to provide for certain reinsurance payments to lower premiums in the individual health insurance market. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Energy and Commerce now printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116-56, modified by the amendment printed in part B of 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) three hours of debate equally divided among and controlled by the respective chairs and ranking minority members of the Committees on Education and Labor, Energy and Commerce, and Ways and Means; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 3. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 5332) to amend the Fair Credit Reporting Act to ensure that consumer reporting agencies are providing fair and accurate information reporting in consumer reports, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Financial Services now printed in the bill, modified by the amendment printed in part C of 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 and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 4. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 7120) to hold law enforcement accountable for misconduct in court, improve transparency through data collection, and reform police training and policies. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary now printed in the bill, modified by the amendment printed in part D of 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) four hours of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 5. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 7301) to prevent evictions, foreclosures, and unsafe housing conditions resulting from the COVID-19 pandemic, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill 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 Financial Services; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 6. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 90) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency relating to "Community Reinvestment Act Regulations". 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 Financial Services; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 7. The provisions of section 125(c) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act shall not apply during the remainder of the One Hundred Sixteenth Congress.

SEC. 8. House Resolution 967, agreed to May 15, 2020, is amended—

(1) in section 4, by striking "July 21, 2020" and inserting "July 31, 2020";

(2) in section 11, by striking "calendar day of July 19, 2020" and inserting "legislative day of July 31, 2020"; and

(3) in section 12, by striking "July 21, 2020" and inserting "July 31, 2020".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL), my friend, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, none of us know what the future holds, but my friend from Georgia has indicated that he is not going to return after this session. He and I serve actively on the Rules Committee and have gotten to know each other and share moments of frivolity, as well as serious debate. I am going to miss him. I don't know whether he and I will be in debate on another rule because we have a rotational system up there, but just in case, I wish him well in his endeavors in the future.

Mr. Speaker, during consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for purposes of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. 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 Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, the Rules Committee met for 7½ hours and reported a rule, House Resolution 1017, providing for consideration of six measures, each under a closed rule.

For H.R. 51, the rule provides 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Oversight and Reform and self-executes a manager's amendment.

For H.R. 1425, the rule provides 3 hours of debate equally divided among and controlled by the chairs and ranking minority members of the Committee on Education and Labor, Committee on Energy and Commerce, and Committee on Ways and Means, and self-executes a manager's amendment.

Mr. Speaker, for H.R. 5332, the rule provides 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services, and self-executes a manager's amendment.

For H.R. 7120, the rule provides 4 hours of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary and self-executes a manager's amendment.

For H.R. 7301, the rule provides 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services.

For H.J. Res. 90, the rule provides 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services. The rule provides one motion to recommit for each measure.

Lastly, the rule provides that the provisions of section 125(c) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act shall not apply for the remainder of the Congress, and extends recess instructions, suspension authority, and same-day authority all through the legislative day of July 31, 2020.

Mr. Speaker, we come together today still struggling in the long shadow of a pandemic that has taken the lives of over 121,000 Americans. With no end in sight, and—even in my judgment—less leadership from the White House than the last time we were together, we again see cases of COVID-19 spiking across the country and in my beloved State of Florida. If ever there was a time when an occupant of the White House has so abjectly failed to meet the moment to lead us to a safer, healthier, and better future, this is it.

We must never forget one simple truth: It never had to be this way. Countless Americans never had to lose a father, a mother, brothers, sisters, grandparents, or dear friends—or even young ones.

In the long shadow cast by the ongoing devastation wrought by a pandemic that has so overwhelmingly affected communities of color, we are witnessing again and again, day in and day out, the images of Black people being brutalized by officers who have taken an oath to serve and protect. Let me make it very clear: I have friends that are police officers. All police officers are not brutal. All police officers do not conduct themselves the way that we have seen some conduct themselves.

My friends, the question is a fair one: How much of this do you expect us to take?

How much of this would you take?

How much would you allow your children and grandchildren to take?

Reflect on that, please.

Now, I imagine many of my friends on the other side of the aisle—I heard some of it yesterday—are going to say that the George Floyd Justice in Policing bill "doesn't do this" and "it could do that." Simply because this bill may not be the reflection of the perfect vision of all Members of this body, does not mean it is therefore unworthy of the support of Members of this body. Currently, in this place, the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act is worthy of every Member's support.

Mr. Speaker, there is another issue at the heart of achieving racial justice in this country. At the heart of ensuring that all American citizens know the liberty the Founders wrote of, and that is the cause of D.C. statehood.

The District is overwhelmingly one of people of color, and the residents have, for years, vociferously, with over 80 percent voting in the affirmative, called for D.C. statehood.

Over 700,000 Americans live in Washington, D.C. They pay Federal taxes, but do not have a say in this Chamber or the upper Chamber on how those dollars are spent. Residents of the District register for, and are subject to, the draft but have no voice in this Chamber as to whether we should declare war.

Indeed, the District has sent 200,000 brave men and women to fight for the ideals and benefits of a democracy they are denied here at home—2,000 of those gave the ultimate sacrifice, and we will never forget them.

□ 1030

It really is a tribute to ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON that she has continued this fight on behalf of her constituents.

The Supreme Court and the Federal bench in general render judgment after judgment that limit or expand the rights of D.C. residents, yet they are denied the right to elect the Senators who will confirm all these judges. Others will make the argument more fully today. They will note the constitutional, legal, and moral evidence that clearly and convincingly makes the case for statehood.

But I would be remiss to let go unsaid the following, having gone to school in the District of Columbia at Howard University, from being the birthplace of Duke Ellington, the hotspot of jazz innovation for decades, Chuck Brown and go-go music, to the District's role in the civil rights movement, going way back with some to Cecilia's and Faces, to Ben's Chili Bowl and the Florida Avenue Grill, let us mute D.C. no more. Let us be about the business of expanding liberty today and pass H.R. 51.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I want to thank the gentleman from Florida, not just for yielding the time, but for his friendship over these 10 years that I have had the honor of serving here.

Mr. Speaker, he may not remember because he is just the kind of man that he is, but when I was assigned to the Rules Committee back in 2011, there were four Democrats on the Rules Committee and four freshman Republicans on Rules Committee. And Mr. HASTINGS came over to the four of us who were sitting on the Republican side of the aisle, introduced himself, and offered his advice and his counsel. He told us we were in for quite a treat, being on the Rules Committee, and he, of course, was absolutely right about that.

I have made a lot of bad decisions in Congress, and I have made a lot of good decisions in Congress. Accepting Mr. HASTINGS' hand of friendship early on

in this tenure and having been the beneficiary of his mentorship over these 10 years in Congress has been one of the best decisions that I have made. I am grateful to him for doing that.

Mr. Speaker, we have six bills wrapped up in this rule today. I have the 30 minutes that the gentleman from Florida yielded me. That gives me 5 minutes to talk about racial justice, 5 minutes to talk about adding a new State to the Union, 5 minutes to talk about reassigning a half a trillion dollars in healthcare spending from one pot to another, and on and on.

We are not going to be able to have that conversation today, and I understand that, because this is our first day back in the month of June. This is the first voting day the United States Congress has had in the month of June. So, we have a lot of things to do.

By separating these bills up into different rules, the Members all know that means having to come back down here for another round of votes. So I don't fault the Rules Committee, as I sometimes might, for stuffing so many things into this provision.

But I will say, Mr. Speaker, that I am surprised that we are back, in all the crises and concerns that the gentleman from Florida reflected on, for our first voting day in June. The bills we have before us are bills that, if they moved through committee at all, moved through with absolutely no Republican amendments accepted, and then the Rules Committee made absolutely no Republican amendments even available for consideration here on the floor.

The crises the gentleman from Florida recognized are real. The solutions to those crises are generally found in partnership and consensus, and we find none of that in the underlying rule today.

For that reason, I am going to ask my colleagues to defeat the rule. It is not a reflection on the merits of the underlying issues. The merits of the issues are real. But the opportunity to solve those issues comes with passing legislation, not just in the House, but also through the Senate, having the President's signature put on that, or overriding a veto here in the House.

We don't have the process that allows us to build that consensus before us today. It is a shame because I know how hard all of my colleagues have been working remotely on legislation over these past weeks. I would have expected partnership and consensus bills to be the order of business today, instead of the take-it-or-leave-it bills we have before us.

Mr. Speaker, I mentioned that there are six bills before us. That half-a-trillion-dollar healthcare bill I mentioned is actually a compilation of 24 separate bills that have all been rolled together into one.

We are not going to put these bills on the President's desk. We are not going to have these bills considered in the Senate. We will most certainly pass

these bills out of the House today. All of us who ran seeking solutions, as opposed to seeking statements, are going to be disappointed by this process.

Mr. Speaker, my friend from Florida talked about things that were worthy of this institution. I recognize the efforts that have gone into crafting this legislation. From the Delegate from the District of Columbia, ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, and the work she has done on D.C. statehood over the years, to the leadership of KAREN BASS and the Congressional Black Caucus on putting together a criminal justice police reform bill, the effort that has gone into here is unquestioned. It has been done with all the best of intentions.

It is the partnership that has been lacking, and it is my great hope—because I know what we do today is not going to be the end of any of these processes; it is only going to be the beginning. We cannot reach the President's desk and a signature and the law of the land that we all seek by ignoring one another. We can only do it by engaging one another.

I do believe that this process is not worthy of the institution because, by definition, it leaves out hundreds of Members and millions of Americans who want to participate in this.

I am encouraged, as we talked through this in the Rules Committee, certainly, as we talked about our differences, we learned a whole lot about things that we have in common, not just on criminal justice reform, not just on D.C. statehood, not just on healthcare, but across the board, places where we can come together and make a difference for those constituents that we serve.

I tell my colleagues, please vote “no” on the rule today because we have a chance to go back and do these in partnership right now. But should these bills pass the House today, we will still have a partnership opportunity coming forward.

I hope that folks will not harden their positions today, having gone through a partisan beginning. We all seek successful conclusions. Those will only be done together.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI), a distinguished member of the Rules Committee and my friend.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the rule for the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act. I stand with those across the country who have lifted their voices, shared their pain, and called on us to enact meaningful change.

With the comprehensive reforms of this legislation, we seek to fundamentally shift our Nation's failed approach of policing, an approach that, for especially Black and Brown communities and other communities of color, assumes guilt and normalizes racial profiling.

We cannot remain complicit in a system that systematically oppresses people of color. We must acknowledge our repeated failures and proactively reinvest in community-based training programs.

There has been plenty of time for discussion. Today, we finally take a step forward.

My district of Sacramento is all too familiar with this pain. We are still mourning the death of Stephon Clark. There are others we have mourned whose families still seek justice. Yet, the resounding response of our community is wonderful. People of all races, ages, and backgrounds have marched side-by-side with a united voice to tell the Nation that we can and must do better.

The George Floyd Justice in Policing Act is a step toward building trust between law enforcement and our communities.

Through this legislation, we will ban the use of deadly techniques like the chokehold and no-knock warrants.

We will end the Pentagon's program of giving local police departments military-grade weapons. The contrasting images of MRAP military vehicles overpowering civilian protestors have no place in America.

We will create new thresholds of transparency, and we will require accountability. We will end qualified immunity that has prevented change in police departments throughout this Nation, and we will streamline Federal law to prosecute excessive force.

America continues to find ways to right our historical wrongs. Together, we must fight for a more equitable future. This legislation is a positive step toward a safer, more equal, and more just America.

I look forward to supporting this bill and others provided by this rule.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS), who serves on the Rules Committee.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, let me just say, to start, I don't often agree with my colleague from Florida, Mr. HASTINGS, but I find myself in agreement with him on two points this morning. One was his eloquent praise for the gentleman from Georgia, and we will indeed miss his eloquence here on the floor. It is always hard to follow the gentleman from Georgia, which I frequently do in the Rules Committee, because he is able to speak so clearly on an issue.

Another point I would agree with the gentleman from Florida on is that we did spend a long time in the Rules Committee yesterday. It was a marathon hearing, but it was important because so many of these things had had no hearing and no chance for debate in the so-called regular order.

About 60 or 70 percent of the bill, H.R. 1425, the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Enhancement Act, which, as the gentleman from Georgia points out, allocates a significant sum

of money to the Affordable Care Act in order to save the Affordable Care Act, something that is now over a decade old. It is a sign that the law has failed and failed to provide for Americans as it was originally described.

The House of Representatives should be leading at a time of crisis. We shouldn't be making a halfhearted attempt to fix a broken law as a present for its 10th birthday, and we certainly shouldn't do that without the proper work from the authorization committee; in this case, the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Last fall, before we could have ever predicted the emergence of this novel coronavirus, we debated a proposal here on this House floor. It was called H.R. 3. It was a Speaker's proposal that would require the government to set drug prices. In the consequence, if American innovation was a casualty of that, then that was judged to be acceptable collateral damage toward their political goal. But it was a bad bill; it was the wrong time.

Unfortunately, some of those very same policies have found their way and have been intruded into this bill. In fact, I very much regret that such policies would receive any consideration during this pandemic.

Let's be very clear: American biomedical innovation in the form of new treatments and cures is going to lead us to victory over this novel coronavirus. We will beat this virus. We always do. We will emerge on the other side victorious. But one of the paths to that victory is American innovation, American biomedical innovation, American pharmaceutical innovation.

A vote for this bill today is a vote against a cure for the novel coronavirus. A vote for this bill today is a vote against a vaccine to prevent this or future illnesses.

If this body wants to make an impact on drug prices, there are ways to do that. We could sit down—in fact, our ranking member of the full committee, Mr. WALDEN, has a bill, H.R. 19, which has a number of bipartisan proposals, which means they have both a Republican and a Democratic cosponsor, and it does so in a way that doesn't harm innovation.

So what does this bill do to States? Well, it really hurts States when they are already down. State Medicaid budgets are really, really out of control right now. In fact, we should be helping, not hurting, the States.

The Foundation for Government Accountability published a report in June of this year titled "States are about to be hit by a Medicaid tidal wave," saying that this coronavirus is putting extra budget pressure on States at the same time their general revenues, because of demand destruction by the virus, are expected—State tax collections are expected to decrease by 20 percent.

The bill before us today would reduce State's administrative FMAP if they

do not expand Medicaid. Punishing States in this way would further hurt State budgets that are already being pushed to the limits.

□ 1045

So many of us remember the Supreme Court case in 2012, the case titled *National Federation of Independent Business v. Sebelius*. The Court ruled that threatening States' Medicaid funding for not expanding that program is, in fact, unconstitutional.

Sections 204 and 205 of this bill would violate the same principles and coerce States, rather than incentivize States, into expanding Medicaid. This bill will actively damage State Medicaid programs like those in Texas.

H.R. 1425 also wastes taxpayer dollars on Affordable Care Act outreach and enrollment and navigators that have already been proven to not have a high return on investment.

It is one thing if they want to improve policies, but let's not go back to bringing policies back from the dead that, in fact, are not working.

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

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS).

Mr. BURGESS. Lastly, this bill fails to protect life. The bill establishes a Federal reinsurance fund, and this reinsurance fund is for individuals in ACA exchange plans. The fund is fiscally irresponsible. It is \$10 billion a year forever, so we don't even know what the final CBO score is. But it also does not include longstanding Hyde protections and, therefore, fails to ensure that Federal dollars would never be used to pay for abortions.

The Energy and Commerce Committee has worked in a bipartisan way this Congress on numerous policies that would make a real difference in American healthcare. It is disappointing that the Democratic leadership is pushing this partisan proposal ahead of providing Americans with real support.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia for his kindness.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN).

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Speaker, look, I can't tell you specifically what it must be like to have the police called on you at your home or a friend's house or a business simply because of the color of your skin.

I can't tell you personally what it must feel like to know that just because of your race, you are significantly more likely to get killed by police simply by encountering them.

But all of these mere facts should bring rage to all of us. We must rethink public safety in America.

Police shouldn't respond with violence just because they can. And unfortunately, impunity has empowered a militarized police force.

The ugly reality is, we have a criminal justice and policing system that disproportionately targets and kills Black people. And when a system isn't performing for the people it is supposed to serve, it is time to fix it. In fact, it is way overdue for that change.

Today, we can do more than just give lip service to the words "Black Lives Matter." We can give those words meaning. We do that by passing the Justice in Policing Act today.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. LESKO), a Rules Committee member and a distinguished leader on the Judiciary Committee.

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, all of us—all of us—believe what happened to George Floyd was horrible, and justice must be served.

Bad cops that do bad things must be held accountable. I have listened to Blacks who have been discriminated against, and I believe discrimination is real.

Congressman HASTINGS yesterday, in the Rules Committee, shared with us things that had happened to him, things that happened to people he knew, and it was horrible. We can't let those types of things continue in our society.

But I also know that the vast majority of law enforcement officers are good people, good people doing good things, helping people in the community, and protecting our communities.

That is why I think it is really important that we address the problems we are having in our Nation in a bipartisan fashion, because this is so important. America needs to heal.

Unfortunately, the bill before us today, part of the rule and the policing bill, was not negotiated with Republicans. So there are portions of the bill that I support, that other Republicans support, and that I believe President Trump would support and sign into law. But there are other portions of the bill that I cannot vote for, nor can other Republicans.

The reason is because I have spoken to a wide variety of law enforcement officers and police chiefs. They have all said that there are portions of this bill that would undermine their ability to do their job in protecting our communities.

I would like to read a portion of a letter that we received from the National Association of Police Organizations that oppose the underlying bill, H.R. 7120, in this rule. It says:

Our most significant concerns include amending section 242 of title 18, United States Code, to lower the standard for mens rea, and the practical elimination of qualified immunity for law enforcement officers. Combined, these two provisions take away any legal protections for officers while making it easier to prosecute them for mistakes on the job, not just criminal acts. With the change to qualified immunity, an officer can go to prison for an unintentional act that unknowingly broke an unknown law. We believe in holding officers accountable for their actions, but the consequence of this would be

making criminals out of decent cops enforcing the laws in good faith.

This organization represents 241,000 sworn law enforcement officers.

The other law enforcement officers I have spoken to, and chiefs, said they have problems with other portions of the bill. Specifically, the banning, outright banning, on chokeholds and carotid holds.

In Arizona, it is used as a last resort, a lethal force, and that is what is in the Senate bill. But in this bill, it outright bans it. The police officers have said: Don't take that option off the table because if you take that option off the table, we will be forced to shoot someone, which I believe is the opposite of what we want to do.

Also, eliminating no-knock warrants, the officers want you to know that no-knock warrants have to go through a court, that they have to go through a judge, and that, often, they are used when going after drug cartels that are heavily armed and you need the element of surprise. So banning them would possibly hurt law enforcement officers, and the drugs would be taken away.

They also were concerned about the outright banning in this bill of law enforcement agencies getting surplus military equipment at little or no cost. They say they don't use this equipment to ride down the roads, you know, like showing military force. In Arizona, they often use this equipment when there are flash floods, and they need to rescue people or need to clear roads.

So, it is disappointing that we can't have a bipartisan bill in front of us today. I hope we can. They didn't talk to Republicans on the bill, that I am aware of, and the Democrats in the Judiciary Committee voted down all of our amendments.

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

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. LESKO).

Mrs. LESKO. Particularly, I had an amendment that said if a city allows an autonomous zone, like what is happening in Seattle, they can't get law enforcement grants from the Federal Government. It seems common sense. They voted it down.

I had another amendment that said if a city wants to defund, dismantle, disband police, they shouldn't get Federal law enforcement grants. That is just wrong.

So I call on all Members, all Members on both sides, to speak out against the violence that is happening in our streets, the violence, the tearing down of statues, statues of Ulysses Grant, who was with the Union, statues of religious figures. This is wrong. Stop the dismantling, defunding calls for police. Stop the looting. It is not peaceful protest when that happens.

Let's work on a bipartisan bill and get something real done.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Mas-

sachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), the distinguished chair of the Committee on Rules and my friend.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, there are many timely measures in this bill to: strengthen our healthcare system; help people stay in their homes; modernize our credit reporting system during this COVID-19 pandemic; protect our civil right laws; and, finally, give full representation to Washington, D.C., so that no President can ever again send in Federal troops to crack down on peaceful, constitutional speech. Each one responds to the urgent needs of the American people during this unprecedented time.

But there is one measure in particular here that I want to focus on that is a direct result of public pressure, the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act. Americans of all backgrounds have been taking to the streets in unprecedented numbers with a single refrain: Black Lives Matter.

People are demanding an end to police brutality, not encouraging an end to it, not recommending an end to it, but, finally, demanding an end to it once and for all.

That is what H.R. 7120 is all about, fixing the broken status quo that has allowed racial injustice and police brutality to continue year after year after year. It is about damn time.

I would never presume to know what it is like to be Black in America today, but I have seen injustice in my own State. I have held grieving community members. I have marched with those calling for change. I have heard their pain.

True allies do more than listen, Mr. Speaker. They take action.

Now, no one at all is suggesting that all police officers are racist and break the law. But the sad reality is that if you are Black in America today, you are three times more likely to be killed by the police compared to a White person. Yet, it is the exception, not the norm, when officers who commit a crime are brought to justice.

There are systemic problems here that require systematic solutions.

Now, I am not naive, Mr. Speaker. This bill alone will not end racism in America. We have so many issues that must be addressed for that to happen. So many communities in Black America aren't getting the investments that they need today. But this bill is an important step forward, and I encourage all of my colleagues to listen to the voices of those demanding change right now.

This is what we were sent here to do, Mr. Speaker, to act on behalf of the people we represent.

While our Constitution begins with the words "We the People," that didn't include all the people when those words were written. It included people who looked like me. But by expanding the reach of our democracy and looking toward a more just and fair country for everyone, we have gotten one step closer to achieving the promise of America for all people.

That is what this bill is about. I urge all of my colleagues to support it.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will amend the rule to provide for consideration of H. Res. 1023, a resolution by Mr. STEUBE.

Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN), the ranking member and one of the great advocates on our side of the aisle.

□ 1100

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding.

I, too, want to urge a “no” vote on the previous question so we can address Mr. STEUBE’s resolution and hopefully pass Mr. STEUBE’s resolution, a resolution which is very basic, has four basic components to it:

Justice for George Floyd’s family. What happened in Minneapolis we all know was a tragedy and never should have happened, wrong as wrong could be, and George Floyd’s family deserves justice, and our resolution calls for that.

It also calls for justice for police officers and others who have suffered violence, police officers like Patrick Underwood, who, along with George Floyd’s brother, Patrick Underwood’s sister came and testified just 2 weeks ago in front of the Judiciary Committee, serving his community as a law enforcement officer, attacked and killed.

The resolution that would happen if we vote “no” on the previous question also condemns all violence and the creation of autonomous zones. There is a big difference between peaceful protest, exercising our First Amendment liberties guaranteed to us under our great Constitution, the greatest constitution ever, there is a big difference between peaceful protest and rioting. There is a big difference between peaceful protest and violence. There is a big difference between peaceful protest and attacking police officers. And there is certainly a big difference between peaceful protest and forming CHAZ or CHOP or any type of autonomous zones separating from our great country. This resolution condemns that kind of practice, as well.

And, finally, our resolution strongly opposes what I think is one of the craziest public policy proposals I have ever seen, this idea that we are going to defund the police. You know, it is funny because I hear some Democrats say defund the police doesn’t mean defund the police. Well, change the sentence. It is three words. That is exactly what it means.

Our biggest cities, the mayor of New York, de Blasio, has already said he is going to defund the police a billion dollars. He got rid of the plainclothes unit in their department.

Garcetti, the mayor of our second largest city, said he is going to defund the police \$150 million.

Baltimore, Hartford, Minneapolis, they went a step further. Minneapolis,

the supermajority of their city council—it is interesting to point out, 13 people on the city council, guess how many of them are Republicans? Twelve Democrats—well, excuse me, 12 on the city council, I think. No, 13, that is right. Twelve Democrats, and one Green Party. They have already decided they are going to abolish the police department.

This is crazy. Let’s vote “no” on this previous question. Let’s bring up a resolution that I think is consistent, where American values are consistent with the problems we face, consistent with the serious situation we are in. Let’s vote “no” on the previous question.

I will finish with this, Madam Speaker.

We had a witness the last couple weeks in two different hearings, a Judiciary hearing and then an Oversight hearing. Dan Bongino, former NYPD, Secret Service, protected Presidents Clinton, Bush, Obama, worked in the NYPD, worked in the neighborhood in Brooklyn, he talked about if you do this, if we allow this concept, this defund the police concept to happen, it will not only be tough for police officers—we all know that—but the communities they serve. What will happen there is frightening.

So I urge a “no” vote on the previous question. Let’s take up the Steube resolution.

Mr. HASTINGS. Madam Speaker, I take notice that the Speaker pro tempore has changed, and I am very pleased that one of the leaders of the legislation that we are taking up today is now serving as Speaker pro tempore.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON), whom I have known all of my career and consider a friend and mentor.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I didn’t know until he indicated he had gone to Howard University here; that is just another plus mark because he has already got a lot of pluses as far as I am concerned.

Madam Speaker, the rule before us for the D.C. statehood bill is no ordinary rule. It is the prelude to the passage of a historic bill, and I use those words advisedly. For the 219 years since the District of Columbia first became the capital of these United States, countless bills that have deeply affected D.C. residents have been enacted not only without their consent, but without their participation.

Indeed, for the greater part of the existence of the Nation’s capital, there was neither representation in either the House or the Senate nor even the right of District residents to govern themselves locally. Local home rule.

In other words, the residents of our Nation’s capital were excluded entirely from American democracy for most of its existence as the capital. Nevertheless, D.C. residents have always paid

the same Federal taxes as other Americans, today ranked number one in Federal taxes paid, and have fought in all of the Nation’s wars, including the war that created the United States of America.

Throughout its existence, the country has flattered itself by saluting itself as a democracy. With the passage of this rule and then the D.C. statehood bill, that flattery at least will be deserved.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. BASS). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. HASTINGS. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I speak of the flattery we give ourselves of democracy here and around the world. With the passage of this rule and of the D.C. statehood bill, that flattery at least and at last will be deserved.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I would say to my friend from Florida, I don’t believe we have any further speakers coming to the floor, so I will reserve the balance of my time and wait to close.

Mr. HASTINGS. Madam Speaker, would you be good enough to tell both sides how much time we have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida has 11½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Georgia has 8½ minutes remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TORRES), my good friend and distinguished member of the Rules Committee.

Mrs. TORRES of California. Madam Speaker, with one word—one word—George Floyd spoke to the conscience of this Nation in a way that countless cries for justice were met with deaf ears before.

When George Floyd called out, “Mama, Mama,” he activated every mother who saw that horrible video. We saw our own child with a police officer’s knee on their neck. We saw our own child being murdered slowly, painfully.

As someone who spent 17½ years as a 911 dispatcher for LAPD telling people, “Don’t worry. It will be okay. The police are on their way,” as someone with that background, my disgust is palpable for any police officer who would harm the very same people they have sworn to protect.

This was not an isolated incident. We don’t have just a few bad apples. We know the names of Breonna Taylor, Ahmaud Arbery, Philando Castile, and Michael Brown because George Floyd was far from the first. And we know Rayshard Brooks’ name because George Floyd is far from being last.

So the Justice in Policing Act is long overdue and urgently needed. It reforms qualified immunity so everyone who faces discriminatory policing or

excessive force has an avenue for recourse. It creates a national police misconduct registry to track officer misconduct. It improves training and practices to make sure that officers are properly prepared for the situations that we ask them to address, and much more.

I commend my colleagues for delivering this bill, and I thank Chairman NADLER for working with me to strengthen the misconduct registry included in it.

We have a long way to go as a country to heal the wounds that cut back for generations. The Justice in Policing Act is an important first step. I look forward to seeing it passed today and to the many steps that will follow in the march for justice.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Speaker, I am proud to stand with Members of the House and Senate leadership and members of the Congressional Black Caucus to introduce the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act. I am proud to be an original cosponsor of the legislation.

This legislation is a timely, critical, bold, and transformative start to addressing the issues millions of Americans have been protesting about. I believe we also need to reorganize funding activities for law enforcement in a way that works to bring police and communities closer together, not further apart.

We must also change our laws to enable swift action to prosecute misconduct by police officers, improve training and transparency, and create a national use of force standard for police who are charged to protect and serve our communities, all of which are included in the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act. We owe it to those who have died and those who have honored them.

So let us vote "yes," and let us vote to continue working on these critical issues.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS. Madam Speaker, yesterday, before we began our proceedings in the Rules Committee, I asked one of my good friends if he would speak on this rule. It is for the reason that I consider him one of the preeminent constitutional scholars in this institution that I made that request.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN), a distinguished member of the Rules Committee and my good friend.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

In "Leaves of Grass," Walt Whitman wrote that "the United States themselves are essentially the greatest poem." So each of our States is like a stanza, a line in the remarkable and al-

ways unfinished American poem, a lyrical whole far greater than the sum of its parts.

Four years ago, the more than 700,000 of our countrymen and women living in Washington, D.C. exercised their rights and their powers under the Ninth Amendment and the Tenth Amendment to vote to form a new State and to petition us for admission to the Union. That vote carried by a 6-1 margin.

Washingtonians ask us today to pierce the sound barrier of propaganda in 2020 to hear once again, and to recall in our hearts, the poetry that is America.

We began as 13 States, but Congress has exercised our powers under Article IV, Section 3, 37 different times, to admit 37 new States, all of them by simple legislative acts, none of them by constitutional amendment. Each one was controversial in its own way:

They said Texas couldn't be admitted because it was a separate republic; West Virginia used to be part of Virginia; Utah was too Mormon; New Mexico was too Catholic; and, of course, everyone knew it was unconstitutional to admit Hawaii and Alaska in 1959 because they weren't contiguous.

Washingtonians do not ask us to convert the Federal district into a State. They ask us, rather, to redraw the boundaries of the Federal district, to shrink it to the White House, the Capitol, the Supreme Court, and The Mall, to effectuate an exodus of the people from direct Federal control, from the condition of being ruled in "all cases whatsoever" by other people's elected representatives without equal rights of self-government and representative participation.

If you have ever met any Washingtonians, you will know they are sick and tired of being governed by other people's representatives. And who wouldn't be?

That is how you get cheated out of \$750 million in the CARES Act.

That is how your State militia gets turned against you with pepper spray and tear gas and rubber bullets.

That is how the choices you make locally about reproductive freedom, adoption, and public safety get trampled and rewritten by politicians from other places who know nothing of the community whose decisions they insist on controlling. This is called virtual representation, and we fought a revolution to destroy that principle.

□ 1115

Those who are taxed, those who are governed, must be represented directly in government by their own voting representatives.

Washington asks us to do something that is not only perfectly constitutional, but time-honored. Congress has drawn and redrawn the boundaries of the Federal District several times before. The passage of the Organic Act in 1801 did not freeze the boundaries of the Federal District, which by its own terms may be "no more than 10 miles

square" but has no minimum size set in the Constitution.

That is why Congress was able to redraw the Federal District in 1847 to shrink it and return Alexandria, Arlington, and Fairfax County to the Commonwealth of Virginia.

It is true this was done to placate the slave masters who foresaw the coming abolition of the slave traffic in the Federal city. That is what Abraham Lincoln argued for.

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

Mr. HASTINGS. Madam Speaker, when I asked the gentleman to speak, I didn't mean for him to take my time. I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN) for closing purposes.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, if Congress can redraw the boundaries of the Federal District to protect the property rights of a few hundred slave masters in the 19th century, surely we can redraw the boundaries of the Federal District to protect the democratic rights of hundreds of thousands of Americans of all races and ethnicities living in the Capital City in the 21st century.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, while I don't always agree with what my friend from Maryland has to say, I do agree with my friend from Florida about his scholarly expertise. We don't talk about the Ninth and Tenth Amendments enough down here on the floor of the House. I suspect this will be the only time in the second quarter that we mention the Ninth and Tenth Amendments, and I am grateful to my friend for his words.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCANLON), my friend and a distinguished member of the Rules Committee.

Ms. SCANLON. Madam Speaker, on this busy legislative day, I would like to focus my attention on both the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act and the Emergency Housing and Relief Act.

The sickening police murders of George Floyd, Breonna Taylor, Rayshard Brooks, Ahmaud Arbery, Elijah McClain, and so many other Black Americans have rightfully brought our country to a place of moral reckoning that is long overdue. We must confront the harsh truths about racism in our country.

Black lives do matter and changing our systems will take each and every one of us. This bill is a start.

The George Floyd Justice in Policing Act will end no-knock warrants, ban chokeholds, it will limit the transfer of military-grade machinery in local police forces, it will create a national registry to prevent the worst police officers from simply transferring to another police force when they have been found guilty of misconduct.

The Justice in Policing Act is the reform that Americans are demanding to

enact real change. This bill must be the starting point for negotiations with the Senate, not empty gestures from Senate Republicans or the White House.

We are a country in desperate need of leadership, both to make the change needed for a civil society and to navigate the economic and health challenges of the COVID-19 pandemic.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle may choose to deny that we are in the middle of a pandemic, but we have seen in recent days that we are far from out of the woods.

Our constituents are struggling, in no small part due to the White House's single-minded focus on the stock market rather than American families, but while the White House and congressional Republicans are denying science and peddling in conspiracy theories, House Democrats are working to help American families.

The Emergency Housing and Relief Act will help those families by providing rental assistance, helping landlords, homeowners, and those experiencing homelessness by providing billions in grants to help cover rent and other fees, as well as expanding the moratorium on evictions and foreclosure.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation, because it is vital to the health and well-being of American families.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I am prepared to close if there are no further speakers remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS. Madam Speaker, I would advise the gentleman that I have no further speakers, and I too am prepared to close.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, may I inquire how much time is remaining on both sides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia has 8 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Florida has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 6 minutes.

Madam Speaker, I told you at the beginning all of the things that this rule did not include. It did not include partnership at the committee level or any Republican input whatsoever. It did not include any partnership in the Rules Committee, or any Republican amendments made in order.

We have got as many bills as I have ever seen jammed into a single rule, and, again, not done in any way that creates any consensus, that provides any opportunity for being able to move a bill to the Senate and on to the President's desk.

That is disappointing, because as I have heard from colleagues on both sides of the aisle, the American people want action on all of these issues, and we are not going to be able to provide that in this way. That is what is not in here.

But, Madam Speaker, it is particularly important to me that we find you in the chair today, as my friend from

Florida recognized. What this might be is one of those moments we look back on as when something got started.

You don't ever know how things got started. You know how they finish, but it is sometimes hard to understand how they got started.

I am absolutely certain that the bill we have before us today isn't going to the President's desk on police reform, I absolutely am, as are my Democratic colleagues.

One of my friends on the Judiciary Committee, SHEILA JACKSON LEE, was quoted in the Hill today saying:

Ultimately there will probably be a conference, but I don't want to take any issue with Democrats saying, You know we have the stronger bill.

Of course, that is true. Folks have the opportunity to start the process where they want to start the process.

The House majority whip, JAMES CLYBURN, went on to state further:

A cleaner road to compromise would have been to have the Senate negotiators smooth out the wrinkles between Senator SCOTT's bill and the one championed by Democrats Corey Booker and Kamala Harris. It could very well have been that they could have come to some kind of a compromise that will fly in the House. Why worry about going to conference between the two bodies if you can work it out together.

Well, of course that is true. The gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN) has been a successful legislator on this floor for decades. You work it out together, you find that consensus, you find that compromise.

It is not lost on me that my Democratic friends in the House have come today to say, "Please accept this police reform bill, even though you have gotten no Republican amendments whatsoever."

My friend from Florida asked us not to make the perfect the enemy of the good in that way. I understand those words.

But my friend from South Carolina, TIM SCOTT, offered the very same proposal to Senate Democrats. In fact, he offered them 20 amendments to his bill, and the Democratic leadership in the Senate said, "No, that is not good enough. We are going to walk away."

Well, 20 amendments aren't good enough. Certainly, no amendments aren't good enough. It frustrates me, because we all know we want to move forward.

My friend from Florida recognized yesterday, Madam Speaker, that he is the oldest member of the Rules Committee. I won't name names here—83—but he is the eldest member of the Rules Committee. I think I am the youngest member of the Rules Committee.

I don't believe the gentleman from Florida has spent one second thinking about what this bill will mean to him in his life. I think he has spent all this time thinking about what the bill that you have championed is going to mean to that child born in a Washington area hospital today and what will it mean to him or her in their life.

I was born 2 years after Martin Luther King was murdered. His work and his impact on the country I was the beneficiary of, but I was not around during that. I know that is where folks' hearts and minds are focused.

While I am certain this bill is not starting the way I would have wanted it to start, I am hopeful that I am going to look back one day and say, KAREN BASS and ALCEE HASTINGS and I were on the floor of the House on that very first day that legislation was moving across the House floor that made this difference in the country that 330 million Americans want to see made.

I don't have to like the way that it starts. I like even less that it hasn't started already.

All the comments you will hear today from our side of the aisle are based not on an opposition to our goals, but a great hope that we will get to our goals faster.

Madam Speaker, I urge defeat of the previous question and defeat of the rule, for an opportunity for partnership, and I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS).

Mr. HASTINGS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time, and I thank my good friend from Georgia for yielding me time. I believe I will be able to wrap up in a shorter period of time if I stick to the script.

Madam Speaker, my friends across the aisle, some of them like to act as though they have no hesitancy in saying "Black Lives Matter."

The problem is there is always a "but" after "Matter," and the sentence typically ends with "All Lives Matter."

I want to be clear about something: The only way "All Lives Matter" is if "Black Lives Matter."

The last thing I will say about this is that we better doggone well agree that "Matter" is a bare minimum.

Madam Speaker, it strikes me that this is the first time we can gather here and note the recent celebration of Juneteenth, a celebration and a time for reflection in these trying days, to be sure.

Indeed, we ought to take stock of and celebrate all that we have accomplished since that June day in Galveston, Texas, when General Gordon Granger read General Order No. 3 informing all who listened to carry forth that all slaves were now emancipated.

The abomination of slavery ended, my ancestors moved forward with the hope of a better future and, I am sure, the knowledge that new and dire challenges would be waiting for them and their progeny, and that has indeed been the case.

Whether it has been the harsh consequences of a reconstruction abandoned too easily and too quickly, Jim Crow, the violent resistance of the civil rights movement, the war on drugs, or the relentless police brutality conducted by some police officers directed

at Black people, we have stood strong, we have stood together, and through prayer and perseverance, we have endeavored to ensure that access to the American Dream, that is rightly ours to attain, is ever growing for our children and grandchildren.

As I have always done, I welcome all colors, creeds, and religions to this righteous march.

Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL), all of the persons who have spoken, the distinguished staff on both sides for putting together this matter, and you, Madam Speaker, along with our colleagues in the various caucuses and, particularly, the Congressional Black Caucus, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives for moving this matter forward.

Like my friend from Georgia, I don't see this today as the end, but it is a privilege for me to be on the floor with him and you, Madam Speaker. And I am sure down the road, it will reflect in this historical record that we were here to make a difference.

Madam Speaker, I urge a "yes" vote on the rule and the previous question.

The material previously referred to by Mr. WOODALL is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 1017

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 9 Immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall proceed to the consideration in the House of the resolution (H. Res. 1023) calling for justice for George Floyd and others, and condemning violence and rioting. The resolution shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and preamble to adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of House Resolution 1023.

Mr. HASTINGS. 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.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3 of House Resolution 965, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 231, nays 176, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 116]

YEAS—231

Adams	Bishop (GA)	Bustos
Aguilar	Blumenauer	Butterfield
Allred	Blunt Rochester	Carbajal
Axne	Bonamici	Cárdenas
Barragán	Boyle, Brendan	Carson (IN)
Bass	F.	Cartwright
Beatty	Brindisi	Case
Bera	Brown (MD)	Casten (IL)
Beyer	Brownley (CA)	Castor (FL)

Castro (TX)	Jackson Lee	Peters	Johnson (OH)	Norman	Steube
Chu, Judy	Jayapal	Peterson	Johnson (SD)	Nunes	Stewart
Cicilline	Jeffries	Phillips	Jordan	Olson	Stivers
Cisneros	Johnson (GA)	Pingree	Joyce (PA)	Palmer	Taylor
Clark (MA)	Johnson (TX)	Pocan	Katko	Pence	Thompson (PA)
Clarke (NY)	Kaptur	Porter	Keller	Perry	Thornberry
Clay	Keating	Pressley	Kelly (MS)	Posey	Tiffany
Cleaver	Kelly (IL)	Price (NC)	Kelly (PA)	Reed	Timmons
Clyburn	Kennedy	Quigley	King (NY)	Reschenthaler	Tipton
Cohen	Khanna	Raskin	Kinzing	Rice (SC)	Turner
Connolly	Kildee	Rice (NY)	Kustoff (TN)	Riggleman	Upton
Cooper	Kilmer	Richmond	LaMalfa	Roby	Van Drew
Correa	Kim	Rose (NY)	Lamborn	Rodgers (WA)	Wagner
Costa	Kind	Rouda	Latta	Roe, David P.	Walberg
Courtney	Kirkpatrick	Roybal-Allard	Lesko	Rogers (KY)	Walden
Cox (CA)	Krishnamoorthi	Ruiz	Long	Rose, John W.	Walker
Craig	Khanna	Ruppersberger	Lucas	Rouzer	Walorski
Crist	Lamb	Rush	Luetkemeyer	Roy	Waltz
Crow	Langevin	Sánchez	Massie	Rutherford	Watkins
Cuellar	Larsen (WA)	Sarbanes	Mast	Scalise	Weber (TX)
Cunningham	Larson (CT)	Scanlon	McCarthy	Schweikert	Wenstrup
Davids (KS)	Lawrence	Schakowsky	McCaul	Scott, Austin	Westerman
Davis (CA)	Lawson (FL)	Schiff	McClintock	Shimkus	Williams
Davis, Danny K.	Lee (CA)	Schneider	McHenry	Simpson	Wilson (SC)
Dean	Lee (NV)	Schrader	McKinley	Smith (MO)	Wittman
DeFazio	Levin (CA)	Schrier	Meuser	Smith (NE)	Womack
DeGette	Levin (MI)	Scott (VA)	Miller	Smith (NJ)	Woodall
DeLauro	Lewis	Scott, David	Mitchell	Smucker	Wright
DeBene	Lieu, Ted	Serrano	Moolenaar	Spano	Yoho
Delgado	Lipinski	Sewell (AL)	Mooney (WV)	Staub	Young
Demings	Loeb	Shalala	Murphy (NC)	Stefanik	Zeldin
DeSaulnier	Lofgren	Sherman	Newhouse	Steil	
Deutch	Lowenthal	Sherrill			
Dingell	Lowe	Sires			
Doggett	Lujan	Slotkin			
Doyle, Michael	Luria	Smith (WA)			
F.	Lynch	Soto			
Engel	Malinowski	Spanberger			
Escobar	Maloney,	Speier			
Eshoo	Carolyn B.	Stanton			
Espallat	Maloney, Sean	Stevens			
Evans	Matsui	Suozzi			
Finkenauer	McAdams	Swalwell (CA)			
Fletcher	McBath	Takano			
Foster	McCollum	Thompson (CA)			
Frankel	McEachin	Thompson (MS)			
Fudge	McGovern	Titus			
Gabbard	McNerney	Tlaib			
Gallego	Meeks	Tonko			
Garamendi	Meng	Torres (CA)			
Garcia (IL)	Mfume	Torres Small			
Garcia (TX)	Moore	(NM)			
Golden	Morelle	Trahan			
Gomez	Moulton	Trone			
Gonzalez (TX)	Mucarsel-Powell	Underwood			
Gottheimer	Murphy (FL)	Vargas			
Green, Al (TX)	Nadler	Veasey			
Grijalva	Napolitano	Vela			
Haaland	Neal	Velázquez			
Harder (CA)	Neguse	Visclosky			
Hastings	Norcross	Wasserman			
Hayes	O'Halloran	Schultz			
Heck	Ocasio-Cortez	Waters			
Higgins (NY)	Omar	Watson Coleman			
Himes	Pallone	Welch			
Horn, Kendra S.	Panetta	Wexton			
Horsford	Pappas	Wild			
Houlahan	Pascarell	Wilson (FL)			
Hoyer	Payne	Yarmuth			
Huffman	Perlmutter				

NAYS—176

Abraham	Chabot	Gibbs
Aderholt	Cheney	Gohmert
Allen	Cline	Gonzalez (OH)
Amash	Cloud	Gooden
Amodei	Cole	Gosar
Armstrong	Collins (GA)	Granger
Bacon	Comer	Graves (GA)
Baird	Conaway	Graves (LA)
Balderson	Cook	Graves (MO)
Banks	Crawford	Green (TN)
Bergman	Crenshaw	Griffith
Biggs	Davidson (OH)	Grothman
Bilirakis	Davis, Rodney	Guest
Bishop (NC)	DesJarlais	Guthrie
Bost	Diaz-Balart	Hagedorn
Brady	Dunn	Harris
Brooks (AL)	Estes	Hartzer
Brooks (IN)	Ferguson	Hern, Kevin
Buchanan	Fitzpatrick	Herrera Beutler
Buck	Fleischmann	Hice (GA)
Bucshon	Flores	Higgins (LA)
Budd	Fortenberry	Hill (AR)
Burchett	Fox (NC)	Hollingsworth
Burgess	Fulcher	Hudson
Byrne	Gaetz	Huizenga
Calvert	Garcia (CA)	Hurd (TX)
Carter (GA)	Gianforte	Johnson (LA)

Johnson (SD)	Norman	Steube
Jordan	Nunes	Stewart
Joyce (PA)	Olson	Stivers
Katko	Palmer	Taylor
Keller	Pence	Thompson (PA)
Kelly (MS)	Perry	Thornberry
Kelly (PA)	Posey	Tiffany
King (NY)	Reed	Timmons
Kinzing	Reschenthaler	Tipton
Kustoff (TN)	Rice (SC)	Turner
LaMalfa	Riggleman	Upton
Lamborn	Roby	Van Drew
Latta	Rodgers (WA)	Wagner
Lesko	Roe, David P.	Walberg
Long	Rogers (KY)	Walden
Lucas	Rose, John W.	Walker
Luetkemeyer	Rouzer	Walorski
Massie	Roy	Waltz
Mast	Rutherford	Watkins
McCarthy	Scalise	Weber (TX)
McCaul	Schweikert	Wenstrup
McClintock	Scott, Austin	Westerman
McHenry	Shimkus	Williams
McKinley	Simpson	Wilson (SC)
Meuser	Smith (MO)	Wittman
Miller	Smith (NE)	Womack
Mitchell	Smith (NJ)	Woodall
Moolenaar	Smucker	Wright
Mooney (WV)	Spano	Yoho
Murphy (NC)	Staub	Young
Newhouse	Stefanik	Zeldin
	Steil	

NOT VOTING—23

Arrington	Gallagher	Mullin
Babin	Holding	Palazzo
Barr	Joyce (OH)	Rogers (AL)
Bishop (UT)	King (IA)	Rooney (FL)
Carter (TX)	LaHood	Ryan
Curtis	Loudermilk	Sensenbrenner
Duncan	Marchant	Webster (FL)
Emmer	Marshall	

□ 1217

Ms. SPEIER changed her vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. MARSHALL. Madam Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 116.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 965, 116TH CONGRESS

Axne (Raskin)	Kirkpatrick (Gallejo)	Payne (Wasserman)
Cárdenas (Gomez)	Langevin (Lynch)	Schultz (Kuster)
DeSaulnier (Matsui)	Lawson (FL) (Evans)	(NH)
Deutch (Rice)	Lewis (Kildee)	Rush (Underwood)
(NY)	Lieu, Ted (Beyer)	Sánchez (Roybal-Allard)
Engel (Nadler)	Lipinski (Cooper)	Serrano (Meng)
Frankel (Kuster)	Lofgren (Boyle)	Watson Coleman (Pallone)
(NH)	Brendan F.)	Welch (McGovern)
Garamendi (Boyle)	Lowenthal (Beyer)	Wilson (FL) (Hayes)
Johnson (TX)	Moore (Beyer)	
(Jeffries)	Napolitano	
Khanna (Gomez)	(Correa)	
Kind (Beyer)		

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. JACKSON LEE). The question is on the resolution.

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

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3 of House Resolution 965, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 230, nays 180, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 117]

YEAS—230

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

NAYS—180

Abraham Brady Cloud
 Aderholt Brooks (AL) Cole
 Allen Brooks (IN) Collins (GA)
 Amash Buchanan Comer
 Amodei Buck Conaway
 Armstrong Bucshon Cook
 Bacon Budd Crawford
 Baird Burchett Crenshaw
 Balderson Burgess Davidson (OH)
 Banks Byrne Davis, Rodney
 Bergman Calvert DesJarlais
 Biggs Carter (GA) Diaz-Balart
 Bilirakis Chabot Dunn
 Bishop (NC) Cheney Estes
 Best Boone Ferguson

Fitzpatrick King (NY)
 Fleischmann Kinzinger
 Flores Kustoff (TN)
 Fortenberry LaMalfa
 Foxx (NC) Lamborn
 Fulcher Latta
 Gaetz Lesko
 Garcia (CA) Long
 Gianforte Loudermilk
 Gibbs Lucas
 Gohmert Luetkemeyer
 Gonzalez (OH) Marshall
 Gooden Massie
 Gosar Mast
 Granger McAdams
 Graves (GA) McCarthy
 Graves (LA) McCaul
 Graves (MO) McClintock
 Green (TN) McHenry
 Griffith McKinley
 Grothman Meuser
 Guest Miller
 Guthrie Mitchell
 Hagedorn Moolenaar
 Harris Mooney (WV)
 Hartzler Murphy (NC)
 Hern, Kevin Newhouse
 Herrera Beutler Norman
 Hice (GA) Nunes
 Higgins (LA) Olson
 Hill (AR) Palmer
 Holding Pence
 Hollingsworth Perry
 Hudson Posey
 Huizenga Reed
 Hurd (TX) Reschenthaler
 Johnson (LA) Rice (SC)
 Johnson (OH) Riggelman
 Johnson (SD) Roby
 Jordan Rodgers (WA)
 Joyce (PA) Roe, David P.
 Katko Rogers (KY)
 Keller Rose, John W.
 Kelly (MS) Rouzer
 Kelly (PA) Roy

NOT VOTING—20

Arrington Emmer Mullin
 Babin Gallagher Palazzo
 Barr Heck Rogers (AL)
 Bishop (UT) Joyce (OH) Rooney (FL)
 Carter (TX) King (IA) Sensenbrenner
 Curtis LaHood Webster (FL)
 Duncan Marchant

□ 1311

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.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE
RESOLUTION 965, 116TH CONGRESS

Axne (Raskin) Kirkpatrick Payne
 Cárdenas (Galego) (Wasserman
 (Gomez) Langevin Schultz)
 DeSaulnier (Lynch) Pingree (Kuster
 Bishop (Matsui) Lawson (FL) (NH))
 Deutch (Rice) (Evans) Rush
 (NY)) Lewis (Kildee) (Underwood)
 Engel (Nadler) Lieu, Ted (Beyer) Sánchez (Roybal-
 Frankel (Kuster) Lipinski (Cooper) Allard)
 (NH)) Lofgren (Boyle, Serrano (Meng)
 Garamendi Brendan F.) Watson Coleman
 (Boyle, Lowenthal) (Pallone)
 Brendan F.) (Beyer) Welch
 Johnson (TX) Lowey (Meng) (McGovern)
 (Jeffries) Moore (Beyer) Wilson (FL)
 Khanna (Gomez) Napolitano (Hayes)
 Kind (Beyer) (Correa)

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess for a period of less than 15 minutes.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 14 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1329

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. UNDERWOOD) at 1 o'clock and 29 minutes p.m.

ANTITRUST CRIMINAL PENALTY
ENHANCEMENT AND REFORM
PERMANENT EXTENSION ACT

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 7036) to amend the Antitrust Criminal Penalty Enhancement and Reform Act of 2004 to repeal the sunset provision, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 7036

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Antitrust Criminal Penalty Enhancement and Reform Permanent Extension Act".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS; PURPOSE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) Conspiracies among competitors to fix prices, rig bids, and allocate markets are categorically and irredeemably anticompetitive and contravene the competition policy of the United States.

(2) Cooperation incentives are important to the efforts of the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice to prosecute and deter the offenses described in paragraph (1).

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this Act, and the amendments made by this Act, is to strengthen public and private antitrust enforcement by providing incentives for antitrust violators to cooperate fully with government prosecutors and private litigants through the repeal of the sunset provision of the Antitrust Criminal Penalty Enhancement and Reform Act of 2004 (15 U.S.C. 1 note).

SEC. 3. REPEAL OF SUNSET PROVISION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 211 of the Antitrust Criminal Penalty Enhancement and Reform Act of 2004 (15 U.S.C. 1 note) is repealed.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 212 of the Antitrust Criminal Penalty Enhancement and Reform Act of 2004 (15 U.S.C. 1 note) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (6); and
 (2) by redesignating paragraph (7) as paragraph (6).

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GEORGE FLOYD JUSTICE IN
POLICING ACT OF 2020

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1017, I call up the bill (H.R. 7120) to hold law enforcement accountable for misconduct