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service to the great State of Minnesota and our Nation.

Currently, Major General Jensen serves as the adjutant general of the Minnesota National Guard, meaning that he is the highest ranking guardsman in the State. Major General Jensen has also held numerous other leadership positions during his 37 years with the National Guard.

Throughout his entire career, Major General Jensen has served with the highest level of dedication. His service has earned him the respect of the public; countless government officials; and, most importantly, his fellow guardsmen.

On behalf of the entire State of Minnesota, I thank Major General Jon Jensen for his service and congratulate him on this well-deserved nomination.

Major General Jensen’s rich experience makes him the perfect fit for the position, and I look forward to seeing him confirmed by the United States Senate soon.

SENATE MUST PASS JUSTICE IN POLICING ACT

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

Ms. Meng. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because our Nation is screaming out, grieving for those killed by police brutality and racial injustice.

I rise today because, for 8 minutes and 46 seconds, a police officer pressed his knee on George Floyd’s neck, slowly killing him. We know there are countless more who will forever remain faceless and nameless because their stories were never recorded.

I rise today because Black lives matter.

Last night, I proudly voted to pass this historic, transformative bill, the Justice in Policing Act.

This bill would finally put in place unprecedented and bold reforms to curb police brutality and racial profiling and combat the epidemic of racial injustice.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot turn our backs on the cries for justice. We cannot go back to a system that would allow police brutality and racial injustice.

The Senate must follow the House’s lead and immediately pass this bill because this moment of national anguish demands nothing less.

HONORING THE LIFE OF ROBERT BOATRIGHT

(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 Mr. Roger Boatright of Alma, Georgia, who passed away on May 8.

Roger was a remarkable man of great courage, leadership, and depth, and I had the honor and privilege of knowing him well.

Roger retired from the Georgia State Patrol as a trooper first class and was a faithful member to his church and numerous community organizations, such as the Bacon County Exchange Club; the Bacon County Hospital Authority; and the Georgia Municipal Association, to which he served as president.

When Roger was elected as a council member for the city of Alma in 1966, this paved the course of his life of service to his community.

A few years later, Roger was elected mayor of Alma, where he faithfully served 14 years. In 2009, he was elected chairman of the Bacon County Board of Commissioners and later returned to serve as a council member for the city of Alma.

While tremendously improving his city as mayor, he was appointed to the board of the Georgia Department of Community Affairs before he became chair of this statewide board.

Roger was truly a pillar in his community, which is why he was rightfully rewarded various accolades.

Although Roger had a passion for service and loved his community deeply, he loved his family more than anything.

I am thankful for the lasting impact Roger had on so many, including myself, and I know his legacy and influence will remain for years to come.

My thoughts and prayers are with all who worked with him, knew him, and loved him. Southeast Georgia has lost a great man.

DEMOCRATS REMAIN COMMITTED TO STRENGTHENING HEALTHCARE

(Mr. Cicilline asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. Cicilline. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the House will vote on the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Enhancement Act, a bill that will lower healthcare costs and prescription drug costs, protect patients with pre-existing conditions, expand Medicaid, and lower prescription drug costs.

Democrats have been committed since the day we arrived here to strengthening access to quality healthcare.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle, on the other hand, are trying to rip away healthcare from 20 million Americans and weaken protection for 135 million Americans with preexisting conditions.

They have been trying to do this for 10 years. They are obsessed with the very idea.

Yesterday, President Trump joined 18 Republican Governors and attorneys general in filing a brief in the United States Supreme Court to have the enforceable Care Act declared unconstitutional in the middle of a global health pandemic. More than 40 million Americans have filed for unemployment; 120,000 Americans have died; and more than 2.25 million Americans have been infected with this virus. There has never been a more important time to protect access to quality, affordable healthcare than right now.

This is why Democrats are going to move forward with another bill that will further strengthen access to high-quality, affordable healthcare. It is important that we continue this fight to protect the American people and their access to healthcare.

RECOGNIZING 70TH ANNIVERSARY OF KOREAN WAR

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

Mr. Wilson of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, yesterday marked the 70th anniversary of the Korean War.

On June 25, 1950, at 4 a.m., the North Korean army mercilessly crossed the 38th parallel with 135,000 troops to begin the invasion of the South.

This anniversary is an opportunity to especially remember the 336,863 Americans who served and the 36,574 who died to successfully stop communist imperialism.

I am grateful that President Donald Trump and First Lady Melania Trump provided a wreath at the extraordinary Korean War Veterans Memorial on The Mall yesterday in Washington.

There is no greater contrast between the blessings of democratic capitalism, with South Korea being one of the world’s wealthiest nations, as North Korea’s totalitarian socialist regime has mass poverty.

Korea is well represented in Washington by Ambassador Lee Soo-hyuck, and Korean Americans are valued citizens.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

HONORING THE LIFE OF REVEREND MAGGIE HOWARD

(Mr. Rose of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. Rose of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with an incredibly heavy heart to honor the life of my dear friend, Reverend Maggie Howard, a woman whose kind soul is impossible to describe in just this 1 minute that I have.

From her Stapleton UAME Church on Tompkins Avenue on Staten Island, Reverend Howard led a ministry that was impossible to miss.

Through her sound pantry and pantry, she not only opened the doors of her church; she opened her heart and soul to anyone in need. When others might see someone homeless or suffering and look the other way, no, Maggie would offer them a meal or even a job.

That love for her community earned her the nickname Stapleton’s Mother
Teresa, and it was her fierce spirit that allowed her to overcome so many challenges in her life, including fighting through her own health struggles.

I know that all of Staten Island is feeling the pain of losing Reverend Howard this young, but I want to close out with words of optimism that were near and dear to her heart: "No matter what happened yesterday, tomorrow can be better if we start today."

Today, Staten Islanders are going to come together to honor and celebrate Reverend Howard's life, and we will never forget her memory.

RECOGNIZING NATIONAL PTSD AWARENESS MONTH

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize June as National PTSD Awareness Month, and this Saturday, June 27, as PTSD Awareness Day.

We must do more to dispel the stigmas surrounding mental health. PTSD treatment is a crucial tool that helps many individuals, particularly our Nation's veterans, process, cope, and treat emotional and mental trauma.

Sadly, many of the men and women who have served in the United States military return home with injuries and scars, but sometimes, it is the invisible scars that hurt the most. Many struggle privately with PTSD and feel there is no outlet.

PTSD Awareness Month is not only an opportunity to raise awareness about this, but it is also an opportunity to raise awareness about treatment options.

The Department of Veterans Affairs offers a variety of resources to help those suffering from PTSD. Those seeking treatment should know that telemedicine may be an option as well, ensuring our veterans receive timely healthcare no matter where they live.

Mr. Speaker, I thank our Nation's veterans for their service, and I encourage those who are struggling with PTSD to pursue treatment.

CONGRESS CANNOT STOP HERE

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

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise in support of the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act. The measures in this bill are long overdue and are a step forward in ensuring people, especially Black folks in our country, do not experience racist police violence.

We can't stop here, though, Mr. Speaker. I think about Aiyana Stanley-Jones, a young girl in Detroit who would be graduating from high school this year if she had not been murdered by police when they raided her home, the wrong home, while she slept in 2010.

We can't stop here. We must continue to push policies that will tear down structural racism, reimagine public safety, and divest from policing so we can invest more in education, healthcare, mental health, jobs, transportation, things that keep us safe and our communities together.

Alyana should be here. George should be here. Brenna Taylor should be here. They all should be here.

Thank you so much, Mr. Speaker, and I continue to work toward justice for all of us.

BUILD UPON THE ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF OUR FOREPARENTS

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

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Speaker, leaders everywhere should shun the violent crowds toppling our statues. Our systems are the greatest ever devised by mankind. They deliver more equality, more justice, more liberty, and more pursuits of happiness than any other system throughout history.

Now, we haven't always lived up to the ideals of our system, but we should build upon the accomplishments of our forefathers, not destroy their memories. We cannot bring about change by following the laws, not breaking them. We must support our police, not ambush them.

WASHINGTON, D.C. ADMISSION ACT

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1017, I call up the bill (H.R. 51) to provide for the admission of the State of Washington, D.C., into the Union, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1017, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of the Rules Committee Print 116–55, modified by the amendment printed in part A of House Report 116–436, is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 51

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE—This Act may be cited as the "Washington, D.C. Admission Act".

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS—The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents. TITLE I—STATE OF WASHINGTON, D.C.

Subtitle A—Procedures for Admission

Sec. 101. Admission into the Union. Sec. 102. Election of Senators and Representative. Sec. 103. Issuance of presidential proclamation.

Subtitle B—Seat of Government of the United States


Subtitle C—General Provisions Relating to Laws of State


TITLE II—INTERESTS OF FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Subtitle A—Federal Property


Subtitle B—Federal Courts

Sec. 203. Jurisdiction over suits brought by or against the District. Sec. 204. Jurisdiction over suits brought by or against the United States. Sec. 221. Waiver of sovereign immunity.

Subtitle C—Federal Elections

Sec. 231. Voting in Federal elections.

Subtitle D—Agencies

Sec. 241. Agencies of the District.

TITLE III—CONTINUATION OF CERTAIN AUTHORITIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Subtitle A—Employee Benefits

Sec. 301. Federal benefit payments under certain retirement programs.

Subtitle B—Seat of Government of the United States

Sec. 311. Terms and conditions of office of President and Vice-President.

Subtitle C—Other Programs and Authorities

Sec. 321. Application of the 23rd Amendment.

Sec. 322. Treatment of pretrial services in United States District Court.

Sec. 323. Repeal of law providing for participation of seat of government in election of President and Vice-President.

Sec. 324. Expedited procedures for consideration of constitutional amendment repealing 23rd Amendment.

TITLE IV—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Sec. 401. General definitions.

Sec. 402. Statehood Transition Commission.

Sec. 403. Certification of enactment by President.
TITLE I—STATE OF WASHINGTON, D.C.

Subtitle A—Procedures for Admission

SEC. 101. ADMISSION INTO THE UNION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to the provisions of this Act, upon the issuance of the proclamation requiring the Mayor to issue a proclamation for the admission of the District of Columbia into the Union, the United States shall consist of all of the States in the District of Columbia, and the District of Columbia shall be admitted to seats in Congress and to all the other rights, privileges, and duties of the other States in Congress.

(b) CONSTITUTION OF STATE.—The State Constitution shall contain an additional article stating the Constitution of the States or the principles of the Declaration of Independence.

(c) NONSEVERABILITY.—If any provision of this section or the application thereof to any person or circumstance, is held to be invalid, the remaining provisions of this Act and any amendments made by this Act shall be treated as invalid.

SEC. 102. ELECTION OF SENATORS AND REPRESENTATIVES.

(a) ISSUANCE OF PROCLAMATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not more than 30 days after receiving certification of the enactment of this Act from the President pursuant to section 403, the Mayor shall issue a proclamation for the first election of Senators and Representatives required to be elected as provided in subsection (a) shall be entitled to be considered in Congress from the State, subject to the provisions of this section.

(2) SPECIAL RULE FOR ELECTIONS OF SENATORS AND REPRESENTATIVES.—In the elections of Senators and Representatives required to be elected as provided in subsection (a), the State shall consist of all of the territory of the District of Columbia as of the date of the enactment of this Act, subject to the provisions of this section.

(b) RULES FOR CONDUCTING ELECTIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The proclamation of the Mayor issued under subsection (a) shall provide for the holding of a primary election and a general election, and at such elections the officers required to be elected as provided in subsection (a) shall be chosen by the qualified voters of the District of Columbia in the manner required by the laws of the District of Columbia.

(2) CERTIFICATION OF RESULTS.—The election results shall be determined in the manner required by the laws of the District of Columbia, except that the Mayor shall also provide written certification of the results of such elections to the President.

(c) ASSUMPTION OF DUTIES.—Upon the admission of the State into the Union, the Senators and Representatives elected at the elections described in subsection (a) shall be entitled to be seated in Congress and to all the rights and privileges of Senators and Representatives of the other States in Congress.

(d) EFFECT OF ADMISSION ON HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES MEMBERSHIP.—

(1) PERMANENT INCREASE IN NUMBER OF MEMBERS.—With respect to the Congress occurring after the admission of the State into the Union and each succeeding Congress, the House of Representatives shall be composed of 436 Members, including any Members representing the State.

(2) INITIAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIVES FOR STATE.—Until the taking effect of the first apportionment occurring after the admission of the State into the Union, the State shall be entitled to one Representative in the House of Representatives upon its admission into the Union.

(3) APPORTIONMENT OF MEMBERS RESULTING FROM ADMISSION OF STATE.—

(A) APPOINTMENT.—Section 22(a) of the Act entitled "The United States Constitution" is amended by inserting "or the District of Columbia" in lieu of all that portion of the Act entitled "the States" and subsequent decennial censuses and to provide for apportionment of Representatives in Congress," approved June 18, 1929 (2 U.S.C. 204(a)), is amended by striking "the then existing number of Representatives" and inserting "436 Representatives."

(B) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subparagraph (A) shall apply with respect to the first regular decennial census conducted after the admission of the State into the Union and each subsequent decennial census thereafter.

SEC. 103. ISSUANCE OF PRESIDENTIAL PROCLAMATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The President, upon the certification of the results of the election of officers required to be elected as provided in section 102(a), shall, not later than 90 days after receiving such certification pursuant to section 102(b)(2), issue a proclamation ascertaining the results of such elections as so ascertained.

(b) ADMISSION OF STATE UPON ISSUANCE OF PROCLAMATION.—Upon the issuance of the proclamation required by subsection (a), the President shall issue a proclamation for the admission of the State into the Union as provided in section 101(a).

Subtitle B—Seat of Government of the United States

SEC. 111. TERRITORY AND BOUNDARIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (b), the State shall consist of all of the territory of the District of Columbia as of the date of the enactment of this Act, subject to the provisions of this section.

(b) EXCEPTIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The territory of the State shall not include the area described in section 102, which shall be known as the "Capital" and shall consist of the property designated as the Capital, as described in section 112(a).

(2) GENERAL DESCRIPTION.—The Constitution of the United States and the laws of the District of Columbia shall be the laws of the District of Columbia, except that the Mayor shall also provide written certification of the results of such elections to the President.

(c) ASSUMPTION OF DUTIES.—Upon the admission of the State into the Union, the Senators and Representatives elected at the elections described in subsection (a) shall be entitled to be seated in Congress and to all the rights and privileges of Senators and Representatives of the other States in Congress.

(d) EFFECT OF ADMISSION ON HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES MEMBERSHIP.—

(1) PERMANENT INCREASE IN NUMBER OF MEMBERS.—With respect to the Congress occurring after the admission of the State into the Union and each succeeding Congress, the House of Representatives shall be composed of 436 Members, including any Members representing the State.

(2) INITIAL NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIVES FOR STATE.—Until the taking effect of the first apportionment occurring after the admission of the State into the Union, the State shall be entitled to one Representative in the House of Representatives upon its admission into the Union.

(3) APPORTIONMENT OF MEMBERS RESULTING FROM ADMISSION OF STATE.—

(A) APPOINTMENT.—Section 22(a) of the Act entitled "The United States Constitution" is amended by inserting "or the District of Columbia" in lieu of all that portion of the Act entitled "the States" and subsequent decennial censuses and to provide for apportionment of Representatives in Congress," approved June 18, 1929 (2 U.S.C. 204(a)), is amended by striking "the then existing number of Representatives" and inserting "436 Representatives."

(B) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subparagraph (A) shall apply with respect to the first regular decennial census conducted after the admission of the State into the Union and each subsequent decennial census thereafter.

SEC. 112. DESCRIPTION OF CAPITAL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsection (c), upon the admission of the State into the Union, the Capital shall consist of the property described in subsection (b) and shall include the principal Federal monuments, the White House, the Capitol Building, the United States Supreme Court Building, the executive, legislative, and judicial office buildings located adjacent to the Mall and the Capitol Building (as such terms are used in section 8501(a) of title 40, United States Code).

(b) GENERAL DESCRIPTION.—Upon the admission of the State into the Union, the boundaries of the Capital shall be as follows: Beginning at the intersection of the southern right-of-way of F Street NE and the eastern right-of-way of 2nd Street NE; (1) thence south along said eastern right-of-way of 2nd Street NE to its intersection with the northeastern right-of-way of Maryland Avenue NE; (2) thence southwest along said northeastern right-of-way of Maryland Avenue NE to its intersection with the northern right-of-way of Constitution Avenue NE; (3) thence west along said northern right-of-way of Constitution Avenue NE to its intersection with the eastern right-of-way of 1st Street NE; (4) thence south along said eastern right-of-way of 1st Street NE to its intersection with the southeastern right-of-way of Maryland Avenue NE; (5) thence northwest along said southeastern right-of-way of Maryland Avenue NE to its intersection with the eastern right-of-way of 2nd Street SE; (6) thence south along said eastern right-of-way of 2nd Street SE to the eastern right-of-way of C Street SE; (7) thence south along said eastern right-of-way of 2nd Street SE to its intersection with the northern right-of-way of Independence Avenue SW; (8) thence east along said northern right-of-way of Independence Avenue SE to its intersection with the northeastern right-of-way of Pennsylvania Avenue SW; (9) thence northwest along said northeastern right-of-way of Pennsylvania Avenue SW to its intersection with the eastern right-of-way of South Capitol Street; (10) thence south along said eastern right-of-way of South Capitol Street to its intersection with the southeastern right-of-way of Canal Street SE; (11) thence southeast along said southeastern right-of-way of Canal Street SE to its intersection with the southern right-of-way of E Street SE; (12) thence west along said southern right-of-way of E Street SW to its intersection with the southwestern right-of-way of New Jersey Avenue SE; (13) thence north along said southwestern right-of-way of New Jersey Avenue SE to its intersection with the northwestern right-of-way of Virginia Avenue SE; (14) thence northwest along said northwestern right-of-way of Virginia Avenue SE to its intersection with the western right-of-way of 1st Street SE; (15) thence north along said southern right-of-way of 1st Street SE to its intersection with the northwestern right-of-way of Square 760 Lot 801; (16) thence west along said southern right-of-way of Square 760 Lot 801 to its intersection with the southwestern right-of-way of New Jersey Avenue SE; (17) thence southeast along said southwestern right-of-way of New Jersey Avenue SE to its intersection with the northwestern right-of-way of Square 760 Lot 801; (18) thence south along said southern right-of-way of Square 760 Lot 801 to its intersection with the southwestern right-of-way of Square 760 Lot 802; (19) thence north along said southern right-of-way of Square 760 Lot 802 to its intersection with the southwestern right-of-way of New Jersey Avenue SE; (20) thence east along said southwestern right-of-way of New Jersey Avenue SE to its intersection with the southeastern right-of-way of Virginia Avenue SE; (21) thence north along said southeastern right-of-way of Virginia Avenue SE to its intersection with the western right-of-way of 3rd Street SW; (22) thence west along said southeastern right-of-way of 3rd Street SW to its end; (23) thence west along a line extending south from the southwestern right-of-way of E Street SW westward to its intersection with the western right-of-way of 3rd Street SW; (24) thence south along said southern right-of-way of 3rd Street SW to its end; (25) thence north along said southern right-of-way of 3rd Street SW to its intersection with the southeastern right-of-way of Square 760 Lot 802; (26) thence north along said southern right-of-way of Square 760 Lot 802 to its intersection with the southwestern right-of-way of Square 760 Lot 803; (27) thence northwest along said southwestern right-of-way of Square 760 Lot 803 to its intersection with the northern right-of-way of 4th Street SW; (28) thence north along said northern right-of-way of 4th Street SW to its intersection with the eastern right-of-way of 4th Street SW; (29) thence north along said eastern right-of-way of 4th Street SW to its intersection with the eastern right-of-way of 5th Street SW; (30) thence north along said eastern right-of-way of 5th Street SW to its intersection with the eastern right-of-way of 6th Street SW;
(32) thence north along said eastern right-of-
way of 6th Street SW to its intersection with the
northern right-of-way of Independence Avenue
SW;
(33) thence west along said northern right-of-
way of Independence Avenue SW to its intersec-
tion with the western right-of-way of 12th Street
SW;
(34) thence south along said western right-of-
way of 12th Street SW to its intersection with the
northern right-of-way of D Street SW;
(35) thence west along said northern right-of-
way of D Street SW to its intersection with the
northeastern boundary of the Consolidated Rail
Corporation railroad easement;
(36) thence south along said northeastern
boundary of the Consolidated Rail Corporation
railroad easement to its intersection with the
eastern shore of the Potomac River;
(37) thence generally northwest along said
eastern shore of the Potomac River to its intersec-
tion with a line extending westward the north-
ern boundary of the property designated as
Square 12 Lot 806;
(38) thence east along said line extending
westward the northern boundary of the prop-
erty designated as Square 12 Lot 806 to its inter-
section with the western boundary of the prop-
erty designated as Square 33 Lot 87;
(41) thence south along said western bound-
ary of the property designated as Square 33 Lot 87
to its intersection with the northwest corner
of the property designated as Square 33 Lot 88;
(42) thence counter-clockwise around the
boundary of said property designated as Square
33 Lot 88 to its southeastern corner, which is along
the northern right-of-way of E Street NW;
(43) thence east along said northern right-of-
way of E Street NW to its intersection with the
western right-of-way of 18th Street NW;
(44) thence south along said western right-of-
way of 18th Street NW to its intersection with the
southern right-of-way of Virginia Avenue
NW;
(45) thence southeast along said southwestern
right-of-way of Virginia Avenue NW to its inter-
section with the northern right-of-way of Con-
stitution Avenue NW;
(46) thence east along said southern right-of-
way of Constitution Avenue NW to its intersec-
tion with the eastern right-of-way of 17th Street
NW;
(47) thence north along said eastern right-of-
way of 17th Street NW to its intersection with the
southern right-of-way of H Street NW;
(48) thence east along said southern right-of-
way of H Street NW to its intersection with the
northeast corner of the property designated as
Square 221 Lot 820;
(49) thence south along the boundary of said
property designated as Square 221 Lot 820 to its
southwestern corner, which is along the
western right-of-way of Pennsylvania Avenue
NW;
(50) thence west along said southern right-of-
way of Pennsylvania Avenue NW to its intersec-
tion with the western right-of-way of Constitution
Avenue NW;
(51) thence south along the boundary of said
property designated as Square 221 Lot 818 to its
southeastern corner, which is along the
northeastern right-of-way of Pennsylvania Avenue
NW;
(52) thence east along the boundary of said
property designated as Square 221 Lot 84 to its
southeastern corner;
(53) thence east along the southern border of
said property designated as Square 221 Lot 40 to
its intersection with the northwest corner of the
property designated as Square 221 Lot 820;
(54) thence south along the western boundary
of said property designated as Square 221 Lot 820 to its
southeastern corner, which is along the
northern right-of-way of Pennsylvania Avenue
NW;
(55) thence east along said northern right-of-
way of Pennsylvania Avenue NW to its intersec-
tion with the western right-of-way of 15th Street
NW;
(56) thence south along said western right-of-
way of 15th Street NW to its intersection with a
line extending northwest from the southern
right-of-way of Pennsylvania Avenue NW north of
Pershing Square;
(57) thence southeast along said line extend-
ing the southern right-of-way of Pennsylvania
Avenue NW to its intersection with the northeastern
right-of-way of Constitution Avenue NW;
(58) thence south along the boundary of said
property designated as Square 221 Lot 820 to its
southwestern corner, which is along the
northern right-of-way of Pennsylvania Avenue
NW;
(59) thence east along said southern right-of-
way of Pennsylvania Avenue NW to its intersection
with the western right-of-way of 14th Street
NW;
(60) thence south along said western right-of-
way of 14th Street NW to its intersection with a
line extending west from the southern right-of-
way of D Street NW;
(61) thence east along said line extending west
from the southern right-of-way of D Street NW
to the southern right-of-way of D Street NW,
and continuing east along said southern right-of-
way of D Street NW to its intersection with the
eastern right-of-way of 13 1/2 Street NW;
(62) thence north along said eastern right-of-
way of 13 1/2 Street NW to its intersection with the
southern right-of-way of Pennsylvania Avenue
NW;
(63) thence east and southeast along said
southern right-of-way of Pennsylvania Avenue
NW to its intersection with the western right-of-
way of 12th Street NW;
(64) thence south along said western right-of-
way of 12th Street NW to its intersection with a
line extending to the west the southern bound-
ary of the property designated as Square 324 Lot
809;
(65) thence east along said line to the south-
western corner of the property designated as
Square 324 Lot 809, and continuing northeast
along the southern boundary of the property
designated as Square 324 Lot 809 to its intersec-
tion with the southwestern right-of-way of 8th Street
NE;
(66) thence north along the boundary of said
property designated as Square 324 Lot 802 to its
northeastern corner, which is along the
northeastern right-of-way of 8th Street NE;
(67) thence southeast along said northeastern
right-of-way of 8th Street NE to its intersection with
the eastern right-of-way of 3rd Street NW;
(68) thence east along said southern right-of-
way of 3rd Street NW to its intersection with the
southern right-of-way of F Street NW;
(69) thence south along said southern right-of-
way of F Street NW to the point of beginning.

(c) EXCLUSION OF BUILDING SERVING AS
STATE CAPITOL.—Notwithstanding any other provision
of this section, after the admission of the State
into the Union, the Capital shall not be consid-
ered to include the building known as the “John
A. Wilson Building”, as described and des-
ignated under section 601(a) of the Omnibus
Spending Reduction Act of 1993 (sec. 10-1301(a),

(d) CLARIFICATION OF TREATMENT OF
FRANCES PERKINS BUILDING.—The entirety of the
Frances Perkins Building, including any portion of
the Building which is north of D Street Northwest,
west of Taylor Street, south of 9th Street North,
and east of 18th Street North shall be included in
the Union.

SEC. 113. RETENTION OF TITLE TO PROPERTY.

(a) RETENTION OF FEDERAL TITLE.—The
United States shall have and retain title to, or
jurisdiction over, for purposes of administration
and maintenance, all real and personal property
with respect to which the United States holds
title or jurisdiction for such purposes on the day
before the date of the admission of the State into
the Union.

(b) RETENTION OF STATE TITLE.—The State
shall have and retain title to, or jurisdiction over,
for purposes of administration and mainte-
nance, all real and personal property with re-
spect to which the District of Columbia holds
title or jurisdiction for such purposes on the day
before the date of the admission of the State into
the Union.

SEC. 114. EFFECT OF ADMISSION ON CURRENT
LAWS OF SEAT OF GOVERNMENT
OF UNITED STATES.

Except as otherwise provided in this Act, the
laws of the District of Columbia which are in ef-
fect on the day before the date of the admission
of the State into the Union (without regard to
which laws were enacted by Congress or by the
District of Columbia) shall apply in the
Capital in the same manner and to the same ex-
tent beginning on the date of the admission of
the State into the Union. The laws of the United States which are applicable
only in or to the Capital.
SEC. 115. CAPITAL NATIONAL GUARD.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—Title 32, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) DEFINITIONS.—In paragraphs (4), (6), and (19) of section 101, by striking “District of Columbia” each place it appears and inserting “Capital”.

(2) DESCRIPTIONS AND ORGANIZATIONS.—In section 103, by striking “District of Columbia” and inserting “Capital”.

(3) UNITS: LOCATION; ORGANIZATION; COMMANDERS.—In subsections (a) and (d) of section 104, by striking “District of Columbia” both places it appears and inserting “Capital”.

(4) AVAILABILITY OF APPROPRIATIONS.—In section 105, by striking “District of Columbia” and inserting “Capital National Guard”.

(5) MAINTENANCE OF OTHER TROOPS.—In subsections (a) and (c) of section 106, by striking “District of Columbia” each place it appears and inserting “Capital”.

(6) DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER-DUG ACTIVITIES.—In section 112(b), by striking “District of Columbia,” both places it appears and inserting “Capital,”; and

(b) in paragraph (2), by striking “National Guard of the District of Columbia” and inserting “Capital National Guard”.

(7) ENLISTMENT.—In section 304, by striking “District of Columbia” and inserting “Capital”.

(8) ADJUTANTS GENERAL.—In section 314, by striking “District of Columbia” each place it appears and inserting “Capital”.

(9) DETAIL OF REGULAR MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES OF THE UNITED STATES TO THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.—In section 315, by striking “District of Columbia” each place it appears and inserting “Capital”.

(10) DISCHARGE OF OFFICERS: TERMINATION OF APPOINTMENT.—In section 324(b), by striking “District of Columbia” and inserting “Capital”.

(11) RECALL FROM NATIONAL GUARD DUTY WHEN ORDERED TO ACTIVE DUTY.—In subsections (a) and (b) of section 325, by striking “District of Columbia” each place it appears and inserting “Capital”.

(12) COURTS-MARTIAL OF NATIONAL GUARD NOT IN FEDERAL SERVICE: COMPOSITION, JURISDICTION, AND PROCEDURES: CONVICTING AUTHORITY.—In sections 326 and 327, by striking “District of Columbia” each place it appears and inserting “Capital”.

(13) ACTIVE GUARD AND RESERVE DUTY: GOVERNOR’S AUTHORITY.—In section 328(a), by striking “District of Columbia” and inserting “Capital”.

(14) TRAINING GENERALLY.—In section 501(b), by striking “District of Columbia” and inserting “Capital”.

(15) PARTICIPATION IN FIELD EXERCISES.—In section 503(b), by striking “District of Columbia” and inserting “Capital”.

(16) NATIONAL GUARD SCHOOLS AND SMALL ARM’S COMPETITIONS.—In section 504(b), by striking “District of Columbia” and inserting “Capital”.

(17) ARMY AND AIR FORCE SCHOOLS AND FIELD EXERCISES.—In section 505, by striking “National Guard of the District of Columbia” and inserting “Capital National Guard.”

(18) YOUTH CHALLENGE PROGRAM.—In subsections (c)(1), (g)(2), (h), and (j)(1) of section 509, by striking “District of Columbia” each place it appears and inserting “Capital”.

(19) ISSUE OF SUPPLIES.—In section 702—

(A) in subsection (a), by striking “National Guard of the District of Columbia” and inserting “Capital National Guard”; and

(B) in subsections (b), (c), and (d), by striking “District of Columbia” each place it appears and inserting “Capital”.

(20) PURCHASES OF SUPPLIES FROM ARMY OR AIR FORCE.—In subsections (a) and (b) of section 703, by striking “District of Columbia” both places it appears and inserting “Capital”.

(21) ACCOUNTABILITY: RELIEF FROM ORDERS TO ACTIVE DUTY.—In section 704, by striking “District of Columbia” and inserting “Capital”.

(22) PROPERTY AND FISCAL OFFICERS.—In section 708—

(A) in subsection (a), by striking “National Guard of the District of Columbia” and inserting “Capital National Guard”; and

(B) in subsection (d), by striking “District of Columbia” and inserting “Capital”.

(23) ACCOUNTABILITY FOR PROPERTY ISSUED TO THE NATIONAL GUARD.—In subsections (c), (d), (e), and (f) of section 710, by striking “District of Columbia” each place it appears and inserting “Capital”.

(24) DISPOSITION OF OBSOLETE OR CONDEMNED PROPERTY.—In section 711, by striking “District of Columbia” and inserting “Capital”.

(25) DISPOSITION OF PROCEEDS OF CONDEMNED PROPERTY.—In paragraphs (1) of section 712, by striking “District of Columbia” and inserting “Capital”.

(26) PROPERTY LOSS: PERSONAL INJURY OR DEATH.—In section 715(c), by striking “District of Columbia” and inserting “Capital”.

(b) CONFIRMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) CAPITAL DEFINED.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Section 101 of title 32, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:—

“(20) ‘Capital’ means the area serving as the seat of the Government of the United States, as described in section 112 of the Washington, D.C. Admission Act.”

(B) WITH RESPECT TO HOMELAND DEFENSE ACTIVITIES.—Section 901 of title 32, United States Code, is amended—

(i) in paragraph (3), by striking “District of Columbia” and inserting “Capital’; and

(ii) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(3) The term ‘Capital’ means, with respect to the Capital, the commanding general of the Capital National Guard.”

(2) TITLE I, UNITED STATES CODE.—Title I, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(A) DEFINITIONS.—In section 101—

(i) in subsection (a), by striking at the end the following new paragraph:

“(20) ‘Capital’ means the area serving as the seat of the Government of the United States, as described in section 112 of the Washington, D.C. Admission Act.”

(ii) in paragraphs (2) and (4) of subsection (c), by striking “District of Columbia” both places it appears and inserting “Capital”;

and

(iii) in subsection (d)(5), by striking “District of Columbia” and inserting “Capital”.

(B) DISPOSAL.—In section 711(a), by striking “District of Columbia” and inserting “Capital”.

(C) TRICARE COVERAGE FOR CERTAIN MEMBERS OF THE NATIONAL GUARD AND DEPENDENTS DURING CERTAIN DISASTER RESPONSE DUTY.—In section 1076—

(i) in subsections (a) and (c)(1), by striking “with respect to the District of Columbia, the mayor of the District of Columbia” both places it appears and inserting “with respect to the Capital, the commanding general of the Capital National Guard”;

and

(ii) in subsection (c)(2), by striking “District of Columbia” and inserting “Capital”.

(D) PAYMENT OF LIABILITY OF APPROPRIATIONS.—In paragraph (2)(B) of section 2732, by striking “District of Columbia” and inserting “Capital”.

(E) MEMBERS OF ARMY NATIONAL GUARD: DETAIL AS STUDENTS, OBSERVERS, AND INVESTIGATORS AT EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS, INDUSTRIAL PLANTS, AND HOSPITALS.—In section 746(c), by striking “District of Columbia” and inserting “Capital”.

(F) MEMBERS OF MILITIA: DETAIL AS STUDENTS, OBSERVERS, AND INVESTIGATORS AT EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS, INDUSTRIAL PLANTS, AND HOSPITALS.—In section 9401(c), by striking “District of Columbia” and inserting “Capital”.

(G) MEDICAL PERSONNEL.—In paragraph (1), by satisfactorily perform prescribed training.—In section 1014(b)—

(i) by striking “District of Columbia,” and inserting “Capital,”; and

(ii) by striking “District of Columbia National Guard” and inserting “Capital National Guard”.

(H) CHIEF OF THE NATIONAL GUARD BUREAU.—In section 1962(a)(1)—

(i) by striking “District of Columbia,” and inserting “Capital,”; and

(ii) by striking “District of Columbia National Guard” and inserting “Capital National Guard”.

(I) VICE CHIEF OF THE NATIONAL GUARD BUREAU.—In section 1965(a)(1)(A)—

(i) by striking “District of Columbia,” and inserting “Capital,”; and

(ii) by striking “District of Columbia National Guard” and inserting “Capital National Guard”.

(J) OTHER SENIOR NATIONAL GUARD BUREAUX OFFICERS.—In subparagraphs (A) and (B) of section 1966(a)(1)—

(i) by striking “District of Columbia,” both places it appears and inserting “Capital,”; and

(ii) by striking “District of Columbia National Guard” and inserting “Capital National Guard”.

(K) NATIONAL GUARD BUREAU: GENERAL PROVISIONS.—In section 10508(b)(1), by striking “District of Columbia” and inserting “Capital”.

(L) COMMISSIONED OFFICERS: ORIGINAL APPOINTMENT; LIMITATION.—In section 1204(b), by striking “District of Columbia” and inserting “Capital”.

(M) RESERVE COMPONENTS GENERALLY.—In section 12201(b), by striking “District of Columbia National Guard” and inserting “Capital National Guard”.

(N) NATIONAL GUARD IN FEDERAL SERVICE: CALL.—In section 12406—

(i) by striking “District of Columbia,” and inserting “Capital,”; and

(ii) by striking “National Guard of the District of Columbia” and inserting “Capital National Guard”.

(O) RESULT OF FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH STANDARDS AND QUALIFICATIONS.—In section 12406(c), by striking “District of Columbia” and inserting “Capital”.

(P) LIMITATION ON RELOCATION OF NATIONAL GUARD UNITS.—In section 12423—

(i) by striking “District of Columbia,” and inserting “Capital,”; and

(ii) by striking “National Guard of the District of Columbia” and inserting “Capital National Guard”.

SEC. 116. TERMINATION OF LEGAL STATUS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AS MUNICIPAL CORPORATION.

Notwithstanding section 2 of the Revised Statutes relating to the District of Columbia (sec. 1–102, D.C. Official Code) or any other provision of law codified in subchapter I of chapter 1 of the District of Columbia Official Code, effective upon the date of the admission of the State into the Union, the Capital (or any portion thereof) shall not serve as a government and shall not be a body corporate for municipal purposes.

Subtitle C—General Provisions Relating to Various Laws of State

SEC. 121. EFFECT OF ADMISSION ON CURRENT LAWS.

(a) LEGISLATIVE POWER.—The legislative power of the State shall extend to all rightful matters of legislation in the State, consistent with the Constitution of the United States (including the restrictions and limitations imposed upon the States by article 1, section 10) and subject to the provisions of this Act.

(b) CONTINUATION OF AUTHORITY AND DUTIES OF MEMBERS OF EXECUTIVE, LEGISLATIVE, AND JUDICIAL OFFICES OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.—The respective executive, legislative, and judicial offices of the District of Columbia shall be deemed members of the respective executive, legislative, and judicial offices of the State, as provided by the State Constitution and the laws of the State.
(c) TREATMENT OF FEDERAL LAWS.—To the extent that any law of the United States applies to the States generally, the law shall have the same force and effect in the State as elsewhere in the United States, except as such law may otherwise provide.

(d) NO EFFECT ON EXISTING CONTRACTS.—Nothing in the admission of the State into the Union shall affect any obligation under any contract or agreement under which the District of Columbia or the United States is a party, as in effect on the day before the date of the admission of the State into the Union.

(e) SUCCESSION IN INTERSTATE COMPACTS.—The State shall be deemed to be the successor to the District of Columbia in all matters.

(f) CONFORMATION OF SERVICE OF FEDERAL MESSAGES ON BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS.—Nothing in the admission of the State into the Union shall affect the authority of a representative of the Federal Government who, as of the day before the date of the admission of the State into the Union, is a member of a board or commission of the District of Columbia to serve as a member of such board or commission or as a member of a successor board or commission after the admission of the State into the Union, as may be provided by the State Constitution and the laws of the State.

(g) SPECIAL RULE REGARDING ENFORCEMENT AUTHORITY OF UNITED STATES CAPITOL POLICE, UNITED STATES PARK POLICE, AND UNITED STATES SECRET SERVICE UNIFORMED DIVISION.—The United States Capitol Police, the United States Park Police, and the United States Secret Service Uniformed Division may enforce any law of the District of Columbia, except to the extent authorized by the State. Nothing in this subsection may be construed to affect the authority of the United States Capitol Police, the United States Park Police, and the United States Secret Service Uniformed Division to enforce any law in the Capital.

SEC. 122. PENDING ACTIONS AND PROCEEDINGS.

(a) STATE AS LEGAL SUCCESSION TO DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.—The State shall be the legal successor to the District of Columbia in all matters.

(b) NO EFFECT ON PENDING PROCEEDINGS.—All existing writs, actions, suits, judicial and administrative proceedings, civil or criminal liabilities, prosecutions, judgments, sentences, orders, decrees, appeals, causes of action, claims, demands, titles, and rights shall continue unaffected by the admission of the State of the United States with respect to the State or the United States, except as may be provided under this Act, as may be modified in accordance with the provisions of the State Constitution, and as may be modified by the laws of the State or the United States, as the case may be.

SEC. 123. LIMITATION ON AUTHORITY TO TAX FEDERAL PROPERTY.

The State may not impose any tax on any real or personal property owned or acquired by the United States, except to the extent that Congress may permit.

SEC. 124. UNITED STATES NATIONALITY.

No provision of this Act shall operate to confer United States nationality, to terminate nationality lawfully acquired, or to restore nationality lost or waived under any law of the United States or under any treaty to which the United States is or was a party.

TITLE II—INTERESTS OF FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Subtitle A—Federal Property

SEC. 201. TREATMENT OF MILITARY LANDS.

(a) RESERVATION OF FEDERAL AUTHORITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2) and subsection (b) and notwithstanding the admission of the District of Columbia, authority over military lands is reserved in the United States for the exercise by Congress of the power of exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever over such tracts or parcels of land located in the State that, on the day before the date of the admission of the State into the Union, are controlled or owned by the United States and held for defense or Coast Guard purposes.

(2) LIMITATION ON AUTHORITY.—The power of exclusive legislation described in paragraph (1) shall be subject to any law of the United States only so long as the particular tract or parcel of land involved is controlled or owned by the United States and held for defense or Coast Guard purposes.

(b) AUTHORITY OF STATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The reservation of authority in the United States under subsection (a) shall not operate to confer power on the State to prevent the United States from exercising its function over the tract of land described in paragraph (1) if the State (A) by an act of the State legislature, or (B) by the invocation of a power of the State under section 44(c) of title 28, United States Code, or (C) by a provision of the State Constitution, or (D) by any other law of the State, or (E) by any law of the United States, granted authority to the United States to prevent the United States from exercising its function over the tract of land described in paragraph (1). The right to exercise such function shall be preserved in effect on the day before the date of the admission of the State into the Union.

(2) SERVICE OF PROCESS.—The State shall have the right to serve civil or criminal process in such tracts or parcels of land in which the authority under subsection (a) extends, by calling for service of process in the tract of land involved, or in any action or proceeding under subsection (a) in suits or process for or on account of rights acquired, obligations incurred, or crimes committed in the State but outside of such lands.

SEC. 202. WAIVER OF CLAIMS TO FEDERAL PROPERTY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—As a compact with the United States, the State and its people disclaim all right and title to any real or personal property not granted or confirmed to the State by or under the authority of this Act, the right or title to which is held by the United States or subject to disposition by the United States.

(b) EFFECT ON CLAIMS AGAINST UNITED STATES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Nothing in this Act shall recognize, deny, enlarge, impair, or otherwise affect any claim against the United States, and any such claim shall be governed by applicable laws of the United States.

(2) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this Act is intended or shall be construed as a finding, interpretation, or construction by Congress that any applicable law authorizes, establishes, recognizes, or confirms the validity or invalidity of any claim referred to in paragraph (1), and the determination of any such claim shall be unaffected by anything in this Act.

Subtitle B—Federal Courts

SEC. 211. RESIDENCY REQUIREMENTS FOR CERTAIN FEDERAL OFFICIALS.

(a) CIRCUIT JUDGES.—Section 44(c) of title 28, United States Code, is amended—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Nothing in this Act shall require or disallow any circuit judge—

(A) in the first column, by striking “District of Columbia” and inserting “Capital” ;

(B) in the second column, by striking “District of Columbia” and inserting “Capital; Washington, Douglass Commonwealth and the Capital”; and

(C) by amending the first paragraph to read as follows:

“State of Washington, Douglass Commonwealth and the Capital.”;

(2) TERMS OF COURT.—Section 48(a) of such title is amended by striking “District of Columbia” and inserting “Capital”;

(b) APPOINTMENT OF INDEPENDENT COUNSEL BY CHIEF JUDGE OF CIRCUIT.—Section 88 of such title is amended to read as follows:

“88. Washington, Douglass Commonwealth and the Capital.”

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS RELATING TO COURT OF APPEALS.—Title 28, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) APPOINTMENT OF JUDGES.—Section 44(a) of such title is amended in the first column by striking “District of Columbia” and inserting “Capital”.

(2) TERMS OF COURT.—Section 48(a) of such title is amended—

(A) in the first column, by striking “District of Columbia” and inserting “Capital”;

(B) in the second column, by striking “District of Columbia” and inserting “Capital”;

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS RELATING TO DISTRICT COURT.—Title 28, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) APPOINTMENT OF JUDGES.—Section 133(a) of such title is amended in the first column by striking “District of Columbia” and inserting “Capital”.

(2) DISTRICT COURT JURISDICTION OF TAX CASES BROUGHT AGAINST UNITED STATES.—Section 1343 of such title is amended by striking “the District of Columbia Circuit” and inserting “the Capital Circuit”.

(3) DISTRICT COURT JURISDICTION OVER CIVIL ACTIONS BROUGHT AGAINST A FOREIGN STATE.—Section 1341(i)(4) of such title is amended by striking “District of Columbia” and inserting “Washington, Douglass Commonwealth and the Capital”.

(4) DISTRICT COURT JURISDICTION OVER CIVIL ACTIONS BROUGHT AGAINST THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.—Section 1355(b)(2) of such title is amended by striking “District of Columbia” and inserting “Washington, Douglass Commonwealth and the Capital”.

(d) CRIMINAL JURISDICTION.—Section 1355(b)(3) of such title is amended by striking “District of Columbia” and inserting “Washington, Douglass Commonwealth and the Capital”.

(e) CLERKS OF DISTRICT COURTS.—Section 751(c) of such title is amended by striking “the District of Columbia and”;

(f) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to individuals appointed after the date of the admission of the State into the Union.

SEC. 212. RENAMING OF FEDERAL COURTS.

(a) RENAMING.—

(1) CIRCUIT COURT.—Section 41 of title 28, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in the first column, by striking “District of Columbia” and inserting “Capital”;

(B) in the second column, by striking “District of Columbia” and inserting “Capital; Washington, Douglass Commonwealth and the Capital”;

(C) in the second column, by striking “District of Columbia” and inserting “Washington, Douglass Commonwealth and the Capital”.

(b) AUTHORITY OF STATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The provision of this Act shall be construed to affect the authority of the State.

(2) CIRCUIT COURT.—Section 1355(b)(2) of such title is amended by striking “Washington, Douglass Commonwealth and the Capital” and inserting “Washington; Douglass Commonwealth and the Capital”.

(c) SPECIAL RULING REGARDING ENFORCEMENT AUTHORITY OF UNITED STATES CAPITOL POLICE, UNITED STATES PARK POLICE, AND UNITED STATES SECRET SERVICE UNIFORMED DIVISION.—The United States Capitol Police, the United States Park Police, and the United States Secret Service Uniformed Division may enforce any law of the District of Columbia, except to the extent authorized by the State. Nothing in this subsection may be construed to affect the authority of the United States Capitol Police, the United States Park Police, and the United States Secret Service Uniformed Division to enforce any law in the Capital.

SEC. 213. LIMITATION ON AUTHORITY TO TAX FEDERAL PROPERTY.

The State may not impose any tax on any real or personal property owned or acquired by the United States, except to the extent that Congress may permit.

SEC. 124. UNITED STATES NATIONALITY.

No provision of this Act shall operate to confer United States nationality, to terminate nationality lawfully acquired, or to restore nationality lost or waived under any law of the United States or under any treaty to which the United States is or was a party.
sec. 223. repeal of law relating to district of columbia delegate.

(a) in general.—sections 202 and 204 of the district of columbia delegate act (public law 93–736; sections 1–401 and 1–402, d.c. official code) are repealed, and the provisions of law amended or repealed by such sections are restored or revived if such sections had not been repealed.

(b) conforming amendments to district of columbia elections code of 1955.—the district of columbia elections code of 1955 is amended—

(1) in section 1 (sec. 1–1001.01, d.c. official code), by striking “the delegate to congress for the district of columbia,” and

(2) in section 3 (sec. 1–1001.03, d.c. official code), by striking “the district of columbia election board.”

sec. 224. repeal of law relating to seat of government.

(a) in general.—chapter 1 of title 3, united states code, is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (6), (b) in paragraph (12), by striking “except the delegate to congress for the district of columbia,” and

(2) in section 1 (sec. 1–1001.01, d.c. official code), by striking “the district of columbia.”
be in order; and
postpone;
the same effect has been disagreed to) to move to
date the joint resolution is introduced in the
of the Standing Rules of the Senate, it is in
motion is disposed of shall not be in order.
the motion to proceed on the joint resolution;
be placed immediately on the calendar.
production in the Senate, the joint resolution shall
REPRESENTATIVES.—
than 30 legislative days after the date the joint
(2) PROCEDURE.—For a motion to proceed to
consider the joint resolution—
(i) all points of order against the motion are
waived;
(ii) such a motion shall not be in order after
the House of Representatives has disposed of a motion to recommit the joint resolution;
(iii) the previous question shall be considered as
ordered on the motion to adoption without intervening motion;
(iv) the motion shall not be debatable;
and (v) a motion to reconsider the vote by which
the motion is disposed of shall not be in order.
(3) CONSIDERATION.—When the House of Repre-
sentatives proceeds to consideration of the joint resolution—
(A) the joint resolution shall be considered as
read;
(B) all points of order against the joint resolu-
tion and against its consideration are waived;
(C) the previous question shall be considered as
ordered on the joint resolution to its passage without
amendment except 10 hours of debate equally divided and controlled by the
proponent and an opponent;
(D) an amendment to the joint resolution shall
not be in order; and
(E) a motion to reconsider the vote on passage of
the joint resolution shall not be in order.
(3) Coordination with Action by Other House.—If, before
the passage by one House of the joint resolution of that House, that
House receives from the other House the joint resolu-
tion—
(A) the joint resolution of the other House shall be
referred to a committee; and
(B) with respect to the joint resolution of the House receiving the
resolution—
(i) the procedure in that House shall be the same as if no joint resolution had been received from the other House; and
(ii) the vote on passage shall be on the joint
resolution of the other House.
(2) Treatment of Joint Resolution of Other House.—If one House fails to introduce or consider the joint resolution under this sec-
tion, the joint resolution of the other House shall be entitled to expedited floor procedures under this section.
(3) Treatment of Companion Measures.—If, following passage of the joint resolution in one
House of Representatives, the companion measure from the House of Representatives, the com-
panion measure shall not be debatable.
(e) Rules of House of Representatives and Senate.—This section is enacted by Congress—
(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of
the Senate and House of Representatives, re-
spectively, and as such is deemed a part of the
rules of the Senate and House of
respective, and applicable only with respect to
the procedure to be followed in
that House in the case of the joint resolution, and
supersedes other rules only to the extent
that it is inconsistent with
(2) with full recognition of the constitutional
right of each House to change the rules (so far as relating to the procedure of that House) at
any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent
as in the case of any other rule of that House.
TITLE III—CONTINUATION OF CERTAIN AUTHORITIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES
Subtitle A. Benefits
SEC. 301. FEDERAL BENEFIT PAYMENTS UNDER CERTAIN RETIREMENT PROGRAMS.
(1) Continuation of Entitlement to Payments.—Any individual who, as of the day be-
tween the date the District of Columbia Retirement Protection Act of 1997 exists with respect to an individual or with respect to the
Washington, D.C., to the District of Columbia Retirement Protection Act of 1997 which exists
with respect to any individual or with respect to the District of Columbia as of the day the admission of the State into the
Union shall remain in effect with respect to such an individual and with respect to the
State after the admission of the State into the
Union, in the same manner, to the same extent,
and subject to the same terms and conditions applicable under such Act.
(2) D.C. FEDERAL PENSION FUND.—Any obliga-
tion of the Federal Government under chapter 9 of
the District of Columbia Retirement Protection Act of 1997 with respect to the
District of Columbia Retirement Protection Act of 1997 which exists with respect to any individual or with respect to the
Federal Government as of the day before the
admission of the State into the
Union shall remain in effect with respect to such an individual and with respect to the
Federal Government after the admission of the State into the
Union, in the same manner, to the same extent,
and subject to the same terms and conditions applicable under such Act.
(c) Individuals Described.—An individual described in this subsection is an individual who
was first employed by the government of the District of Columbia before October 1, 1987.
(A) which exists with respect to any individual and the District of Columbia as the result of service accrued prior to the date of the admission of the State into the Union shall remain in effect with respect to the State after the admission of the State into the Union, in the same manner, to the same extent, and subject to the same terms and conditions, as provided under such subchapter; and

(B) subject to paragraph (2), shall exist with respect to any individual and the State as the result of service accrued after the date of the admission of the State into the Union in the same manner, to the same extent, and subject to the same terms and conditions applicable under such subchapter as such obligation existed with respect to individuals and the District of Columbia as of the date of the admission of the State into the Union.

SEC. 311. PUBLIC DEFENDER SERVICE.

(a) CONTINUATION OF OPERATIONS AND FUNDING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2) and section 305(c) of such Act (sec. 2–1606 et seq., D.C. Official Code) shall apply with respect to the State in the same manner and to the same extent as such title applied with respect to the District of Columbia and the District of Columbia Public Defender Service as of the day before the date of the admission of the State into the Union.

(2) RESPONSIBILITY FOR EMPLOYER CONTRIBUTION.—For purposes of paragraph (2) of section 305(c) of such Act (sec. 2–1605(c), D.C. Official Code), the Federal Government shall be treated as an employer with respect to the benefits provided under such section to an individual who is an employee of the public defender service of the State who, pursuant to section 305(c) of such Act (sec. 2–1605(c), D.C. Official Code), is employed as an employee of the Federal Government for purposes of receiving benefits under any chapter of part III of title 5 of United States Code.

(b) RENAMING OF SERVICE.—Effective upon the admission of the State into the Union, the State may rename the public defender service of the State.

(c) CONTINUATION OF FEDERAL BENEFITS FOR EMPLOYEES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Any individual who is an employee of the public defender service of the State as of the day before the date described in subsection (a) and who, pursuant to section 305(c) of such Act (sec. 2–1605(c), D.C. Official Code) is employed as an employee of the Federal Government for purposes of receiving benefits under any chapter of part III of title 5, United States Code, shall continue to be employed as an employee of the Federal Government for such purposes, notwithstanding the termination of the provisions of subsection (a) under subsection (d).

(2) RESPONSIBILITY FOR EMPLOYER CONTRIBUTION.—Beginning on the date described in subsection (a), the State shall be treated as an employer with respect to the benefits described in paragraph (1) which are provided to an individual who, for purposes of receiving such benefits, is continued to be treated as an employee of the Federal Government for such purposes.

SEC. 312. PROSECUTIONS.

(a) ASSIGNMENT OF ASSISTANT UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In accordance with such Act, the Attorney General, with the concurrence of the District of Columbia or the State (as the case may be), shall provide for the assignment of assistant United States attorneys to the State to carry out the functions described in subsection (b).

(2) ASSIGNMENTS MADE ON DETAIL WITHOUT REIMBURSEMENT BY STATE.—In accordance with such Act, an assistant United States attorney who is assigned to the State under this section shall be deemed to be on detail to a regular work assignment in the Department of Justice.

(b) ASSIGNMENTS MADE ON DETAIL WITHOUT REIMBURSEMENT BY STATE.—In accordance with such Act, the Attorney General, with the concurrence of the District of Columbia or the State (as the case may be), shall provide for the assignment of assistant United States attorneys to the State to carry out the functions described in subsection (b).

(c) CLARIFICATION REGARDING CLEMENCY AUTHORITY.

(1) IN GENERAL.—Effective upon the admission of the District of Columbia into the Union, the authority to grant clemency for offenses against the District of Columbia which would have been conducted in the name of the United States by the President, the Attorney General, or any department or agency of the District of Columbia, shall be exercised by the Attorney General, with the concurrence of the District of Columbia, but for the admission of the State into the Union.

(2) MINIMUM NUMBER ASSIGNED.—The number of assistant United States attorneys who are assigned under this section may not be less than the number of assistant United States attorneys whose principal duties as of the day before the date of the admission of the State into the Union were to conduct criminal prosecutions in the name of the United States by the District of Columbia attorney for the District of Columbia or his or her assistants, provided that, on or before the date of the admission of the State into the Union, the number of assistant United States attorneys who are assigned under this section for criminal prosecutions in the name of the United States by the District of Columbia shall be the same as the number of assistant United States attorneys who were employed by the Attorney General as of the date of the admission of the District of Columbia into the Union.

(3) TERMINATION.—In this subsection, the term ‘clemency’ means a pardon, reprieve, or commutation of sentence, or a remission of a fine or other financial penalty.

SEC. 313. SERVICE OF UNITED STATES JUDGES.

(a) PROVISION OF SERVICES FOR COURTS OF STATE.—The United States Marshals Service shall provide services with respect to the courts of the State in the same manner and to the same extent as the Service provided services with respect to the courts and court system of the District of Columbia as of the day before the date of the admission of the State into the Union, except that the President shall not appoint a United States Marshal for the District of Columbia, United States Code, for any court of the State.

(b) TERMINATION.—The obligation of the United States Marshals Service to provide services under this section shall terminate upon written certification by the State to the President that the State has appointed personnel of the State to provide such services.

SEC. 314. DESIGNATION OF FELONS TO FACILITIES OF BUREAU OF PRISONS.

(a) CONTINUATION OF DESIGNATION.—Chapter 1 of title C of title XI of the National Capital Revitalization and Self-Government Improvement Act of 1997 (sec. 24–101 et seq., D.C. Official Code) and the amendments made by such chapter—

(1) shall continue to apply with respect to individuals convicted of offenses under the laws of the District of Columbia prior to the date of the admission of the State into the Union; and

(2) shall apply with respect to individuals convicted of offenses under the laws of the State after the date of the admission of the State into the Union in the same manner and to the same extent as the Commission exercised in the case of any individual who is an imprisoned felon who is eligible for parole or re-parole under the laws of the District of Columbia as of the day before the date of the admission of the State into the Union, as provided under section 1231 of the National Capital Revitalization and Self-Government Improvement Act of 1997 (sec. 24–131, D.C. Official Code); and

(3) shall exercise authority over any individual who is an imprisoned felon who is eligible for parole or re-parole under the laws of the State in the same manner and to the same extent as the Commission exercised in the case of any individual described in subparagraph (A).

(b) PROVISIONS OF SERVICES OF COMMISSIONER.—The United States Parole Commission—

(1) shall continue to exercise the authority to grant parole, deny parole, and revoke parole, and to impose conditions upon an order of parole, in the case of any individual who is an imprisoned felon who is eligible for parole or re-parole under the laws of the District of Columbia as of the day before the date of the admission of the State into the Union, except that the President shall appoint as the Commissioner of the United States Parole Commission, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, a person to serve as Commissioner of the United States Parole Commission for a term of four years, unless sooner removed by the President with the concurrence of the Senate, or is re-appointed as such, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, for a term of four years unless sooner removed by the President with the concurrence of the Senate.

(2) shall exercise authority over any individual who is an imprisoned felon who is eligible for parole or re-parole under the laws of the State in the same manner and to the same extent as the Commissioner exercised authority over any individuals described in subparagraph (A).

(c) CONTINUATION OF FEDERAL BENEFITS FOR EMPLOYEES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Any individual who is an employee of the United States Parole Commission—

(A) shall continue to exercise the authority over any individual who is an imprisoned felon who is eligible for parole or re-parole under the laws of the United States as of the day before the date of the admission of the State into the Union, as provided under section 1233(c)(2) of the National Capital Revitalization and Self-Government Improvement Act of 1997 (sec. 24–133(c)(2), D.C. Official Code); and

(B) shall exercise authority over any individual who is an imprisoned felon who is eligible for parole or re-parole under the laws of the State in the same manner and to the same extent as the Commissioner exercised authority over any individual described in subparagraph (A).

(2) SUPERVISION OF RELEASED OFFENDERS.—The United States Parole Commission—

(A) shall continue to exercise the authority over any individual who is released offenders of the District of Columbia as of the day before the date of admission of the State into the Union, except that the President shall appoint as the Commissioner of the United States Parole Commission, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, a person to serve as Commissioner of the United States Parole Commission for a term of four years, unless sooner removed by the President with the concurrence of the Senate, or is re-appointed as such, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, for a term of four years unless sooner removed by the President with the concurrence of the Senate.

(B) shall exercise authority over any individual who is released offenders of the State in the same manner and to the same extent as the Commissioner exercised authority over any individual described in subparagraph (A).

(3) CONTINUATION OF FEDERAL BENEFITS FOR EMPLOYEES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Any individual who is an employee of the United States Parole Commission—

(A) shall continue to exercise the authority over any individual who is an imprisoned felon who is eligible for parole or re-parole under the laws of the United States as of the day before the date of the admission of the State into the Union, except that the President shall appoint as the Commissioner of the United States Parole Commission, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, a person to serve as Commissioner of the United States Parole Commission for a term of four years, unless sooner removed by the President with the concurrence of the Senate, or is re-appointed as such, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, for a term of four years unless sooner removed by the President with the concurrence of the Senate.

(B) shall exercise authority over any individual who is an imprisoned felon who is eligible for parole or re-parole under the laws of the State in the same manner and to the same extent as the Commissioner exercised authority over any individual described in subparagraph (A).
State which exercises the authority described in such either such subparagraph, shall continue to be treated as an employee of the Federal Government for purposes of receiving benefits under any chapter of subpart G of part II of title 5, United States Code, notwithstanding the termination of the provisions of this subsection under paragraph (4).

(b) RESPONSIBILITY FOR EMPLOYER CONTRIBUTIONS.—Beginning on the later of the date described in subparagraph (A) of paragraph (4) or the date described in subparagraph (B) of paragraph (4), the State shall be deemed to be the employing agency with respect to the benefits described in subparagraph (A) which are provided to an individual who, for purposes of receiving such benefits, is continued to be treated as an employee of the Federal Government under such subparagraph.

(4) TERMINATION.—The provisions of this subsection shall terminate—

(A) in the case of paragraph (1), on the date on which the State provides written certification to the President that the State has in effect laws providing for the State to exercise the authority to grant, deny, and revoke parole, and to impose conditions upon an order of parole, in the case of any individual who is an eligible parolee or parolee reappointed under the laws of the State; and

(B) in the case of paragraph (2), on the date on which the State provides written certification to the President that the State has in effect laws providing for the State to exercise authority over individuals who are released offenders of the State.

(b) COURT SERVICES AND OFFENDER SUPERVISION AGENCY.(1) REMAINING.—Effective upon the date of the admission of the State into the Union—

(A) the Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency for the District of Columbia shall be known and designated as the Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency for Washington, Douglass Commonwealth, and any reference in any law, rule, or regulation to the Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency for the District of Columbia shall be deemed to refer to the Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency for Washington, Douglass Commonwealth; and

(B) the Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency for Washington, Douglass Commonwealth, including the Washington, Douglass Commonwealth Pretrial Services Agency (as renamed under paragraph (1))—

(1) shall continue to provide pretrial services with respect to individuals who are charged with an offense in the District of Columbia, provide supervision for individuals who are offenders on probation, parole, and supervised release pursuant to laws of the District of Columbia, and carry out sex offender registration functions with respect to individuals who are sex offenders in the District of Columbia, as of the date before the date of the admission of the State into the Union, as provided under section 11233 of the National Capital Revitalization and Self-Government Improvement Act of 1997 (sec. 24-133, D.C. Official Code), and carry out such functions for individuals described in subparagraph (A).

(2) shall provide pretrial services with respect to individuals who are charged with an offense in the State, provide supervision for offenders on probation, parole, and supervised release pursuant to the laws of the State, and carry out sex offender registration functions in the State, in the same manner and to the same extent as the Administration of Courts, Justice, and Offender Supervision and carried out such functions for individuals described in subparagraph (A).

(3) CONTINUATION OF FEDERAL BENEFITS FOR EMPLOYEES.—(A) CONTINUATION.—Any individual who is an employee of the Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency for Washington, Douglass Commonwealth as of the day before the date described in paragraph (4), and who, on or after such date, is an employee of the Federal Government for purposes of receiving benefits under any chapter of subpart G of part II of title 5, United States Code, notwithstanding the termination of the provisions of this subsection under paragraph (4), shall continue to be treated as an employee of the Federal Government for purposes of receiving benefits under any chapter of subpart G of part II of title 5, United States Code, and shall continue to be treated as the employing agency with respect to the benefits described in subparagraph (A) which are provided to an individual who, for purposes of receiving such benefits, is continued to be treated as an employee of the Federal Government under such subparagraph.

(B) REMAINING.—Beginning on the date described in paragraph (4), the State shall be treated as the employing agency with respect to the benefits described in subparagraph (A) which are provided to an individual who, for purposes of receiving such benefits, is continued to be treated as an employee of the Federal Government under such subparagraph.

(4) TERMINATION.—Paragraph (2) shall terminate on the date on which the State provides written certification to the President that the State has in effect laws providing for the State to provide pretrial services, supervise offenders on probation, parole, and supervised release, and carry out sex offender registration functions in the State.

SEC. 316. COURTS.

(a) CONTINUATION OF OPERATIONS.—(1) IN GENERAL.—As provided in paragraphs (2) and (3) and subsection (b), title 11, District of Columbia Official Code, shall apply with respect to the State and the courts and court system of the State into the Union in the same manner and to the same extent as such title applied with respect to the District of Columbia and the courts and court system of the District of Columbia as of the day before the date of the admission of the State into the Union.

(b) RESPONSIBILITY FOR EMPLOYER CONTRIBUTIONS.—For purposes of paragraph (2) of section 11–1501(a) of such Code, the Federal Government shall be treated as the employing agency with respect to the benefits provided under such section to an individual who is an employee of the courts and court system of the State and who, pursuant to either such subparagraph, shall continue to be treated as an employee of the Federal Government for purposes of receiving benefits under any chapter of subpart G of part III of title 5, United States Code, notwithstanding the termination of the provisions of this section under subsection (e).

(2) RESPONSIBILITY FOR EMPLOYER CONTRIBUTIONS.—Beginning on the date described in subparagraph (e), the State shall be treated as the employing agency with respect to the benefits described in paragraph (1) which are provided to an individual who, for purposes of receiving such benefits, is continued to be treated as an employee of the Federal Government under such paragraph.

(b) CONTINUATION OF FUNDING.—Section 11241 of the National Capital Revitalization and Self-Government Improvement Act of 1997 (section 11–1743 note, District of Columbia Official Code) shall apply with respect to the courts and court system of the State after the date of the admission of the State into the Union in the same manner and to the same extent as such section applied with respect to the District of Columbia and the courts and court system of the District of Columbia as of the day before the date of the admission of the State into the Union.

(c) CONTINUATION OF FEDERAL BENEFITS FOR EMPLOYEES.—(1) DENOMINATION OF RECEIPTS.—As provided in paragraph (2), all receipts received by the courts and court system of the State shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States.

(2) CRIME VICTIMS COMPENSATION FUND.—Sec. 16 of the Victims of Violent Crime Compensation Act of 1996 (sec. 4–515, D.C. Official Code), relating to the Crime Victims Compensation Fund, shall apply with respect to the courts and court system of the State in the same manner and to the same extent as such section applied with respect to the courts and court system of the District of Columbia as of the day before the date of the admission of the State into the Union.

(e) TERMINATION.—The provisions of this section, other than paragraph (a) and except as provided under subsection (b), shall terminate on the date on which the State provides written certification to the President that the State has in effect laws requiring the State to appropriate and make available funds for the operation of the courts and court system of the State.

Subtitle C—Other Programs and Authorities

SEC. 321. APPLICATION OF THE COLLEGE ACCESS ACT.

(a) CONTINUATION.—The District of Columbia College Access Act of 1998 (Public Law 106–98, sect. 2401a, D.C. Official Code) shall apply with respect to the State, and to the public institution of higher education designated by the State as the successor to the University of the District of Columbia, after the date of the admission of the State into the Union in the same manner and to the same extent as such Act applied with respect to the District of Columbia and the University of the District of Columbia as of the day before the date of the admission of the State into the Union.

(b) TERMINATION.—The provisions of this section, other than with respect to the public institution of higher education designated by the State as the successor to the University of the District of Columbia, shall terminate upon written notification by the President to the Congress that the State has in effect laws requiring the State to provide tuition assistance substantially
similar to the assistance provided under the District of Columbia College Access Act of 1999.

SEC. 322. APPLICATION OF THE SCHOLARSHIPS FOR OPPORTUNITY AND RESULTS

(a) CONTINUATION.—The Scholarships for Opportunity and Results Act (division C of Public Law 112–10; sec. 38–1853.01 et seq., D.C. Official Code) is amended by striking the date of the admission of the State into the Union in the same manner and to the same extent as such Act applied with respect to the District of Columbia as of the day before the date of the admission of the State into the Union.

(b) TERMINATION.—The provisions of this section shall not apply if the State submits written certification by the State to the President that the State has in effect laws requiring the State—

(1) to provide tuition assistance substantially similar to the assistance provided under the Scholarships for Opportunity and Results Act; and

(2) to provide supplemental funds to the public schools and public charter schools of the State in the amounts provided in the most recent fiscal year for public schools and public charter schools of the State or the District of Columbia (as the case may be).

SEC. 323. MEDICAID FEDERAL MEDICAL ASSISTANCE PERCENTAGE.

(a) CONTINUATION.—Notwithstanding section 1906(b) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396(b)), during the period beginning on the date of the admission of the State into the Union and ending on September 30 of the fiscal year during which the date of the admission of the State as described in section 112 of the Washington, D.C. Admission Act, and the territory the Federal Government owns in the environs of the Capital shall be described in subsection (b), the Federal medical assistance percentage for the State under title XIX of such Act shall be the Federal medical assistance percentage for the State of Washington, Douglass Commonwealth under such title as of the day before the date of the admission of the State into the Union.

(b) TERMINATION.—The certification described in this subsection is a written certification by the State to the President that, during each of the first 5 fiscal years beginning after the date of the certification, the estimated revenues of the State will be sufficient to cover any reduction in revenues which may result from the terminations of the provisions of this section.

SEC. 324. FEDERAL PLANNING COMMISSIONS.

(a) NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION.

(1) CONTINUING APPLICATION.—Subject to the amendments made by paragraphs (2) and (3), upon the admission of the State into the Union, chapter 89 of title 40, United States Code, shall apply to the District of Columbia as of the day before the date of the admission of the State into the Union.

(2) SUCH CHARTER APPLIED.—Such chapter applies only with respect to commemorative works in its environs.

(3) DEFINITION.—(A) The term ‘Capitol’ means the area serving as the seat of the Government of the United States, as described in section 112 of the Washington, D.C. Admission Act.

(b) LIMITING APPLICATION TO THE CAPITAL.

(1) LIMITING APPLICATION TO THE CAPITAL.—Section 11300(a) of title 40, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(a) LIMITING APPLICATION TO THE CAPITAL.—This chapter applies only with respect to commemorative works in its environs.

(2) DEFINITION.—Section 11300(b) of such title is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(D) ‘Capitol and its environs’ means—

(1) ‘Capitol’ means the area serving as the seat of the Government of the United States, as described in section 112 of the Washington, D.C. Admission Act; and

(2) ‘Capitol and its environs’ means—

(A) The area serving as the seat of the Government of the United States, as described in section 112 of the Washington, D.C. Admission Act; and

(B) Those lands and properties administered by the National Park Service and the General Services Administration located in the area of the District of Columbia as of the day before the date of the admission of the State into the Union.

(c) LIMITING APPLICATION TO DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

(1) LIMITING APPLICATION TO DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.—This chapter applies only with respect to the District of Columbia as of the day before the date of the admission of the State into the Union.

(2) LIMITING APPLICATION TO DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.—Such chapter applies only with respect to the District of Columbia as of the day before the date of the admission of the State into the Union.

(d) DEFINITION.—The term ‘District of Columbia’ means the area serving as the seat of the Government of the United States, as described in section 112 of the Washington, D.C. Admission Act.

SEC. 401. GENERAL DEFINITIONS.

In this Act, the following definitions shall apply:

SEC. 402. STATEHOOD TRANSITION COMMISSION.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established the Statehood Transition Commission (hereafter in this section referred to as the “Commission”).

(b) COMPOSITION.—(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall be composed of 18 members as follows:

(A) 3 members appointed by the President.

(B) 2 members appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

(C) 2 members appointed by the Minority Leader of the Senate.

(D) 2 members appointed by the Majority Leader of the House of Representatives.

(E) 2 members appointed by the Minority Leader of the Senate.

(F) 2 members appointed by the Majority Leader of the House of Representatives.

(G) 3 members appointed by the Council.


(2) APPOINTMENT DATE.—(A) IN GENERAL.—The appointments of the members of the Commission shall be made not
later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(B) EFFECT OF LACK OF APPOINTMENT BY APPOINTMENT DATE.—If one or more appointments under subparagraph (A) are not made by the appointment date specified in subparagraph (A), the authority to make such appointment or appointments shall expire, and the chair of the Commission shall be reduced by the number equal to the number of appointments so not made.

(3) TERMINATION.—Each member shall be appointed for the life of the Commission.

(4) VACANCY.—A vacancy in the Commission shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made.

(5) NO COMPENSATION.—Members shall serve without pay, but shall receive travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, in accordance with applicable provisions under chapters 59 and 62 of title 5, United States Code. Members appointed to fill vacancies shall be paid without regard to the provisions of chapter 59 or 62 of title 5, United States Code.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from the District of Columbia, Mr. Norton, for 5 minutes.
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Chairman.
Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, it is important that Republicans recognize the constitutional right of the residents of D.C. to be heard. The questions for Republicans are these: Do they truly believe in tax representation? Do they truly believe that the Federal Government should stay out of local affairs? Do they truly believe that the Constitution should be interpreted in a different way? This argument is anti-democratic, and they should be willing to make that choice.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY), chairwoman of the House Committee on Oversight and Reform, and I thank her for the way she conducted hearings on H.R. 51.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. WILSON) for his remarks and his willingness to defend his position. I am here today to explain the urgent need for full local representation.

Mr. Speaker, we stand for as Americans. The American people are paying more than 22 States and more per capita than any State. Think about that. It pays more than half the States in this country, yet D.C. residents have no vote in Congress, and that is wrong.

The people of the District have been fighting for equal rights for more than 200 years. In 1966, an overwhelming 86 percent of D.C. residents voted for statehood. President Trump’s recent decision to deploy thousands of Federal law enforcement officers in D.C. against residents demonstrates the urgent need for full local government and congressional representation.

Unfortunately, so far, Republicans have rejected our efforts, and the President has clearly stated that they would rather deny the right to vote to over 700,000 American citizens than consider the possibility of representatives from the new State being Democrats.

Now, think about that argument. They are willing to vote the core principles of our democracy merely because they may be from a different political party. This argument is antidemocratic and un-American.

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

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. The questions for Republicans are these: Do they truly believe in tax representation? Do they truly believe in States’ rights? Do they truly believe that the Constitution should be interpreted in a different way? This argument is anti-democratic, and they should be willing to make that choice.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge every Member to vote on H.R. 51 for the soon-to-be 51st State of our great country.

Mr. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would just remind the chairwoman that the entire court system of Washington, D.C., is supported by the Federal Government.

And there is representation. This District has three electoral votes. No other city in the country has that. There is a representation.

It is just an amazing thing, too, that this whole bill does not even allow elections for the new Governor that is proposed here, so the very thing they are arguing, they reject and deny from the residents.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MURPHY), my good friend.

Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in opposition to H.R. 51. Voting against this legislation is not an economic, racial, or a social injustice, as my colleagues across the aisle may unfairly claim. I have no doubt that my Democratic friends, just like Republicans, want the citizens of Washington to have political rights like every other American. However, let’s talk about what is honest here.

Let’s just be honest.

The true goal here is to have two virtually guaranteed new Democratic seats so that D.C. can become a State. That is what it comes down to. That is the goal.

Why do I say that? Because there is a much simpler alternative that I am sure that the Democrats do not want anything to do with. I offered an amendment to this bill that would retrocede the District of Columbia back to Maryland. That is where the land came from.

Congress ceded the west side of the Potomac, now Alexandria, from the District of Columbia back to Virginia in 1847. So there is plenty of historical precedent for this action.

Unfortunately, despite making total sense, my amendment was, sadly, blocked.

If D.C. were ceded back to Maryland, citizens can vote for Members of the House of Representatives and Senate in Maryland. They would have congressional representation in both Chambers, with the exact effect of statehood.

The move is simply unnecessary, when ceding D.C. back to Maryland is a viable, cost-effective, and commonsense option.

To further nullify this debate, the District of Columbia would require a constitutional amendment to change. The Framers of the Constitution, as has been said before, were very clear about this. The Supreme Court reaffirmed this in 1949.

So why are we trying to overturn the Supreme Court? One answer: politics, pure and simple.

Even setting aside the obvious need for a constitutional amendment, my colleagues across the aisle know that this legislation has no chance of becoming law. It is just the majority’s attempt, again, to message bills to satisfy the base.

Let me be clear: Republicans do not want to attempt to stifle voices or suppress representation.

If the D.C. citizens want to have representation, then cede the land back to Maryland, because I have demonstrated it is a more hands-down, more practical solution.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to note that the gentleman’s amendment to cede the District of Columbia back to Maryland did not have the consent of Maryland.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY), my good friend.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend, ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, who is managing today’s business to right a wrong, but unfortunately, because D.C. does not have a vote here in the Congress, she won’t be able to cast a vote on final passage of her own bill.
Today, we are being asked to right a wrong. And you hear the contortions on the other side of the aisle to continue to justify a fundamental right being denied 700,000 fellow Americans who pay taxes, who fight in our wars and at home, who are family, who are Americans, but have no votes in the United States Congress. They are bigger than five States.

They hide behind the Constitution. The Constitution was written before they knew where the capital of the United States would be, before a blade of grass was touched to construct Washington, D.C. No one at that time could have envisioned the metropolis of 700,000 Americans, let alone that they would be denied their fundamental American right.

Let’s cede it to Maryland. Two problems: Maryland doesn’t want D.C. and D.C. doesn’t want to be in Maryland. The consent of the governed is a fundamental American architecture, which you conveniently overlook. And then there is the right to be represented, another fundamental right denied D.C.

Mr. Speaker, it is partisan politics, yes. It is theirs. They want to deny 700,000 people their right to representation in this body and in the other body because of their politics, or likely politics.

When have we ever done that as America? We haven’t looked at how people would vote before we decide to incorporate them into the Union as a State. We understood the right of people to petition to become a State, and Congress has that power.

Let’s right a wrong, especially in the post-George Floyd world, and give people their rightful representation in the people’s body and in the Senate.

Mr. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. COMER), my good friend and a great member of the Oversight Committee.

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. HICE) for his great leadership on this issue.

At a time when Speaker PELOSI is keeping Congress largely on the sidelines, it is unfortunate that we are spending precious work time debating blatantly unconstitutional legislation.

Not only is this measure unconstitutional and dead on arrival in the Senate, but it should not be a priority for this Congress. Our Nation is facing a serious need for action. We need police reform that focuses on transparency and accountability, we need to support American workers as States safely reopen their communities and economies, and we need to ensure that money we have spent to fight the coronavirus is effectively guarded against waste, fraud, and abuse.

Passing this measure today would signal a stunning lack of respect for the Constitution. Making Washington, D.C., a State would specifically violate the intentions of our Founding Fathers, who wanted the national seat of government to belong to no State.

In fact, the Constitution specifically calls for Congress, not any State government, to have authority over the District serving as the seat of Federal Government.

Granting statehood for Washington, D.C., requires a constitutional amendment, just as amending the District three electoral college votes required the ratification of the 23rd Amendment.

It is time for Congress to get back to full-time work and take up the pressing issues facing our country, not playing unconstitutional games.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN), my good friend and neighbor.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, when in the course of human events a relationship stops working and one party experiences a long train of abuses and indignities at the hands of the other, you scrap the old relationship and you start anew.

It is nothing personal, but I wish our GOP colleagues in the House and Senate could recognize that this just isn’t working out anymore for the people of Washington. The relationship you have taken for granted with the District, where the local population is dysfunctional and, frankly, abusive.

Plainly put, the people of Washington want out.

It is not just the pepper spray and the tear gas and the rubber bullets; it is not just crashing their churches and desecrating their religion with your photo-ops; it is not just the use of their sons and daughters in the National Guard to put down protests by their sons and daughters in the streets; it is not just the threats to Federalize their local police or the decision to overturn their adoption laws, their marijuana laws, and their health funding choices; or your control of their judges and prosecutors; or the constitutional presidential insults leveled against their chosen leaders; it is not that the GOP Members who claim to be the attentive partners of the District never listen to the people here, never go to their local meetings, don’t know the mayor or the city council or the ANC members; it is not even the $750 million that they just cheated the people of Washington out of in the middle of this plague.

It is something deeper. It is not just something personal.

The people of Washington have found someone and something else. They have voted to break up this dysfunctional relationship with Congress to start a healthy and respectful relationship with America.

In America, States make their own local policy and budget decisions without constant tampering and interference by other people’s representatives.

In America, every political community stands on equal footing through statehood. Each one sends two Senators to the U.S. Senate and voting representatives to the House, delegations that guarantee no one will push their people around.

When you are a State, you help decide things like whether your country goes to war, who will be your judges and supreme court justices, how will your Federal tax dollars get spent, and what should be the laws of the Nation.

The only question now is whether Congress is mature enough, is man enough, to deal with the fact that Washington no longer wants to be under your thumb. A mature and faithful Congress that wants the best for all of its people is not afraid of statehood. We celebrate it. We delight in it.

America started as 13 States, but we have exercised our powers under Article IV, Section 3, 37 separate times to admit 37 new States, all of them by simple legislative acts, none of them by constitutional amendment, and every one was controversial in its own way.

I heard the gentleman say that you have to be either a territory or formally part of another State to be admitted as a State. It is not true. I have a Woodward article on this.

It is not just that Washington was its own independent country. It was a republic, and people said that was unconstitutional and Congress said: No, we are going to favor the trajectory of democratic inclusion and political equality.

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

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Maryland an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. RASKIN. So every State has faced objections. They said Utah was too Mormon, and New Mexico was too Catholic. Hawaii and Alaska, in 1959, of course, they weren’t contiguous; they couldn’t be admitted.

Yes, the District exists now under Article I, Section 3, Clause 17, but the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia proposes to shrink the Federal district the way it was shrunk in 1847 because the slave masters of Virginia wanted the land back in advance of congressional abolition of the slave traffic in the District.

If we can modify the boundaries of the Federal district to placate the slave masters in the 19th century, we can modify the boundaries of the Federal district in the 21st century to grant statehood and equal rights to the people of Washington, D.C.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

Ms. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I will just remind my good friend, listen, we share the concern if people are upset, if it is not working. But the reality is, if it is not working, we have a system in this government, in our system, to deal with it. And in this case, if it is called a constitutional amendment.

Why the Democrats are not presenting a constitutional amendment to...
Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. Gosar), my good friend.

Mr. Gosar. Mr. Speaker, I rise today by proxy putting resolution to H.R. 51 and its affront to the Constitution. The Founding Fathers did not intend for Washington, D.C., to be a State. Article I, Section 8, Clause 17 of the United States Constitution provides Congress with exclusive jurisdiction over the District of Columbia. The enclave clause was included for specific reasons, notably the fact that the operation of the seat of the Federal Government of the United States, whose laws now affect approximately 350 million Americans, should not be impeded by local ordinances, actions, or taxation.

The Framers of the Constitution had good reason for this concern, having witnessed the reluctance of local authorities to police disorderly conduct by people engaged in trade or commerce. The Constitution was designed to become law over the District of Columbia.

In the face of willful disregard for the rule of law, it is irresponsible for this body to follow in these footsteps by blatantly taking action against our Constitution. The democratic and legal wisdom of our Founders is unprecedented, and their principles of a federal charter guaranteed and preserved individual liberties and good government, stand true today. Going against their intentions now is neither prudent nor in the best interest of the country.

I urge my colleagues to vote against H.R. 51.

Ms. Norton. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. Pelosi), the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Ms. Pelosi. Mr. Speaker. I thank the gentleman for yielding and for her tremendous leadership over time to remove obstacles of participation to our democracy, whether it is a voting rights act for all, or whether it is observing the 100th anniversary of women having the right to vote, and whether it is about giving full participation in our democracy to the District of Columbia. I am proud to join her in wearing this mask. It says “Slst,” and that is why this legislation is H.R. 51, D.C. statehood, which I will talk about now.

But Congressman Eleanore Holmes Norton has been brilliant, relentlessly about the lack of full participation for her constituents in the work of Congress. So I salute her as the patron saint and guiding star of D.C. statehood, even before she came to Congress, but since she came to Congress, she has worked tirelessly and relentlessly to build historic support for this bill. She gives us the honor of participating in this historic vote, wherein the House of Representatives, for the first time, will vote for statehood for the District.

Mr. Speaker, D.C. statehood, is both an official and a personal priority for me. My colleagues have heard me say this, but I will say it again. When I was born, my father was a Member of Congress from Baltimore, Maryland. He spent his entire adult life in the Appropriations Committee, and he served as the chair of the D.C. appropriations subcommittee.

At that time, they tell me, that period did not understand statehood for the District of Columbia. He was a big supporter of home rule, seeing from that perspective the unfairness of it all, a big supporter of home rule. In any event, he did his job in a way to try to make a path, and it passed; then later, home rule; then later a mayor and the rest; and now, to where we are now.

Yesterday, someone said: Can you find middle ground? This is middle ground, the status quo. We have to go forward.

I later had the privilege of serving on the Appropriations Committee, on the District of Columbia subcommittee, and I saw the obstacles to home rule that some in our Congress would put forth, diminishing the self-determination that the people of the District of Columbia should have.

Today, the District of Columbia is about showing respect for our democracy. It is not just about the District. It is about our democracy, for the American people and for our U.S. Constitution, yes.

The Constitution begins with our beautiful preamble, “We the People,” setting out our Founder’s vision of a government of, by, and for the people of the United States. It doesn’t say, “except for the District of Columbia.” Yet, for more than two centuries, the residents of Washington, D.C., have been denied their right to fully participate in our democracy. Instead, they have been dealt the injustice of paying taxes, serving in the military, and contributing to the economic power of our Nation, while being denied the full enfranchisement that is their right. Serving in the military, fighting, risking their lives for our democracy, fundamental to that democracy is representation. They should not risk their lives for a principle, for a value, for our democracy, while where they lived was being denied that full opportunity.

Today, by passing H.R. 51, the Washington, D.C. Admission Act, to admit the State of Washington, Douglass Commonwealth—State of Washington, Douglass Commonwealth—to the Union—that would be Frederick Douglass, from Maryland but who lived in the District of Columbia, an abolitionist and a suffragist, actually. He was in Seneca Falls at the Conference of Women, coming together for women having the right to vote, so much about our democracy and voting for all Americans.

In doing so today, we will bring our Nation closer to the founding ideals that all are created equal and all deserve a say in our democracy.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a bipartisan vote, I urge a yes vote, a strong yes vote, a yes vote in this House for this very important legislation, legislation important to our democracy, to our Constitution.

I thank, again, and salute Eleanor Holmes Norton for her leadership, working with our distinguished leader, Mr. Hoyer, for whom this has been a priority. I am proud that this is on the floor today.

Mr. Hice of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time I have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia has 18½ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from the District of Columbia has 14 minutes remaining.

Mr. Hice. Of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I would just say again that our Constitution has representation here in our Capitol from the Federation of the States, and this district was set apart, not to be a State, nor to be influenced by one.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. Massie), a great member of the Oversight and Reform Committee.

Mr. Massie. Mr. Speaker, if there is a constitutional way to turn D.C. into a State, this bill is not it. This bill is a farcical exercise in legislative virtue signaling because it contains a fatal constitutional flaw.

Let’s talk about what this bill does do. This bill doesn’t magically convert all of D.C. into a State. This bill doesn’t create a new State containing a city called D.C. Because both of these clearly violate the Constitution.

Some overly clever legislative artists think they have found a new loophole, a way to create a State in D.C. without violating the Constitution. What this bill does is it seeks to shrink the city
of D.C. into a tiny city, and then creates a State from the territory that is left over.

The problem with that is there is the 23rd Amendment to the Constitution that gives the city of D.C. presently three electoral votes. Paradoxically, the bill itself acknowledges the constitutional flaw within because it contains an expedited procedure to vote on the repeal of the 23rd Amendment in this Chamber and the Senate Chamber. The problem is, the bill keeps flowing and would create a new State, even if the 23rd Amendment is not repealed. This creates the farcical situation where the few residents, which are the residents at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, the First Family, would control three electoral votes. This is crazy.

So, I urge my colleagues to vote for the Constitution today and vote against H.R. 51.

Ms. Norton. Mr. Speaker, the last thing we have to be concerned about is whether or not the 23rd Amendment will be repealed, and the bill, H.R. 51, contains an expedited procedure for that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. Hoyer), my good neighbor and good friend, the majority leader of the House of Representatives.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I am going to leave my mask on, not only because it is the safe thing to do for all of you—not just for me—but also because it represents the best of America. I am from Maryland. Maryland was a slaveholding State. I represent the district that probably had the most slaves, along with my friend from the First Congressional District.

In fact, there were many sympathetic voices from the Southern cause that would have had Marylanders join the Confederacy. They were, of course, wrong. But I want to tell my friends from those States that withdrew and whose States tried to destroy the Union that they ought to remember that this Nation took them back without condition with full citizenship and the right to vote. Surely we can do the same for our fellow citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this bill, and I thank Delegate ELENA HOLMES NORTON in her extraordinary quest keeping her eye on the prize to make sure that the citizens she represents have full citizenship and have our respect. I am proud to stand with her in supporting statehood for the people of the District of Columbia.

On this mark, there is a drawing of the outline of the District of Columbia. That is Maryland before the 1789 and subsequent actions. That was Maryland. I daresay, there is not a Marylander who voted on that section of that land for the Capital of the United States who thought to themselves they were disenfranchising those who lived in that District.

I want to thank Mayor Bowser, with whom I have been proud to work to move this issue forward with the leadership of Delegate Holmes Norton. I made clear when we announced that the House would consider this bill the people who call our Nation’s Capital home have been disenfranchised and shortchanged too long. Martin Luther King said: How long? Too long.

Not only have the residents of one of America’s most historically African-American cities—let me repeat that—historically, it is one of our largest African-American cities. It is not exclusive. It is a diverse city. Very frankly, it does not make a decision, if you don’t vote for us, we will not allow you to vote.

Hear me: If you don’t vote for us, we will not allow you to vote.

But President Trump says that my friends on the other side of the aisle, Mr. Speaker, would be foolish to vote for this bill. Why? Because we are too Democratic and we wouldn’t vote for you.

What do you think the North would have done with the 11 States that tried to destroy the Union if we had said: You are not going to vote for us, so you can’t come back—at least, you can’t come back with voting rights, and we will keep you as subjects, not as citizens?

I hope every Member who represents one of those States thinks about that proposition as you vote to exclude 700,000 of your fellow citizens from full participation in our democracy.

Not only have the residents of one of America’s great cities been prevented from having full citizenship, but they have also been shortchanged in the money that we give them. Just recently, COVID-19, we gave them 40 percent of what we gave Wyoming, an entity 200,000 people smaller than the District of Columbia. I see no heads shaking on the other side of the aisle, Mr. Speaker. I see no agreement on that.

Should we say Wyoming is too small and that we ought to exclude Wyoming, it is not big enough to be a State?

Yet Wyoming, more than 10 times smaller than the State of Maryland and, as opposed to 40 million people in California, 500,000, one-eighth of the size, have two United States Senators. Stand up if you think Wyoming ought to have an electorate.

I see no one standing.

This constitutional argument is a Don Quixote windmill argument. These are 706,000 American citizens. At the same time, some of our predecessors can be overruled by Congress and by the President when it comes to local issues, as we saw when President Trump ordered Federal law enforcement and the National Guard to suppress peaceful and legitimate protest actions. And guess who? Black men and women in encounters with the police and with others. George Zimmerman comes to mind and Trayvon Martin.

This is about human rights. This is about democracy. This is about our Nation being better than that.

I see my colleague from Maryland shaking his head. We disagree.

The people of D.C. deserve not only real self-government, but also full representation in the Congress of the United States.

Are these 700,000 people less than the 500,000 people in Wyoming?

If we ask somebody to come to the District of Columbia and work for our government, is the condition that they lose their citizenship, that they lose their full voting rights? Is that the condition we put on them? If so, I respectfully disagree with my colleagues who believe that is what America is about.

That is what this historic legislation would do, admit Washington, D.C., as the 51st State. That would provide residents of the District of Columbia with a voting House Member and two Senators, as every other group of Americans who lives in a jurisdiction called a State has the right to have.

It would right a historical wrong to ensure that our Founders’ vision of representative government will be enacted for all Americans, no longer excluding the 706,000 in the District of Columbia.

The House will take action today to make the District of Columbia a State. It is an historic day.

Be on the right side of history. So many voted against the Civil Rights Act of the 1960s and years thereafter. Today, we are on the right side of history.

The gentleman is absolutely right. Somebody mentioned it was Democrats. We were a segregationist party. And guess what? We said we do not want to be that kind of party, and Hubert Humphrey got up in 1948 in New York at a Democratic convention and said that we need to come out of the dark shadows of slavery and segregation into the bright sunlight of justice and equality.

Yes, I understand that was our party. We said to them: We do not want to be that party.

Don’t you be that party. Don’t you have Lincoln turn over in his grave and say: That is not our party.

Yes. I heard the gentleman over there. Sadly, in the denial of democracy, the Republican-led Senate has indicated, Mr. Speaker, it will not act, just as it has not acted on 275 bipartisan bills that we have sent to the United States Senate. They will not act.

The majority of the Senate is elected by 18 percent of the American people. That is unfortunate, Mr. Speaker, because this is more than just a local issue for the District of Columbia. It is a civil rights issue for our country, as yesterday was a civil rights issue for our country.

It is something that ought to concern all Americans, because when some Americans are denied the full rights and representation of citizenship, it diminishes the meaning of citizenship for
all. Statehood is not merely a status; it is a recognition by the rest of the States of the sovereign equality of the people who live there that they are part of the main, not simply an island, as the poet reflected, and that they cannot be treated as lesser by their fellow citizens.

By admitting Washington, D.C., as a State, we will admit what we already know to be true: that its people are our fellow Americans, equal in their pursuit of happiness and their enjoyment of the full rights and privileges of American citizenship, including representation in the Congress of the United States.

Our patriot forebears in the 18th century used to cry out, “No taxation without representation.” The citizens of Boston stole some tea, a criminal act, and they threw it into the Boston Harbor. Why? They said: Because we will not be taxed without representation and that King George cannot tell us what to do without consulting us.

Be on the right side of history. Washington residents correctly still use that battle cry in the 21st century. Let us make it ring true at last. Let us make our Union of States a more perfect one by adding to its number as we have 37 times consistent with the Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to stand up for America, stand up for democracy, and stand up for the premise of America that every person counts. Vote “yes.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TRONE). Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I feel like the arguments on the other side of the aisle are so weak that they respond by yelling louder.

We have just heard a great, passionate speech about something that is totally irrelevant. In fact, the point was highlighted that the condition for statehood is not population; otherwise, we would not have States like Wyoming or Alaska or other States that were ever admitted. That is not the issue. The issue was that Washington, D.C., was set apart as a seat of government not to be the same as the federations of States that our Constitution speaks to creating the Federal city in Washington, D.C. The Founders wanted to do that for a reason. We wanted this seat to be completely intertwined and separated from other States. We wanted it to be special and unique and not subject to the powers and the struggles that go on about the people in a certain State. That is what is at stake here.

I would note that my friends, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. HOYER, and Mr. BRYER, are the first to rant—the first to say they dare not do what we dare go down the road of potential shutdown, if we dare go down the road of limiting the size and scope of the Federal Government. Why? Because the jurisdictions they represent are wholly and heavily dependent on this Federal Government.

I am a proud Texan dating back to the 1850s, but I grew up in Loudoun County, Virginia, and went to the University of Virginia. When I grew up in Loudoun County, it was 80 percent dirt roads. There was one stoplight in my entire school district. It was a rural county fully separated from Washington, D.C., and now it is the richest per capita county in the United States of America because levithiathan grows.

I appreciate the opportunity to address this important issue and the question the gentleman from Maryland just asked. I hear the question.

Yes, their District boundary lines have changed in the past, but what the major issue today is fundamentally what the Washington, D.C., is. That is what is at stake here. I would love to hear the gentleman from Maryland expound on his support and belief in our electoral college since, suddenly, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have newfound respect for the power of States and the importance of States. I would love to hear them expound on that.

I would love to hear my colleagues on the other side of the aisle talk about what is critical about community and about respecting the ability of people to live differently in order for us to agree to disagree, to allow Texas to be Texas, California to be California. I would like love to hear my colleagues on the other side of the aisle expound on these principles.

This is about power. That is what this is about. Let’s make no mistake about it. D.C., I do not believe, should become a State—and I use that word importantly, should not become a State.

We can talk about the constitutional infirmities with what the majority is trying to do. My colleagues are doing that, and they have laid that out.

The Constitution speaks to creating the Federal city in Washington, D.C. The Founders wanted to do that for a reason. We wanted this seat to be completely intertwined and separated from other States. We wanted it to be special and unique and not subject to the powers and the struggles that go on about the people in a certain State.

That is what is at stake here.

I would note that my friends, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. HOYER, and Mr. BRYER, are the first to rant—the first to say they dare not do what we dare go down the road of potential shutdown, if we dare go down the road of limiting the size and scope of the Federal Government.

I am a proud Texan dating back to the 1850s, but I grew up in Loudoun County, Virginia, and went to the University of Virginia. When I grew up in Loudoun County, it was 80 percent dirt roads. There was one stoplight in my entire school district. It was a rural county fully separated from Washington, D.C., and now it is the richest per capita county in the United States of America because levithiathan grows.

It is because leviathan continues to separate from the real Americans out there—the people throughout the entire country who are not being represented by this body.

If we want to talk about representation, then let’s talk about this body doing its job to represent the people, the forgotten man. The American people are tired of watching their country burning to the ground, statutes being toppled, people getting killed in the streets. And we are spending time here today on an unconstitutional effort to create a State of D.C. A Federal city was not intended being separated so that it could be unique and be the power seat of this great country.

Mr. Speaker, that is what this is about.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland State (Mr. SARBANES), my good friend, that ceded land in perpetuity out of which the District of Columbia was formed.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, our colleague across the aisle a moment ago talked about the District of Columbia being special. There is nothing special about being second class, which is what we have happened to the residents of the District. For two centuries, the people of the District of Columbia have been disenfranchised, denied fair representation, excluded from our great democratic experiment. Over 700,000 residents—who just like my constituents and your constituents—work hard, pay their taxes, and contribute every day to the betterment of our society. Yet, they do not have an equal voice in this Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to remedy this great injustice. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON should have the same opportunity that every one of our Members does: To see her name on that board for every vote, to walk into the well and cast her “yea” or “nay” on behalf of the constituents she represents.

We thank Congresswoman NORTON for her service and for her tireless fight to bring dignity to the residents of Washington, D.C.

House Democrats committed to this moment when this body passed H.R. 1 more than a year ago. We observed them then and we reiterate today: There are no constitutional, historical, financial, or economic reasons why the 700,000 Americans who live in the District of Columbia should not be granted Statehood.

At a time when Americans of all political stripes are demanding a greater voice and participation in the political town square, the residents of D.C. are being forcibly kept out of the town square by this bizarre and indefensible anachronism.

Today, we are declaring enough is enough. It is time to give a voice and a vote to the residents of the District of Columbia.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote “yes” on H.R. 51.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Speaker, to somehow try to paint a situation that D.C. is a second-class city is absolute absurdity. Without question, this is the most influential city in this country—perhaps in the world.
Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN), my friend.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, first of all, a little comment, maybe clearing things up. I will point out to everyone in Washington that when we say the Pledge of Allegiance, the phrase “to the Republic for which it stands” is in the pledge. And I think we all remember the memorable comment of Benjamin Franklin at a time around when the Constitution was drafted. He talked about how we were giving us “a Republic, if we can keep it.”

Now, at the time the Constitution was drafted, our forefathers did include a district, which would be the capital for the country. Our forefathers put together the United States and reached a compromise between the 13 States. They realized at the time it would be ridiculous to break apart a State and give it two Senators, like all of the other States. In part, that is because it is so easy to know has such a different interest in the States.

All of the States, the 50 States, to a variety of degree, have been given an amount of agriculture. There is virtually no agriculture—maybe no agriculture anywhere there is a greenhouse or something in the District of Columbia. There is no manufacturing. There is no mining or logging. Or if there is, it is so tiny we can barely see it.

Mr. Speaker, it is a unique city because it is based on government jobs and tourist jobs connected to people coming and visiting those government buildings. It is not like any other State out there. If it were to become a State, its representatives would have spent all their time almost devoted to getting more money for the city. And already the Federal Government puts a great deal of money into the city. And already the Federal Government puts a great deal of money into the city. You couldn’t complain that they do not have enough funds for their schools or their schools are somewhere in the top—if you considered it a State—somewhere in the top three or four in the country, as far as funding per person.

Mr. Speaker, it would make no sense, say, for Wisconsin to break off and give two Senators to Milwaukee and give two Senators to the rest of the State. Milwaukee is not a State.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. KELLY).

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 51.

For more than 200 years, Americans living in the District of Columbia—many of whom serve the people of this great Nation as public servants—have been denied the right to self-govern. That is a founding principle of our great Nation.

Mr. Speaker, today, D.C. is home to more than 700,000 Americans and, yet, they have no voting Members of Congress and no voice in the Senate.

Establishing Washington, Douglass Commonwealth would not create our Nation’s smallest State by population, nor would it be reliant on the Federal Government to survive. There are States with smaller populations and many other States that are far more dependent on Federal assistance.

Despite paying more in total Federal income tax than the residents of 22 other States, D.C. is continually treated like a territory instead of a State in funding bills, those calculations starve the local government of the funds they rightly deserve.

Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues listen to the voice of our Founding Fathers, who we keep hearing about. ‘No taxation without representation.’ Well, D.C. pays its taxes. It deserves a voice in Congress. And let’s be clear about who is playing politics.

Mr. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT), my good friend and a great leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, it is amazing to hear people that have been trained in the Constitution disregard it so. But you almost know that this ability to rationalize absolutely anything. But the fact is, Article I, Section 8, there is not one of the 37 States that have been brought in by Congress that is addressed in the Constitution like this district is. And they say specifically—this is the right of Congress—‘To exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever, over such District (not exceeding 10 miles square)—’ that is this one—‘as may, by cession of particular States, accept the District of Columbia, become the seat of Government of the United States.’

And if you go back and look at Federalist Paper 43, you look at the debate at the time, they understood. We have had the capital in New York City. We have had it in Philadelphia. And that is dangerous. Because it means if you are surrounded by a State and the capital is part of that State or in the middle surrounded by the State, the pressure can be brought to bear that would be so unfair. Look at the debate. That is why that is there, to protect that.

Mr. Speaker, now, one of the things that we agree on is that it is wrong to make the residents of the District of Columbia pay income tax. I have been filing a bill since 2008, I think it was, that would eliminate the Federal tax. None of the territories—who also don’t have full voting Members of Congress—pay Federal income tax. D.C. shouldn’t either. That is a legislative fix we can do.

Mr. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time is remaining for each side?

The Speaker. The time is 4 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HARRIS), my good friend.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I hope America is watching what is going on on the floor today, and they are paying careful attention to this debate.

We hear speaker after speaker from the other side of the aisle say things like, “It has been done before.” The majority leader: “Clear precedent.”

Yeah, there is clear precedent. We know the person who was in the Chair just before comes from the State that actually was the clear precedent: In
1847, when retrocession occurred. You
know, my colleagues on the other side
of the aisle say this isn’t politics. This
is about getting voting rights. This is
about things like this. I would suggest
that perhaps the people watching go to
Wikipedia and see what the history is
about the support for retrocession back
to Maryland.

Mr. Speaker, because, you see, this is
not Congress’s land. This is Maryland’s
land. You can’t have it, you can’t lose it, to the United
States for the sole purpose of a perma-
nent, Federal enclave. The nerve of hundreds of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle thinking it is their
land. It is Maryland’s land. And if you want voting rights, it is simple: Do ex-
actly what occurred in 1847 and give the land back to Maryland.

But, whoa, wait a minute. That is not
what this debate is about, because ret-
rocession has been proposed many
times with no Democrat supporters. In
fact, the majority leader was in Con-
gress when these bills were proposed. If
what he really wants is voting rights, he
should have cosponsored the bill.

Mr. Speaker, you know that if retro-
cession occurs, every single resi-
dent—except those ones in the White
House—because of the amendment to
the Constitution they actually get
three electoral votes under this pro-
lapsed legislation, every single one of
those residents would have representa-
tion in Congress. And, yes, ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON could sit in Congress
representing people from the State of
Maryland.

This is a pure political ploy. That is
why none of my colleagues from Mary-
land are going to vote against this bill
today. That is why none of my col-
leagues from Maryland have put in a
retrocession bill. That is why all of my
hundreds of colleagues across the aisle are going to pretend this is Congress’
land. This is not.

The Constitution is clear. If this land
is given back to Maryland, Maryland has
to accept.

We have the argument that is Maryland
doesn’t want it back. That is inter-
esting. I sat in the Maryland legisla-
ture with my colleague, who is sitting
across the aisle right now. If our repre-
sentatives from Maryland are so con-
cerned about getting voting rights, it
is very simple. Go to their colleagues
in the Maryland General Assembly,
fully controlled by the Democrats, and
say: “Let’s take it back. Let’s give those
700,000 people voting rights.”

Mr. Speaker, that is the correct ap-
proach. Don’t steal this land from
Maryland.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, import-
ant to note that Maryland perma-
nently ceded the land that now is part
of the District of Columbia. You can’t
get back what you permanently ceded.

And it is important to note that we
have had several Members from Mary-
land on this Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the
gentleman from Maryland (Mr. MFUME).

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Speaker, I want to
thank the distinguished Delegate, the
congressperson from Washington, D.C.,
for her steadfast leadership on this.

I had the opportunity to work with
her predecessor back in the late 1980s
in the Washington, D.C., Delegate Walter
Fauntroy, who passed the torch, and the
Delegate has done a great job.

It took 27 years to get this vote back
onto the floor. I was there in 1993 when
we came up short. Today, I am hoping
and praying for a different outcome.

I want to congratulate you on that
and to remind others that this is not
going to go away because, at the end of
the day, this is really about taxation
without representation, one of the
original 27 colonial grievances filed
against the King, which was a major
cause of the Revolutionary War.

So when people in Boston had the
Tea Party and threw tea in the Boston
Harbor in December of 1773, they were
making a statement and setting an ex-
ample for people across this Nation to
understand that we just can’t tax peo-
ple without allowing them to be rep-resented.

You have heard the great discussions,
the cogent points about the fiscal side
of the situation. But one thing we have
to remember when we raise Hamilton and talk about
the Federalists is that their stated be-

My friend and the Chair of the Financial Services
Committee.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to
support H.R. 51, the Washington, D.C.
Admission Act, which would end cen-
turies of taxation without representa-
tion and make Washington, D.C., the
51st State.

And nobody is giving back anything. Washington, D.C., is the home to more
Americans than two States, and more
than 46 percent of its 700,000 residents
are Black.

Make no mistake, race underlies
every argument against D.C. state-
hood, and denying its citizens equal
depth of democracy and representa-
tion is a racial, democratic, and economic injus-
tice we cannot tolerate.

It must be acknowledged that the
chance to right these wrongs with to-
day’s vote would not be possible without
the good friends, ELEANOR HOLMES
NORTON. We were both elected at the
same time, and she has been dogged
and consistent every single year since
then in her fight for this bill and D.C.
statehood.

I am so pleased to join my friend in
today’s milestone vote, and I am hopeful
that ELEANOR’s long effort will fi-
nally give D.C. the rights they deserve.
Mr. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers. I am prepared to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD).

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker. I thank Delegate ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON for her years of leadership on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, from 1910 through 1970, thousands of African Americans from my district, and from your district, Mr. HICE, migrated to Washington, D.C., seeking employment and better opportunities than existed in the segregated South. They work and worship, and they pay their taxes. They own and operate businesses here in D.C. They teach in the public schools. They are Capitol Police. They clean our offices.

I know very well that some of Ms. HOLMES NORTON’s ancestors originated in my district.

Mr. Speaker, D.C. residents pay the highest per capita Federal income taxes in the country. They pay more Federal taxes than residents of 22 States. It is a grave injustice that they don’t have representation in this body. It is time to say to the citizens of this city that they, too, are American citizens and deserve to be part of this great Union, with full rights of citizenship.

What they don’t need to hear on this floor today is for Members to say, “I will never vote for D.C. statehood.”

That is irresponsible.

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

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker. Article IV, Section 3.1, provides that new States may be admitted by Congress into this Union. There is absolutely no requirement for a constitutional amendment.

I was born and raised in Washington, D.C., spending my formative years in this great domain, and I grew up knowing that my parents paid taxes but had no voting representation in Congress.

It was paradoxical that I learned in school that the cries of patriots, “No taxation without representation,” did not apply to the people of this great domain.

We obeyed the same laws and paid the same taxes as our fellow Americans, but we had no hope in taking part in the governance of America.

I thank the Delegate ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON for keeping hope alive.

I am here today to say that it is time to end the legal disenfranchisement of a population larger than the States of Vermont and Wyoming. This vote is long overdue, and I intend to vote in favor of D.C. statehood, and I encourage my colleagues to vote “yes.”

Mr. HICE of Georgia. May I inquire as to how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker. I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. STEVENS).

Ms. STEVENS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my esteemed colleague from the District of Columbia, Congresswoman HOLMES NORTON.

In this very Chamber, we have, throughout our Nation’s history, long debated statehood for many lands and many people, and adding new States what we have.

In 1837, Michigan statehood was passed by Congress as the 26th State and signed by President Jackson, who proudly stated Michigan was “admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States in all respects.”

In 1959, as we added Hawaii to the Union, the Secretary of the Interior declared: “The great statehood of Hawaii will be granted and prove to the world . . . that we practice what we preach.”

Now, as we add Washington, D.C., and recognize the over 700,000 people, hundreds of thousands of Federal tax-paying residents of D.C. are left without representation.

With the agreement of my esteemed and tireless colleague from the District of Columbia, Congresswoman ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, my colleague and the representative of the 706,000 residents of the District of Columbia, for her tireless and relentless efforts in shepherding this legislation to the floor today.

Mr. Speaker, in his famous 1857 oration in Cincinnati, New York, abolitionist Frederick Douglass said, “If there is no struggle there is no progress. Those who profess to favor freedom and yet deprecate agitation are men who want crops without plowing up the ground; they want rain without thunder and lightning. They want the ocean without the awful roar of its many waters.”

The vote we are about to cast today is long in coming but shows that struggle can lead to progress, that truth crushed to earth shall rise again, that justice cannot be denied.

Today, we vote to end two centuries of inequality, we restore, and we continue to flourish our democracy that manifests to promote the general welfare.

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

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from the District of Columbia has 3 minutes remaining.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I want to give all acknowledgment to the outstanding gentlewoman, ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON.

President Washington said: “The Constitution is the guide which I will never abandon.”

Nothing in the Constitution says that we should not make the Washington State the Douglass Commonwealth. Frederick Douglass said there is no power without struggle.

The action we are taking today to admit the State of Washington, Douglass Commonwealth, as the 51st state of the Union is consistent with the authority vested in the Congress by the Constitution in Article IV, section 3, clause 1.

The Constitution does not specify a minimum population or acreage test that a state must meet to gain admission to the Union, rather leave the determination to be made in the sound judgment of the Congress, which admitted Wyoming which has more than 200,000 fewer persons than the District of Columbia and Alaska, and less than 1,640,000 persons when it was admitted as a state in 1959.

Mr. Speaker, in doing passing this legislation, we remove a stain that has blighted our nation for more than 200 years.

I thank Congresswoman ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, my colleague and the representative of the 706,000 residents of the District of Columbia, for her tireless and relentless efforts in shepherding this legislation to the floor today.

Mr. Speaker, let us not lose sight of one indisputable and shameful fact: over 700,000 people living in the District of Columbia lack direct voting representation in the House of Representatives and Senate.

Specifically, the citizens of the District of Columbia pay more in Federal taxes than 22 states and pay more in Federal taxes per capita than any state.

The District of Columbia’s population (705,000) is larger than the populations of Wyoming and Vermont, and seven states had populations under one million in the last census.

The District of Columbia’s annual budget ($15.5 billion) is larger than the budgets of 14 states.

The District of Columbia has a higher per capita personal income and gross domestic product than any state.

District of Columbia residents have fought and died in every American war, including the Revolution itself, and almost 200,000 District residents have served in the military since the Revolution.

District of Columbia residents have served in the military since the Revolution itself, and almost 200,000 District residents have served in the military since the Revolution itself, and almost 200,000 District residents have served in the military since the Revolution itself.

Approximately 30,000 veterans live in the District of Columbia, and it should be noted that during the Vietnam War, 243 District residents were casualties of war, a casualty figure greater than that observed by 10 different states.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is indisputable that residents of the District of Columbia serve in the military, pay billions of dollars in federal taxes each year, and assume other responsibilities of U.S. citizenship.

But for over 200 years, the District of Columbia has been denied voting representation
Mr. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I am intrigued listening to my colleagues wax about the divine creation of the District of Columbia. Give me a break. It was old-fashioned horse trading between Hamilton, Madison, and Jefferson like the declaration of enslaved people being three-fifths of a person, able to vote for themselves, simply power for White people.

It is time to recognize the reality of what I think was a corrupt bargain and give the District of Columbia the statehood it deserves.

Mr. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Despite the passionate arguments that we have heard today regarding H.R. 51, the plain truth is that Washington, D.C., is the Capital of the United States as exactly as our Founders intended.

To be clear, Washington, D.C., is a vibrant and special city holding a unique position in our Nation’s Federal system. Our Nation’s Capital does not exist within one State, and therefore, it is free from the influence of any State. That is exactly the intention of our Constitution and our Founders.

But not only is the Constitution proposal going to be in violation of our Constitution, but practically speaking, D.C. is not prepared financially and otherwise as a microstate.

Currently, Washington, D.C., only raises about half of its annual budget through local taxes, despite the fact that they have some of the highest taxes in the Nation. This shows a lack of financial readiness for the responsibility of statehood.

Congress has already dealt with this in the past, and D.C.’s financial situation, we bailed it out in the 1990s after 20 years of troubled self-rule.

The majority’s bill does not take into account how these budgetary shortfalls would be remedied or how the tax-payers would be relieved. Statehood first, the details later, is that the majority’s proposal.

In seeking to gain an extra two seats in the Senate, Democrats would strip this great historic city of its special status and make it a State. The Democrat’s statehood proposal leaves us with a State in name only, and a tiny remnant of a Federal district. This is far from the intent of our Founding Fathers.

We live in a federation, a federation of States. I would say there is no one who is a greater supporter of States’ rights than I am, but because I believe in States’ rights, I cannot support this city becoming a State.

D.C. is not equipped to shoulder the burden of statehood. If Democrats were serious about granting representation to the citizens of D.C., they would consider retroceding the land back to Maryland, as has been proposed, but that has been rejected over and over. If D.C.’s citizens rejoin Maryland, they would gain the Senate and House representation that supposedly is what this bill is about.

But this statehood proposal is about politics all dressed up in noble arguments about disenfranchising and taxation without representation. It is just a big sham.

The Constitution is clear. A new State can be formed from Federal territories or from existing States with their permission. But the current Federal district is not an existing State, nor is it a territory. It is a unique district, the seat of our Federal Government that is not influenced by a State. That is what we have, and that is what we need to keep.

H.R. 51 disregards the Constitution, and we cannot take this lightly. I ask my colleagues to oppose this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining, please?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from the District of Columbia has 30 seconds remaining.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

This bill allows our country to live up to its claim to be a democracy. We stand out as the only democracy which denies democracy to the residents of its own Capital City.

Our claim to world leadership is marred until, with this bill, the residents of our Capital are equal in citizenship to the citizens of every Member of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 51, the Washington, D.C. Admission Act—a bill long overdue and exceedingly necessary.

This is a measure we have supported since my inaugural term in the House of Representatives, 27 years ago, when I cosponsored Representative HOLMES NORTON’s second-ever statehood bill. Her continued leadership and tenacity on this issue as the Delegate from Washington, D.C. is nothing short of extraordinary, and it is a testament to her efforts that today we vote on a statehood bill for the first time in almost three decades.

For too long, the over-700,000 residents of the District of Columbia been denied voting representation while still paying taxes, serving in our military, and adhering to federal laws. Think of that—here, in the greatest legislative and deliberative body in the world, we routinely prevent hundreds of thousands of our
citizens, half of which are African American, from having their voices heard. The admission of D.C. as a state and redesignation as the Douglass Commonwealth will not only extend rights and liberties to its residents but, in doing so, honor the memory of the iconic abolitionist and freedom advocate Dred Scott.

Mr. Speaker, as over half of the Members of the House of Representatives are already co-sponsoring H.R. 51, I do not doubt that it will pass. I urge those remaining who have not co-sponsored this bill to stand on the right side of history and do the same.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of D.C. statehood. Today’s affirmative vote in the House of Representatives to admit the State of Washington, Douglass Commonwealth as the 51st state in the Union is long overdue for the more than 700,000 disenfranchised American citizens who currently live in the District of Columbia. This is the first time a chamber of Congress has voted to approve D.C. statehood. I have long been a proponent of D.C. statehood and was the only member of the Virginia delegation to vote for D.C. statehood the last time it came before the House in 1993. And during my service as a member of the Virginia House of Delegates, I introduced the resolution for Virginia to ratify the Constitutional Amendment to grant full Congressional voting rights to the District of Columbia. Unfortunately, neither my resolution nor the Constitutional Amendment were ultimately successful.

Today’s vote marks a historic victory for the indefatigable advocates for statehood including my colleague, Congresswoman ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, who has been a tireless advocate for the disenfranchised citizens of our nation’s capital. Supporting D.C. statehood is about our nation’s core constitutional principles of self-determination, opposition to taxation without representation, and giving an equal voice to all Americans regardless of where they live. I hope my Republican colleagues in the Senate put aside politics and pass this bill and finally end the historic injustice and long overdue voting representation for the nearly 200 years for the people of Washington, D.C.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 51—the Washington, D.C. Admission Act—introduced by my colleague and fellow Member, HOLMES NORTON. This bill would not only establish the District of Columbia (“D.C.”) as the 51st state of the United States, but it would also grant long overdue voting representation at the federal level to the residents of D.C.

I remain committed to the principles this country boasts: democracy and representation. Since 1801, the residents of D.C. have been denied federal representation. They pay their taxes and have fought and died in every American war, yet those armed service members and their families are deprived of the freedoms they have fought to protect. Statehood is the only remedy that provides full representation in Congress for the residents of Washington, D.C.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time to the Member for his second time.

Mr. KELLER moves to recommit the bill H.R. 51 to the Committee on Oversight and Reform with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendments:

SEC. 2. FINDINGS. Congress finds the following:

(1) The admission of Washington, Douglass Commonwealth as a State under this Act requires the President to issue a proclamation prior to the new State’s admission to the Union.

(2) To assure the interests of the rest of the Nation that up until now have had shared ownership of the Nation’s capital through their representation in Congress, this Act revises the Title of the District of Columbia and the State of Washington, Douglass Commonwealth to contain certain provisions before the President issues a proclamation recognizing it as a new State in the Union.

(3) This Act provides as a precondition of admission that the new State require in its State constitution that the State does not require a fee or assessment in order to carry a concealed firearm in the state.

(4) This Act provides as a precondition of admission that the new State prohibit in its State constitution any statute, ordinance, policy or practice that prohibits or restricts any government entity or official from enforcing national immigration laws.

(5) This Act provides as a precondition of admission that the new State prohibit in its State constitution any statute, ordinance, policy or practice that prohibits or restrains any person who incites, sets on foot, assists, incites, or engages in any rebellion, secession at any person who incites, sets on foot, assists, incites, or engages in any rebellion, secession at...
welfare of the citizens of the State and visitors from other jurisdictions by ensuring the adequate and continued funding of law enforcement and public safety agencies.

(A) requiring the State Chief Financial Officer, or the equivalent State official, to appropriately prioritize law enforcement and public safety in the State budget and in the administration of the State’s cash management and payroll operations; and

(B) an amendment prioritizing access to the State’s cash management and payroll operations, or their equivalents, to assure uninterrupted spending to cover the operational expenses related to law enforcement and public safety.

(8) Participation in Opportunity Scholarship Program.—An amendment requiring the State to continue to participate in the Scholarship at the same levels as of the day before the date of the amendment.

(9) Monitoring Capital Zoning Zones.—An amendment requiring the State to continue to participate in the Capital zoning zones.

(b) States.—The term ‘State’ means the State of Washington, Douglass Commonwealth.’’

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to talk about how for over 200 years lawmakers have come from every State in the Union to work and live in this District.

The city was not meant to be a prize of conquest like the ancient walled cities of Europe. It was not meant to be the hub of trade like the early American cities. Above anything, it was meant to represent a center of the federation created by our Constitution.

The city is tied to the idea of the American Republic, a living piece of collaboration, the star on the map representing the 50 stars on the flag.

With this in mind, I would like to propose an amendment clarifying the relationship between the State of Washington, Douglass Commonwealth, a State the size of a small county, that collaboration will be gone. The majority believes it is a small price to pay for two Senators.

Republicans need assurances that the interests of their constituents will be reflected in this new State that will have undue influence over the Nation’s Federal Government.

So, my motion contains reasonable additions to H.R. 51 that will require the State to provide adequate and permanent funding for law enforcement and public safety agencies to enforce the laws of the State and protect the life, property, and welfare of the citizens of the State and visitors from other jurisdictions.

Page 85, line 10, strike ‘‘shall apply as follows:’’ and insert ‘‘shall apply with respect to the State of Washington, Douglass Commonwealth and the Capital in the same manner as of the day before the date of the amendment of the State into the Union’’.

Page 86, line 3, strike ‘‘four citizen members’’ and insert ‘‘five citizens’’.

Page 86, line 5, strike ‘‘capital’’ and add ‘‘Capital’’

Page 87, line 2, strike ‘‘means the’’ and insert ‘‘means the State of Washington, Douglass Commonwealth, the’’

Page 87, line 7, strike ‘‘and the State of Washington, Douglass Commonwealth’’.

Page 87, line 13, strike ‘‘LIMITING APPLICATION TO THE CAPITAL’’

Page 87, line 20, strike ‘‘the term ‘Capital’ means’’ and add ‘‘the term ‘National Capital’ means’’

Page 88, line 3, strike ‘‘Capital’’ and insert ‘‘National Capital’’.

Page 88, line 5, strike ‘‘LIMITING APPLICATION TO CAPITAL’’ and insert ‘‘CLARIFYING APPLICATION TO NATIONAL CAPITAL’’

Page 88, line 9, strike ‘‘LIMITING APPLICATION TO CAPITAL’’ and insert ‘‘CLARIFYING APPLICATION TO NATIONAL CAPITAL’’

Page 88, line 14, strike ‘‘CAPITAL’’ and insert ‘‘NATIONAL CAPITOL’’

In the matter proposed to be amended by paragraph (2) of section 324(c), insert ‘‘National’’ before ‘‘Capital’’ each place it appears in the heading and the text of the new paragraph (2) of section 8902(a) of title 46, United States Code.

Page 88, line 15, strike ‘‘Capital’’ and insert ‘‘National Capitol’’

Page 89, line 8, strike ‘‘Capital’’ and insert ‘‘NATIONAL CAPITOL’’

Page 89, line 11, strike ‘‘urban fabric of the State of Washington, Douglass Commonwealth, and the’’.

Mr. KELLER (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.
For one thing, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Roy) said that we should legislate for the real Americans, and he is going to speak for the real Americans, not the people who live in Washington, I would hope he would reflect on that and issue an apology to the people of Washington, D.C.

But it seemed that the logic of the argument was that the only people who live here are Federal employees, and they are different from the rest of America.

Now, think about that for a second. In the first place, the overwhelming majority of Federal employees do not live in Washington, D.C. As far as I could tell, less than 8 percent of Federal employees live in Washington, D.C., which means 92 percent of them live in our States in the rest of America.

Should those people be disenfranchised? Should people who work for the post office lose their right to representation in Congress? Should members of the Armed Forces be disenfranchised?

The Supreme Court already said no in Carriazo Check It Out.

So, the overwhelming majority of Federal employees don’t live in D.C., and the overwhelming majority of people who live in Washington, D.C., are not Federal employees. They do other things.

Yes, they are real Americans, too. They are bus drivers. They are schoolteachers. They are businesspeople and entrepreneurs. I mean, come on, get real, be serious, get out and meet the people in Washington.

The gentleman from Georgia said Washington, D.C., was set aside in the Constitution as a Federal district, and that was echoed by the former judge from Texas. But here, our friends just advertised their unfamiliarity both with the Constitution and with American history.

The Constitution does not fix the geographic site of the so-called seat of government, the district that is set aside for the seat of government. That is why after the Constitution was adopted the capital was in New York for a while. It was in Philadelphia for a while. Before that, it was in Trenton, New Jersey. It was in Princeton. It was in Annapolis. We have a whole room in Annapolis set aside for where Congress met.

So the idea that you can look up the Constitution and see the boundaries or the map of Washington, D.C., is just absurd.

Now, does Congress have the authority to modify the boundaries of the Federal district as proposed by Ms. Norton? Of course it does. We voted to do that in 1846 at the behest of a couple hundred slave masters in Virginia who were afraid that this Congress would follow the advice of Representative Lincoln from Illinois, who said abolish the slave traffic in Washington, D.C.

And they were afraid it was going to happen, so Alexandria, Arlington, and Fairfax county were given back to Virginia, and it was perfectly constitutional. And there is no legal authority to the contrary in any way.

If we can modify the boundaries of the Federal District to placate a couple hundred slave masters from the 19th century, we can modify the boundaries of the Federal District to grant statehood and political equality for the people of Washington, D.C.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

Mr. KELLER. Mr. 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.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MURPHY of Florida). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

NATIONAL PULSE MEMORIAL

Mr. SOTO. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3094) to designate the National Pulse Memorial located at 1912 South Orange Avenue, Orlando, Florida, 32806, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill as follows:

H.R. 3094

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

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION OF NATIONAL PULSE MEMORIAL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Pulse Memorial located at 1912 South Orange Avenue, Orlando, Florida, 32806, is designated as the “National Pulse Memorial”.

(b) EFFECT OF DESIGNATION.—The national memorial designated by this section is not a unit of the National Park System and the designation of the National Pulse Memorial shall not require or permit Federal funds to be expended for any purpose related to that national memorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SOTO) and the gentleman from California (Mr. MCLINTOCK) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SOTO. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the measure under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, on June 12, 2016, a gunman shot and killed 49 people and injured 53 others in the Pulse nightclub shooting in Orlando, Florida. It was the single deadliest known violent attack on the LGBTQ community, the deadliest violent attack in America at that time, and an attack on our Latino community, our African-American communities, and so many others.

After this tragedy, our city came together. Doctors, first responders, and friends rushed to save the wounded; others donated funds, supplies, even their blood. Countless works of art, gifts, and letters were left at impromptu memorial sites paying tribute to the victims and survivors.

We came together in candlelight vigils across the globe to grieve and remember. We became truly Orlando Strong in the face of adversity for the whole world to see.

As we continue to honor 49 angels, we remind the world that love will always conquer hate in the end. The designation of the Pulse nightclub as a national memorial honors the lives taken, as well as the survivors, first responders, and an entire central Florida community. Together, we will open minds and hearts and make the Pulse Memorial a national symbol of hope, love, and change.

I thank my Orlando area colleagues, Congresswoman VALENCIA and Congresswoman STEPHANIE MURPHY, for joining me in leading this important bipartisan legislation.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3094, offered by our colleague from Florida (Mr. Soto).

A little over 4 years ago, on June 12, 2016, the Pulse nightclub in Orlando, Florida, became the scene of the worst terrorist attack on American soil since September 11, 2001. Forty-nine Americans died and 53 were injured that terrible night at the hands of an ISIS-inspired coward who turned on the very country where his parents had sought refuge from the violence in Afghanistan. Instead of gratitude, he unleashed hatred and violence upon this country that had sheltered his family and made it possible for him to be born into a land of freedom and opportunity.

The poisonous political ideology that infected and animated him in his attack—and to which he pledged allegiance just before the attack—is a familiar nemesis to the founding principles of our country.

However, on that dark day in Orlando, the Orlando community and the nation came together to mourn the loss of those 49 lives. Never forget their names. Never forget the lives they touched. Never forget their parents, their loved ones, and their communities.

As we mark the 4-year anniversary of this attack, we also honor the survivors. Their physical wounds may have healed, but the emotional pain lingers on.

Forty-nine angels died that day. We honor their memory.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.
This craven and wanton attack reminds us of the threats of Islamic extremism both at home and abroad: that they are real, that they are malignant, and that they are deadly.

In the aftermath of this terrible attack on the patrons of the Pulse nightclub, its owner established a nonprofit called the onePULSE Foundation to memorialize those who died in this mass murder, known simply as “the 49.” The foundation worked quickly to establish in Orlando, but recently began working with Orlando’s mayor to launch a design competition for a permanent memorial and museum slated to open in 2022.

I urge adoption of the measure, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SOTO. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California and our friends across the aisle for their support.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. DEMINGS).

Mrs. DEMINGS. Madam Speaker, it is time to make the Pulse nightclub a national memorial, and the reason is that what Pulse symbolizes is relevant to all Americans.

Let me say this: Orlando does not need Congress in order to honor the 49 victims, nor the 53 who were wounded that night. We have honored them and will continue to do so for as long as their stories live on.

But it is still the right thing to do, that Congress take this action today, because, by making Pulse a national memorial, we honor not only the victims, but what they stood for, what they represent, and what our country could be and should be.

Pulse is in my district. It was a sanctuary. It was a place where Orlando’s LGBTQ residents could find safety and friendship. The people there that night were not in the wrong place at the wrong time. They were exactly where they were supposed to be, among friends and loved ones, taking joy together in what my bishop referred to as a late night fellowship.

Isn’t that worth celebrating? Isn’t that worth protecting for every American? Could there be any right more basic?

And that is why we are here: to honor and remember them.

We will continue to grieve for those we lost and to help those who survived.

We will continue to act on gun violence and civil rights, for the survivors of Pulse have called upon us to honor those we lost with action, not just words.

Today, with this vote, we state that Pulse was about more than just the 49 who were lost. It was about what it was, and for what it meant; and it will be a national memorial not just to commemorate our past, but to guide our future.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Madam Speaker, I have no further speakers on our side, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SOTO. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

Mr. CICILLINE. Madam Speaker, I thank you, who brought me to the site of this horrible tragedy and allowed me to see the warmth and beauty of your community in response to it.

Four years ago, 49 people were murdered in a violent, hate-filled mass shooting at a gay nightclub in Orlando. In the days that followed, we heard stories of courage, bravery, and resolve. But mostly, there was unspeakable pain for those who lost someone in this attack. And although I pray that the passage of 4 years has brought some measure of relief, the truth is that their pain will never fully go away.

It is critical that we designate this memorial today so that our country never forgets those who are lost, but it is also important to take action so this never happens again.

Individuals convicted of hate crimes should never own a gun, and that is why I introduced the Disarm Hate Act—to do just that. If you commit a hate crime, you shouldn’t be allowed to own a gun, period. We know that those who commit hate crimes become increasingly violent as time goes on.

No American family should have to suffer because of this loophole. Let’s disarm hate once and for all.

We will never forget the 49 young people who lost their lives at the Pulse club in Orlando, the extraordinary response of the first responders, and the hospital facilities that provided miraculous care that prevented so many other lives from being lost.

Let’s do all that we can to prevent the next hate-filled tragedy.

Again, I salute Orlando Strong for the magnificent and nurturing response of the entire community to this devastating attack on all of us.

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

Mr. SOTO. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ).

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Speaker, I take this opportunity to commend Congresswoman Soto, Congresswoman DEMINGS, and the gentlewomen's (Congresswoman MURPHY), who is in the Chair, on this incredibly important legislation.

I traveled to attend a memorial service in the aftermath of the tragedy at Orlando’s Pulse gay nightclub to mourn with the stunned community how the confluence of bigotry and weapons of war conspired to steal 49 innocent lives.

I remember the feeling of numbness and agony. It was so hard to grasp that in 2016, visitors to Pulse that night suffered a violence that far too often plagues LGBTQ-plus communities and communities of color, but this time on a mass scale. They were targeted for who they were.

Out for the evening, they assumed it was safe to be themselves, to live their truths, and yet their precious lives were snuffed out.

But in this darkest of moments, Floridians opened their arms to embrace and heal one another. They vocally denounced bigotry, whether it was aimed at our LGBTQ-plus or Hispanic communities, or both. They would not stay silent.

Even public figures who were not always clear LGBTQ-plus allies stood up and made a commitment to equality.

Two years later, my community endured similar heartache and anger when a student and educators were killed at Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School. Days after that horrific school shooting, I was in Orlando and visited Pulse, where spontaneous messages of love and sadness were left behind.

As I added my message to the thousands hanging on banners there, I saw Pulse was not simply a site of tragedy and pain. It was a hallowed place to remember and honor all the individuals who were lost. But it was also now a public space affirming that equality, justice, and love are worth rallying to and fighting for.

Making Pulse a national memorial would most importantly, properly honor those we lost too soon.

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

Mr. SOTO. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ).

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Speaker, but it would also elevate that site so that millions of Americans might turn our collective pain into collective action.

In passing this bill, I hope visitors the world over will be inspired by a community that emphatically declared that love and hope will always triumph over prejudice and violence.

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

Mr. SOTO. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL).

Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL. Madam Speaker, I am proud to rise in support of H.R. 3094, a bill to designate the National Pulse Memorial.
On June 12, 2016, a shooter hatefully took the lives of 49 people at the Pulse nightclub in Orlando, Florida. Those who died were sons and daughters, brothers and sisters, mothers, fathers, and loving members of Florida’s community. This tragedy brought grief and pain to all parts of the Nation, to Florida, including my very own district, and to the LGBT community.

The evening at the nightclub was Jerry Wright. His parents, MJ and Fred, are part of our community in south Florida. They described Jerry as a wonderful, loving, and caring son. He was there that evening, like any other event. He loved Latin music with friends, and from 1 minute to the next, his life was cruelly taken from him. He was only 31 years old.

We all know that Jerry did not deserve this. His parents and family did not deserve this.

I am very close friends now with the Wright family, and I know firsthand the anguish and the pain that they go through every single day. Mother’s Day, Father’s Day. That pain never goes away.

I know that personally, Madam Speaker, because I have also lost a loved one tragically to gun violence. So the pain that the families and the friends of 49 other people who lost their lives the same way is still present today.

Just over 4 years later, now it is time that we designate the Pulse nightclub as a national memorial. This memorial will honor the memory of those who died that night. It will ensure that loved family members like Jerry Wright are never forgotten. It will reflect on the pain that their families are still suffering. But most importantly, it will serve as a reminder that we as a country have to stop this violence and disarm hate.

This memorial is a testament to the courage and sacrifice of the Pulse victims and their families.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Madam Speaker, I would inquire if the gentleman is ready to close.

Mr. SOTO. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO).

Mr. TAKANO of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Four years ago, during Pride Month, our country awoke to the devastating news about a shooting at a nightclub in Orlando, Florida. The Pulse nightclub, a safe haven for the LGBTQ-plus community in Orlando was the target of an act of hate.

Forty-nine lives were taken and 53 were wounded after a gunman opened fire. The victims and survivors were LGBTQ-plus members and members of the Latinx community.

This shooting was one of the deadliest attacks on LGBTQ-plus Americans in our history, and it left our community hurting, fearful, and skeptical about the progress our Nation had made towards acceptance, understanding, and belonging for LGBTQ-plus people.

Four years later, we are still grieving, we are still healing, and we are still demanding action to make equality the law of the land and to end gun violence in America.

When I visited Orlando to pay my respects to the victims and to honor their memories, what I saw at Pulse during such a painful time gave me hope. I saw a community that had come together to condemn hate, to reject intolerance, and to celebrate the lives of every single soul that was lost that night.

Our community’s pride and the bravery we exhibit worldwide, and courage, which will always triumph over hate. Madam Speaker, as the co-chair of the LGBT Equality Caucus, I thank Representative Soto for his leadership, also Representative Murphy and Representative Demings.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote “yes” on H.R. 3094.

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

Mr. SOTO. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. CLARK), the vice chair of our caucus.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Madam Speaker, almost 4 years ago today, I joined with my colleagues and my friend, Congressman John Lewis, in leading a sit-in on this very floor after the Pulse nightclub shooting in Orlando, Florida. We could not stand for another moment of silence. We could not stand for another day of inaction. We could not stand for another mass shooting in America.

We sat in protest. The House Democrats stopped the work of Congress because Congress had stopped working for the American people.

Now, 4 years later, our commitment to ending gun violence and hate remains absolute.

Making the Pulse nightclub a national memorial will honor the 49 lives lost in Orlando and will declare that love is love.

Today, during Pride Month, we celebrate these lives and we honor them, but we can’t stop there. We need commonsense gun violence prevention measures now.

Within weeks of taking the majority, House Democrats passed two bipartisan gun safety bills. To this day, they remain stalled in the Senate.

COVID-19 is not the only public health crisis in this country. We lose 40,000 Americans a year to gun violence.

We cannot waste another day. We ask the Republicans in the Senate to pass our legislation, end this sickening cycle of gun violence in our country.

Choose love, choose peace, recognize that gun violence is often the lethal partner of racism and bigotry.

With this national memorial, we will have a physical manifestation of our commitment to end gun violence and to have equality for all.

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

Mr. SOTO. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, this is a somber moment, and I thank the gentlewoman from Florida for not only his passion but his recognition that America should never forget.

I thank the Speaker pro tempore for letting us remember all the faces and
families and loved ones that were impacted. Forty-nine lives, I believe, were taken in one moment, with an act of violence by a crazed gunman, with a gun. We have been trying to stand in the gap, with background checks passed and violence by a crazed gunman, with a gun. That was a tragedy that we could never have imagined. Forty-nine lives, I believe, were taken in one moment, with an act of violence, but it also stands as a symbol of standing up against hate in all its forms.

I remember hearing the stories of families waiting outside of the Pulse nightclub, saying they heard from their loved one but had not seen them because they were making their last minute cries for help.

This memorial would say to America that we are not a nation of bigots, of xenophobia, racism, hatred. We are a nation of respect and dignity. I know the families of those who died at the Pulse nightclub are still in pain and will never forget.

But it is the duty of the United States Congress, with our voices raised to say that the book that I have been holding on to over the last 2 days, to fight for justice in policing, to talk about D.C. statehood, this book, this Constitution, which George Washington said he would use as a guide, that he would never abandon, everyone has the right to decency and life and due process.

I enthusiastically support this legislation to give dignity to the lives of those who died, at the Pulse nightclub.

Madam Speaker, as a senior member of the House of Representatives, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3094, “To designate the National Pulse Memorial located at 1912 South Orange Avenue, Orlando, Florida, 32806, and for other purposes.”

I am voting for H.R. 3094 because it not only memorializes and honors the 49 people who tragically lost their lives from this horrific act of violence, but it also stands as a symbol to the LGBTQ+ community, to our Latino community and to the world, that we will not stand for or tolerate acts of hatred against marginalized persons.

Madam Speaker, you will remember that the Pulse nightclub shooting took place on June 12th, 2016 in Orlando, Florida when a gunman shot and killed 49 people and injured 53 others.

It was the single deadliest known violent act on both the LGBTQ+ community and our Latino community. The Pulse nightclub was a haven for the LGBTQ community to live, love, and dance.

They came for music, celebration and fellowship. Over four dozen would leave the Pulse Nightclub with their names added to a list of fatal victims of gun violence.

In the aftermath, we saw communities come together and support one another. We saw doctors, first responders, and friends rush to save the wounded. Organizations donated funds, supplies, and even their blood.

There were countless murals and other artworks, gifts, and letters left at impromptu memorial sites, paying tribute to the victims and survivors.

Our nation refused to let hate win. We came together in the form of thousands of candlelight vigils to grieve, remember, and heal.

By passing H.R. 3094 today, we seek to create a permanent reminder that this act of violence and other heinous instances of bigotry are not emblematic of America or its true values.

It will also remind us that it is our duty as a society to be better and do better in terms of standing up against hate in all its forms. I ask all members to join me in voting for H.R. 3094, “To designate the National Pulse Memorial located at 1912 South Orange Avenue, Orlando, Florida, 32806, and for other purposes.”

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

Mr. SOTO. Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD a list of the names of the 49 victims lost in the Pulse nightclub shooting.

Stanley Almodovar III, 23 years old; Amandla L. Alvear, 25 years old; Oscar A. Aracena Montero, 26 years old; Rodolfo Ayala Ayala, 35 years old; Antonio Davon Brown, 29 years old; Darryl Roman Burt II, 29 years old; Angel Candelario-Padro, 28 years old; Juan Chavez Martinez, 25 years old; Luis Daniel Colon, 24 years old; Cory James Connell, 21 years old; Trevin Eugene Crosby, 25 years old; Dooka Deidra Drayton, 32 years old; Simon Adrian Cittadino Fernandez, 31 years old; Lorvo Valentin Fernandez, 25 years old; Mercedes Marisol Flores, 26 years old; Peter Ommy Gonzalez Cruz, 22 years old; Juan Ramon Guerrero, 22 years old; Paul Terrell Hammonds, 27 years old; Miguel Angel Honorato, 30 years old.

Javier Jorge Reyes, 40 years old; Jason Benjamin Josaphat, 19 years old; Eddie Jamoldroy Justice, 30 years old; Anthony Luis Laureano Dizla, 25 years old; Christopher Andrew Leinonen, 32 years old; Alejandro Barrios Martinez, 21 years old; Brenda Marquez McCool, 49 years old; Gilberto R. Silva Menendez, 25 years old; Kimberly Jeanne Morris, 37 years old; Akyra Monroe, 25 years old; Monet Murray, 25 years old; Omar Oscar Capo, 20 years old; Geraldo A. Ortiz Jimenez, 25 years old; Eric Ivan Ortiz-Rivera, 36 years old; Joel Rayon Panday, 32 years old; Jean Carrasquillo, 33 years old; Enrique L. Rios, Jr., 25 years old; Jean Carlos Nieves Rodriguez, 27 years old; Xavier Emmannuel Serrano Rosado, 35 years old; Christopher Joseph Sanfeliz, 24 years old; Ylimary Rodriguez Solivan, 24 years old; Edward Sotomayor Jr., 34 years old; Shane Evan Tomlinson, 31 years old; Matthew Christopher Ton开, 32 years old; Benitez Torres, 33 years old; Jonathan A. Camuy Vega, 24 years old; Juan Pablo Rivera Velazquez, 23 years old; Luis Sergio Vielma, 22 years old; Franky Jimmy DeJesus Velazquez, 50 years old; Luis Daniel Wilson-Leon, 37 years old; Jerald Arthur Wright, 31 years old.

Mr. SOTO. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California, Ms. BASS, the ranking member of the House of Representatives.

Ms. PELOSI. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank you and him for making this important memorial possible for us today.

I rise to solemnly join my colleagues to honor the 49 beautiful souls murdered 4 years ago in an unfathomable act of hatred and bloodshed at the Pulse nightclub in Orlando.

I thank Congressman DARREN SOTO for giving us this opportunity of observing and for being a voice for peace and healing for all of those affected.

Pulse was a peaceful haven where young LGBTQ Americans could enjoy music, dancing, and celebration, knowing they were in a sanctuary of safety and solidarity.

Pulse was a monument to joy, a tribute to resilience and pride born out of the grief that Barbara Poma experienced after losing her brother, John, to AIDS. That was her motivation for starting that.

May the grief that we experience now at the loss of 49 who were murdered move us to turn our pain into purpose. This poster is all of them.

But some time after the terrible tragedy, as one of the first actions of our majority last year, the House took action to end the bloodshed by passing H.R. 8 and H.R. 1112, H.R. 8 so designated because it had been 8 years since the assault on the life of our colleague Gabby Giffords.

She survived. She is doing remarkable things, in terms of trying to end gun violence. But other people died. Hence, H.R. 8, as it was 8 years since. Then, H.R. 1112 was Mr. CLYBURN’s legislation to address what happened in South Carolina.

485 days, nearly 500 days, later, we continue to urge the Senate to take up this legislation, supported broadly, Democrats, independents, Republicans, gun owners, hunters, many of whom have had to pass background checks in order to have their guns and to enjoy their sport and protect themselves. They are not against background checks. Across the country, this has broad support, bipartisan support.

Yet, in the Congress of the United States, there is resistance to that safety of simply commonsense background checks. It isn’t as if we were starting something new. This is just an expansion of the background checks that already exist to include gun shows and online sales, et cetera, just an expansion.
I remind my colleagues that an average of 100 people die every day from gun violence. Let me restate, it has been almost 500 days since the House passed those bills and the Senate has failed to take it up—almost 500 times 100 a day.

We see the consequences. Not that all of them would have been saved, but some, many, would have. Many have been saved since the original background check legislation passed.

Four years later, 4 years after Pulse, our grief remains raw. It has been almost 500 days since the House passed those bills and the Senate has failed to take it up—almost 500 times 100 a day.

I yield myself such time as I may conceive.

Mr. SOTO, and I urge a “yes” vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues, both Democrats and Republicans, for coming together: Chair GRIJALVA, Ranking Member BISHOP, Mr. MCLINTOCK, Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN, Mr. FITZPATRICK. We appreciate all the work being done in the Senate.

Today, we recognize the memory of the 49 angels across our Nation by making this the Pulse National Memorial.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SOTO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3094, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Providing for Congressional Disapproval of Rule Submitted by Department of Education Relating to “Borrower Defense Institutional Accountability”—Veto Message from the President of the United States

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Will the House, on reconsideration, pass the joint resolution, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

For veto message, see proceedings of the House of June 1, 2020, at page H2923.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote to override the President’s veto.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX), who is the ranking member, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

We all agree this was an attack motivated by hate, hatred against our country, hatred against all that our country stands for.

I think we can take some solace in knowing that Americans today retain their right to defend themselves against such attacks, that such terrorist attacks like this should remind us how important our Second Amendment rights remain today.

We can also take solace from the fact that al-Baghdadi, the inspiration for this terrorist attack, was hunted down and brought to justice in October last year by American Delta Force commandos, as he shielded himself with children, who he killed when he detonated a suicide vest rather than to be taken prisoner.

Madam Speaker, in memory of the 49 Americans killed by this terrorist attack, I ask for an “aye” vote in this House today.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

We all agree this was an attack motivated by hate, and today, we recognize the 49 angels we lost and the 53 who were injured during the Pulse nightclub shooting.

Vigils occurred across this Nation, across the political spectrum, after this deadly shooting. I can tell you, on behalf of Congresswoman DEMINGS, Congresswoman MURPHY, myself, and our region, we want to thank everyone for doing that.

We want to thank our colleagues, both Democrats and Republicans, for coming together: Chair GRIJALVA, Ranking Member BISHOP, Mr. MCLINTOCK, Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN, Mr. FITZPATRICK. We appreciate all the work being done in the Senate.

Today, we recognize the memory of the 49 angels across our Nation by making this the Pulse National Memorial.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SOTO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3094, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Providing for Congressional Disapproval of Rule Submitted by Department of Education Relating to “Borrower Defense Institutional Accountability”—Veto Message from the President of the United States

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Will the House, on reconsideration, pass the joint resolution, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

For veto message, see proceedings of the House of June 1, 2020, at page H2923.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of overriding the President’s veto of H.J. Res. 76, a bipartisan Congressional Review Act resolution that would stop the Department of Education’s harmful borrower defense rule from going into effect.

Mr. Speaker, I first want to recognize the hard work of the gentlewoman from Nevada, Representative SUSIE LEE, for her tireless efforts in protecting students, particularly student veterans, from predatory schools.

Borrower defense is a valuable tool to provide relief to student borrowers who are defrauded by predatory institutions. Unfortunately, instead of using the Department’s authority to make borrowers whole and give students a second chance at student loan education, it has gone out of its way to prevent victims of fraud from getting relief.

The Department’s rewrite of the borrower defense rule, which is set to go into effect on July 1, will mean that a vast majority of defrauded student borrowers will get virtually no relief. Even in cases where a school clearly violates the law, defrauded victims can still be denied relief under the rule if they can’t show that the school intentionally defrauded them or they can’t file their claim fast enough or they can’t document, according to the flawed Department methodology, exactly how much harm they suffered due to fraud.

Even those student borrowers who do receive partial relief will receive significantly less relief than before. Under Secretary DeVos, the average loan discharge amount for approved borrowers has dropped from about $11,000 to about $500, and for many students zero relief would be available even though they can prove massive fraud.

Class actions are not allowed under the rule. Each student must bring an individual case even though the school may have been found to have been guilty of egregious systemic fraud.

Democrats and Republicans came together earlier this year to pass a Congressional Review Act resolution that rejects this rule and prevents the Department of Education from denying borrowers the relief they deserve. A broad coalition, including veterans and military groups, consumer advocates, student advocates, and civil rights groups, called on the President to sign the congressional resolution and protect student borrowers from predatory schools; but, while the President initially indicated support for the resolution, he ultimately chose to veto it.

Today the House has one final opportunity to ensure that defrauded students get the relief they deserve by overriding that veto.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote to override the President’s veto.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX), who is the ranking member, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I thank my colleague from Virginia for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition of H.J. Res. 76, a resolution that would overturn the Education Department’s effort to assist students who
Massive loan forgiveness has long been a Democratic objective, and the Obama rule was a giant leap toward that goal—one that also ignored the high cost to taxpayers.

Furthermore, the Obama administration’s regulations were convoluted, blurring the line between fraud and inadvertent mistakes made by schools. The distinction between the two is important because, if institutions are found to engage in fraud, the Education Department can cause schools to close—despite no intentional wrongdoing—through significant financial penalties.

But don’t just take my word for it. Colleges and universities, including historically Black colleges and universities, HBCUs, voiced concerns about the Obama regulation. Postsecondary education leaders believed what President Obama’s administration proposed could ruin those colleges and universities that did not have large endowments or significant revenue streams like the Ivy League institutions. The Obama rule undermined the goals of the Department of Education’s borrower defense because the institutions designed and dedicated to serving low-income, minority, and first-generation students.

Additionally, The Washington Times pointed out: “Under the Obama rule, students in the coronavirus era who could not attend classes on campus and were forced to take makeshift Zoom classes would have legitimate claims against their schools because the Obama rule does not differentiate between willful misrepresentation and inadvertent mistakes made by schools.”

The Obama regulations created more chaos than clarity, and the Trump administration recognized immediately the need to right these wrongs. So, working with the Education Department, President Trump produced a rule with clearer standards for borrower defense and increased transparency for both students and institutions.

The rule, first and foremost, holds all schools accountable. Students who have been lied to and suffered financial harm are entitled to relief and forgiveness.

Let me repeat that. The Trump administration’s borrower defense rule delivers relief to students, including veterans, who have been lied to and suffered financial harm.

In fact, the Obama rule undermined the ability of students to earn relief if the institution was considered an elite liberal arts institution. In contrast, President Trump’s rule makes sure students have the last word no matter what institution they attend.

Democrats will have you believe that the President and Secretary DeVos want to intentionally harm students who have been defrauded by an institution of higher education, and that is simply not the case.

While my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are willing to spend taxpayer money recklessly, President Trump’s rule actually reduces the cost of the 2016 Obama-era regulations by $11 billion because it helps students go to and complete their education rather than closing schools indiscriminately.

This shouldn’t come as a surprise. Massive loan forgiveness has long been a Democrat objective, and the Obama administration began encouraging frivolous appeals, and the appeals jumped to 300,000 and climbing.

Democrats have resorted to political finger-pointing on this issue at every turn. First, Education and Labor Committee DeFazio held a hearing at the end of last year to hurl unfounded and personal attacks at Secretary DeVos. Then they passed H.J. Res. 76 shortly after to overturn the Education Department’s borrower defense rules; and now, following the Trump rule and providing context on the administration’s borrower defense rule, Democrats still没去 "override the President’s veto."

As we stand here today—yet again—to watch the Democrats’ political games unfold, I would like to begin by highlighting real priorities we are letting fall by the wayside as we waste time debating this partisan resolution.

For starters, we should be working on bipartisan solutions to combat the devastating effects of the coronavirus. We should be addressing the concerns of small businesses—the backbone of our economy—and the workers whose livelihoods are being impacted by this crisis.

Or we could address labor union shortcomings, including the widespread and brazen corruption amongst United Auto Worker, UAW, union leadership. We know the UAW senior union leaders engaged in money laundering, tax fraud, and fraud. The Department of Justice wrote in its many shortcomings.

Unfortunately, Democrats have a long track record of pursuing ideological objectives at the expense of taxpayers, students, and schools. Today is no different, so I would like to spend some time touching upon the advantages of the Trump administration’s new rule and providing context on the Obama-era borrower defense rule and its many shortcomings.

The borrower defense rule was first released by the Education Department in 1994. Borrowers rarely used this rule over the next 20 years, until 2015, when a large for-profit school was forced to close—despite no intentional wrongdoing—through significant financial penalties.

The borrower defense rule was a giant leap toward that goal—one that also ignored the high cost to taxpayers.

Furthermore, the Obama administration’s regulations were convoluted, blurring the line between fraud and inadvertent mistakes made by schools. The distinction between the two is important because, if institutions are found to engage in fraud, the Education Department can cause schools to close—despite no intentional wrongdoing—through significant financial penalties.

But don’t just take my word for it. Colleges and universities, including historically Black colleges and universities, HBCUs, voiced concerns about the Obama regulation. Postsecondary education leaders believed what President Obama’s administration proposed could ruin those colleges and universities that did not have large endowments or significant revenue streams like the Ivy League institutions. The Obama rule undermined the goals of the Department of Education’s borrower defense because the institutions designed and dedicated to serving low-income, minority, and first-generation students.

Additionally, The Washington Times pointed out: “Under the Obama rule, students in the coronavirus era who could not attend classes on campus and were forced to take makeshift Zoom classes would have legitimate claims against their schools because the Obama rule does not differentiate between willful misrepresentation and inadvertent mistakes made by schools.”

The Obama regulations created more chaos than clarity, and the Trump administration recognized immediately the need to right these wrongs. So, working with the Education Department, President Trump produced a rule with clearer standards for borrower defense and increased transparency for both students and institutions.

The rule, first and foremost, holds all schools accountable. Students who have been lied to and suffered financial harm are entitled to relief and forgiveness.

Let me repeat that. The Trump administration’s borrower defense rule delivers relief to students, including veterans, who have been lied to and suffered financial harm.

In fact, the Obama rule undermined the ability of students to earn relief if the institution was considered an elite liberal arts institution. In contrast, President Trump’s rule makes sure students have the last word no matter what institution they attend.

Democrats will have you believe that the President and Secretary DeVos want to intentionally harm students who have been defrauded by an institution of higher education, and that is simply not the case.

While my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are willing to spend taxpayer money recklessly, President Trump’s rule actually reduces the cost of the 2016 Obama-era regulations by $11 billion because it helps students go to and complete their education rather than closing schools indiscriminately. This is an $11 billion savings for American taxpayers during a time when many are struggling to make ends meet.

Additionally, the Trump borrower defense rule holds all institutions, not just for-profit colleges, accountable for misrepresentations instead of picking winners and losers at considerable cost to taxpayers. It ensures due process for all parties; extends the look-back window to qualify for closed school loan discharges from 120 to 180 days so when schools close more students are eligible for forgiveness; and allows for arbitration, which could result in borrowers recovering resources such as cash payments or other expenses not provided by the Education Department.

Furthermore, this rule is the result of more than 2 years of deliberations, hearings, public comment, and working with higher education stakeholders, as well as considering, incorporating, and responding to public comments on this issue.

Thanks to this regulatory reset, all colleges and universities will be held accountable, defrauded students will see relief, and taxpayer dollars will be better protected.

Republicans stand ready to provide relief to students who have been harmed by fraud, and the borrower defense rule issued by the Trump administration delivers on that front.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge a "no" vote on this resolution, and I reserve the balance of my time.
the answer, and they believe us. But that system failed them. The system failed my constituent, Kendrick Harrison, a brave Iraq war veteran, a father, and a Black American.

Kendrick and his family were left home alone and left holding the bag by their for-profit school. Kendrick went through his GI benefits and convinced him to take out $16,000 in debt right before shutting their doors. He is fighting to this day and working as hard as anyone to get his life back on track.

I promise this story is not an exception. There are over 350,000 students just in recent years who were lied to, manipulated, and defrauded by predatory schools.

So I ask my colleagues: Are you going to stand with these students? Are you going to stand with the system that perpetuates inequality and holds down brave Americans like Kendrick? Are you going to let these for-profit schools close on the lives of these students and take advantage of American taxpayers?

Because it is us, American taxpayers, who foot the bill for these bad actor schools because the Department of Education refuses to hold them accountable.

I am ready to take a stand against this broken policy, and I need you to stand with me. Take a stand for the very communities who have been rising up in this country.

These protests over the last several weeks are about police brutality, but they are about so much more. They are about decisions that we make in this body that perpetuate inequality and continue to stack the deck against Black Americans, student veterans, students in poverty, and working people who are just trying to better themselves.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote to override the President’s veto. It is time to take a stand.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS), the chair of the Subcommittee on Higher Education and Workforce Investment.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, the new borrower defense rule provides relief to students who are waiting for student loan relief. Over 40,000 of those students are from my home State of California.

After doing nothing for students who have been defrauded by predatory colleges, the Department has come out with a new borrower defense rule that only makes things worse—in several ways—under the guise of protecting the taxpayer from footing the bill. But we have to remember, our students are taxpayers, too.

This new rule clearly gives preference to the very colleges causing the harm from the borrower defense rule that it was intended to prevent. If a school closes, and the institution defaults on its promises to students, they should have automatic discharge of their loans to that institution. Students who have spent years bettering themselves working to get into jobs, sacrificing in the hope of improving their financial conditions for their families are being told that they simply don’t matter.

Colleges, on the other hand, can use this system to keep taking money and they don’t have to deliver what they promised. They should be held to more stringent protections.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution before us today is the first step toward blocking the new fraud borrower defense rule from taking support, and I urge its support.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON).

Mr. Speaker, I thank our education Republican leader for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the veto override of H.J. Res. 76. The Department of Education first released borrower defense rules in 1994, which were rarely used over the next 20 years. After a large for-profit school closed in 2015, the Obama administration used this opportunity to issue new regulations on borrower defense. These regulations could cost the American taxpayer more than $20 billion and encourage tens of thousands of borrowers—whether they were harmed or not—to apply to have their loans forgiven. The 2016 Obama regulations created more chaos than clarity and set massive loan forgiveness of a loan, regardless of the cost to taxpayers.

However, in 2019, the Trump administration issued that new borrower defense rule, which takes effect July 1. The new rule creates clear, consistent standards and procedures for borrowers who have suffered financial harm due to a misrepresentation by a school.

Specifically, the rule...

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the attempted veto override of H.J. Res. 76.

When this legislation was advanced through this Chamber in January, the majority sought to turn back the clock on borrower defense leading to dangerous consequences for students, those repaying their loans, and the American taxpayer. The Obama-era rule, which the majority seeks to return us to, in this legislation was marked by regulatory chaos, excessive punishments, and ridiculous costs. The Obama rule provided no clarity and sought to forgive student loans at a massive scale, regardless of the cost to taxpayers or merits of the borrower’s case.

Mr. Speaker, most importantly, the Obama-era regulations did not distinguish between more-rate fraud and unintentional errors made by schools, which is critical because the Department can levy substantial financial penalties against institutions found to engage in fraud, which can cause a school to close. This would be another form of wrongdoing, thus ending access to alternative avenues for higher education for some current and prospective students.

Estimates put the total cost of the Obama Loan Forgiveness giveaway as high as $40 billion. That is why in 2019, the Trump administration issued the new Borrower Defense Institutional Accountability Rule. The new rule...

Mr. Speaker, we simply cannot afford to return to the outdated, costly, and confusing Obama-era rule. I also urge a ‘no’ vote, because with respect to this issue, Congress should stay in protecting students with more options to continue their education, should their school close; and allows for faster relief by allowing institutional level arbitration.

Mr. Speaker, just a few weeks ago, right before Memorial Day, President Trump very quietly, behind closed doors, vetoed this bill, a bill that protects a borrower defense rule, which was supported by a wide range of veteran service organizations.

For years, young veterans who sought an education after serving their country have been targeted by for-profit, rip-off education factories that swallowed up their GI benefits and then piled on new student loans.

Mr. Speaker, for these reasons, I urge my colleagues to vote to override the President’s veto.
Stories abound about men and women who wore the uniform of this country left with crushing debt and worthless degrees that denied them the rewarding careers they were promised. Although many today are entitled to loan forgiveness, the Department of Education secretary, Betsy DeVos, has willfully made this process as onerous as possible.

Mr. Speaker, if we listen to the American Legion, the Iraq and Afghan Veterans of America, and the Vietnam Veterans of America, we can restore these victims of fraud and greed some semblance of financial solvency. If we do not override this veto, the share of eligible debt forgiveness will drop from 53 percent to just 3 percent, and we will betray thousands of Americans who stepped up and volunteered to protect our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" to override.

Mr. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, is it interesting that my colleagues would say the President "very quietly and behind closed doors" vetoed a bill. They issued a statement on it almost immediately, so it wasn't exactly quietly. Generally, they have to vote a bill at a desk with people present.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my strong opposition to overriding President Trump's veto.

We can all agree that no student should be intentionally misled and schools engaging in fraudulent misrepresentation must be held accountable. But the Obama-era borrower defense regulations lack clarity, and simply, did not function. The 2016 regulations did not make the critical distinction between fraud and unintentional mistakes made by schools.

Mr. Speaker, under the rule, the Department of Education can impose significant financial penalties on institutions found to engage in fraud. But with no distinction, this can cause a school to have to close despite no intentional wrongdoing, hurting students on their path to a higher education. That is why President Trump took decisive action and created the 2019 borrower defense rule to clear this up.

Mr. Speaker, the Trump administration's solution delivers relief to students whose lofty promises turned student debt into a nightmare. The student borrowers who were defrauded by these unscrupulous institutions, not with Secretary DeVos and unscrupulous institutions that cheated students. This is indefensible.

Mr. Speaker, we are in a challenging time for our country, but this should not be hard. Let's stand with the victims, the students, the servicemembers, and stand with Secretary DeVos, and not with Donald Trump.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join together and override this veto.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DAVID P. ROE).

Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the resolution.

As a ranking member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I have heard a lot of misinformation about the Department of Education's borrower defense rule and its effects on student veterans.

Here is the truth: The rule does not limit the rights or benefits provided for veterans in the GI bill or servicemembers who use the Department of Education's Tuition Assistance Program, or the TAP program. Any veteran or servicemember who is defrauded by an institution and took out Federal loans, will have the opportunity to have that claim fairly adjudicated, just like any other student would under the rule.

Mr. Speaker, 45 years ago, this Army veteran, when he left the Army, used the GI bill. I know how valuable it is, personally, Mr. Speaker. It helped me and my family tremendously, and that is why we wanted to make the GI benefit a lifetime benefit.

Mr. Speaker, just a few months ago, this Congress passed two bills to protect student veterans whose GI bill benefits were impacted by the coronavirus pandemic. My record has shown that one of my top priorities is ensuring veterans can receive a quality education, and a large part of that is ensuring that they receive the education they were promised and holding schools accountable for fraud.

Mr. Speaker, the Department's rule does just that. And it sets up a clear process for borrowers to have their claim adjudicated and hold institutions of all types accountable. This rule is fair to borrowers. It is fair to schools. It is fair to taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker, I support this rule, and I support the President's veto.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO), a member of the Committee on Education and Labor, but more importantly, chair of the full Committee on Veterans' Affairs, because so many veterans have been implicated by fraud on these institutions.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, 45 years ago, this Army veteran, when he left the Army, used the GI bill. I know how valuable it is, personally, Mr. Speaker. It helped me and my family tremendously, and that is why we wanted to make the GI benefit a lifetime benefit.

Mr. Speaker, just a few months ago, this Congress passed two bills to protect student veterans whose GI bill benefits were impacted by the coronavirus pandemic. My record has shown that one of my top priorities is ensuring veterans can receive a quality education, and a large part of that is ensuring that they receive the education they were promised and holding schools accountable for fraud.

Mr. Speaker, the Department's rule does just that. And it sets up a clear process for borrowers to have their claim adjudicated and hold institutions of all types accountable. This rule is fair to borrowers. It is fair to schools. It is fair to taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker, I support this rule, and I support the President's veto.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO), a member of the Committee on Education and Labor, but more importantly, chair of the full Committee on Veterans' Affairs, because so many veterans have been implicated by fraud on these institutions.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, 45 years ago, this Army veteran, when he left the Army, used the GI bill. I know how valuable it is, personally, Mr. Speaker. It helped me and my family tremendously, and that is why we wanted to make the GI benefit a lifetime benefit.

Mr. Speaker, just a few months ago, this Congress passed two bills to protect student veterans whose GI bill benefits were impacted by the coronavirus pandemic. My record has shown that one of my top priorities is ensuring veterans can receive a quality education, and a large part of that is ensuring that they receive the education they were promised and holding schools accountable for fraud.

Mr. Speaker, the Department's rule does just that. And it sets up a clear process for borrowers to have their claim adjudicated and hold institutions of all types accountable. This rule is fair to borrowers. It is fair to schools. It is fair to taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker, I support this rule, and I support the President's veto.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO), a member of the Committee on Education and Labor, but more importantly, chair of the full Committee on Veterans' Affairs, because so many veterans have been implicated by fraud on these institutions.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, 45 years ago, this Army veteran, when he left the Army, used the GI bill. I know how valuable it is, personally, Mr. Speaker. It helped me and my family tremendously, and that is why we wanted to make the GI benefit a lifetime benefit.
We must override the President’s veto. Congress must again stand with student loan borrowers and stop the Trump administration’s attack on America’s students and his attempts to rig the rule in favor of Secretary DeVos’ cronies. More than 200,000 student borrowers are still waiting for relief.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SMUCKER).

Mr. SMUCKER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to today’s attempt to override the President’s veto. I think all of us agree that it is important to offer borrowers a process to discharge loans when they have been defrauded by a school, and that is what the rule, crafted with significant stakeholder input, offers. That was the original intent of borrower defense process when it was enacted in 1995.

However, in 2016, as we have heard, the Obama administration used this process to advance an ideological loan forgiveness scheme, and it worked as they said it would. Few went from fewer than 60 claims over 20 years to nearly 330,000 claims in 4 years, which would cost the hardworking taxpayers, if you had to pay this price, $40 billion. And they will have to pay that price.

Now, I don’t need to go into reasons why that 2016 Obama rule was flawed. Instead, I will highlight some of the improvements made under the new rule.

This rule strengthens protections for borrowers from fraud and applies the same accountability metrics to all institutions across the board. The rule provides due process for students and institutions but, rightfully, gives the last word. The rule keeps the standard of evidence the same as the one used by the Obama administration, by the way, and thanks to stakeholder feedback, the rule does not require borrowers to prove intent.

Another point, this new rule will only apply to new claims for loans taken out after July 1.

I do want to thank Secretary DeVos and all of the hardworking individuals at the Department of Education for working through the caseload under the Obama standard. Your hard work of processing more than 5,000 cases per week for borrowers seeking relief has not gone unnoticed.

A vote against this veto override is a vote in favor of creating a system that is fairer for students and taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this resolution.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. ADAMS), the chair of the Workforce Protections Subcommittee and also chair of the HBCU Caucus.

Ms. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this measure to override the President’s veto and to stand up for our Nation’s 20 million college students.

Secretary DeVos’ rule would harm tens of thousands of college students and would allow bad actors to continue some of the worst practices, such as forcing students to sign pre-arbitration agreements that limit their rights. We cannot allow predatory institutions to steal the dream of a college degree from any child.

It is shameful that in his veto message, President Trump used historically Black colleges and universities, HBCUs, as cover for his pro-fraud, anti-student agenda.

Mr. SMUCKER. Now, let’s be clear. No HBCU has ever been implicated in a borrower defense claim, and no HBCU has voiced support for Secretary DeVos’ rule. That is fake news.

It is time that President Trump and Secretary DeVos began standing up for North Carolinians seeking opportunity instead of lying down to our Nation’s worst institutions. And if they won’t do it, Congress will.

It is a fundamental right. Du Bois told us: ‘‘Of all of the civil rights for which the world has struggled and fought . . . the right to learn is . . . the most fundamental.’’

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Alabama (Mr. BYRNE).

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to overriding President Trump’s veto of H.J. Res. 76.

Everyone in this Chamber who agree that schools who cheat and take advantage of students must be held accountable. However, returning to the 2016 borrower defense rule put in place by the Obama administration is not the answer.

Put simply, the Obama-era rule sends millions of taxpayer dollars to those who were not harmed by their university. Under the Obama-era rule, the standard to define fraud was placed so low that the Department of Education saw about 200,000 relief applications in just 5 years. Compare that to the just 59 applications in the previous 20 years the borrower defense process has been in place.

Understanding this problem, the Trump administration released an updated borrower defense rule in 2019 to prevent fraud, ensure taxpayer dollars are spent responsibly, and cut the regulatory red tape that has made it difficult for students and educational institutions to understand the old rule.

The new rule also ensures that due process, a founding principle of our Nation, is in place for both students and institutions.

The cost of allowing the Obama rule to stand is great, over $40 billion taxpayer dollars. That is why, the changes made by the Trump administration will save taxpayers billions while still ensuring that students are protected from fraud.

The Trump administration rule applies relief where it is needed, unlike the overly broad Obama-era rule. This should be something both parties can support.

Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that students who are defrauded by educational institutions deserve debt relief, but the Obama-era rule is not the answer.

I urge my colleagues to vote “no” and sustain the President’s veto.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL), a distinguished member of the Committee on Education and Labor.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Speaker, the American people do not support Betsy DeVos.

We don’t support her radical attempts to privatize education.

We don’t support her corrupt efforts to take coronavirus relief away from public schools so that it can be sent to private ones.

We don’t support her hateful, transphobic agenda or her attacks on survivors of sexual assault.

We don’t support her putting predatory, for-profit colleges over those they cheated with a rule that would force the most vulnerable students who were robbed to repay 97 percent of what they borrowed. That is why Congress passed H.J. Res. 76, with bipartisan support.

But just as Vice President PENCE had to save Betsy DeVos’ Senate confirmation, President Trump is trying to save her dangerous rule against our bipartisan bill.

So I urge my colleagues to override this veto, and, once again, let’s make clear that the people’s House stands on the side of the people and not Betsy DeVos.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Kansas (Mr. WATKINS).

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this costly resolution that would allow more fraud, waste, and abuse.

No one condones fraud, especially when it is perpetrated by an institute of higher learning. Every student who is financially defrauded is entitled to relief and forgiveness, period. But we should make sure that we are helping those who have been defrauded. It is our job to do due diligence for the American taxpayer.

The Trump administration has made this a priority, unlike the Obama administration. They used the rule to force as many students as they could. They would even target institutions they didn’t like. That is partisan. It is costly to the taxpayer, and it is harmful to the student. That is why I support Secretary DeVos and President Trump. Their borrower defense rule takes taxpayers into account.

After seeing the enormous price tag of $42 billion that the Obama rule created, President Trump and Secretary DeVos acted swiftly to take that burden off the backs of the taxpayers. I thank the President and Secretary DeVos.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL).
from Pennsylvania (Ms. WILD), a distinguished member of the Committee on Education and Labor.

Ms. WILD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.J. Res. 76.

Students defrauded by predatory, for-profit colleges can be left with crushing debt, useless degrees, and none of the job opportunities they were promised.

Secretary DeVos could provide immediate relief to students who were defrauded through the Department of Education's Student Loan Ombudsman. The regulations she has halted make it nearly impossible for veterans and student borrowers defrauded by their schools to obtain financial relief. Congress voted, on a bipartisan basis, to override Secretary DeVos' borrower defense rule, which only cancels 3 percent of the student loans resulting from school misconduct, keeping 97 percent of our veterans and student borrowers drowning in debt they only incurred due to fraud and from which they may never recover.

If Secretary DeVos' efforts to prioritize profit over education are allowed to stand, then the for-profit industry will continue to do what it always has: exploit veterans, student borrowers, and those trying to better their lives and support their families by obtaining an education.

This is a fight with which I am deeply familiar. This Congress, the House Financial Services Committee held two hearings examining the student loan crisis and approved three bills that will provide strong student borrower protections, including for those harmed by for-profit colleges. And during this COVID-19 crisis, I have fought to provide up to $10,000 of relief for private student loan borrowers, and I continue to fight to protect student loan borrowers who should not have to deal with debt collections, negative credit reporting, late fees, and penalties while dealing with this pandemic.

With over 200,000 pending borrower defense applications for loan relief, these students desperately need and deserve our help.

I urge my colleagues to support veterans and student borrowers by overriding the President's veto of H.J. Res. 76.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), the chair of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding for me.

It is unconscionable that any institution of higher education would engage in fraudulent misrepresentation to prey on student loan borrowers, particularly veterans who are able to qualify for GI benefits to attend schools.

President Trump's commonsense rule would protect students who were defrauded and suffered financial harm by any school, giving them the opportunity to individually make their case, ensuring due process for all parties. It would also save taxpayers $11 billion, compared to President Obama’s last-minute, one-size-fits-all rule that did not hold schools accountable.

As a member of the Education and Labor Committee and the former chairman of the Higher Education Subcommittee, I strongly urge my colleagues to vote "no" today.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. HARDER), a distinguished member of the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. HARDER of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to encourage my colleagues to vote to protect our constituents who were scammed by for-profit colleges.

Both the House and the Senate took bipartisan votes to protect these students, but the President overruled our votes, siding with Secretary DeVos and her billionaire donors.

This issue hits home for me. I met a woman named Artemisa, who attended a corrupt college in my district. She studied to be a nurse and graduated with $40,000 in debt, but no one would hire her. She is still paying off that debt to this day.

And it is not just Artemisa. Thousands of students at scam colleges across the country have similar stories. And if Secretary DeVos' new plan isn't stopped, these student borrowers may never get the justice they deserve. That is not what we do in this country.

If Secretary DeVos is concerned about cost, she should talk to her billionaire friends in the corrupt college industry. The criminals should not be putting the financial burden on the victims of this fraud.

I encourage everyone to vote to overturn the President's veto.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS), the chair of the Committee on Financial Services.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman SCOTT for yielding to me on this important issue.

I rise to override the President's veto of H.J. Res. 76, which undoes a Secretary DeVos rule that would make it nearly impossible for veterans and student borrowers defrauded by their schools to obtain financial relief.

Congress voted, on a bipartisan basis, to reject Secretary DeVos' borrower defense rule, which only cancels 3 percent of the student loans resulting from school misconduct, keeping 97 percent of our veterans and student borrowers drowning in debt they only incurred due to fraud and from which they may never recover.

If Secretary DeVos' efforts to prioritize profit over education are allowed to stand, then the for-profit industry will continue to do what it always has: exploit veterans, student borrowers, and those trying to better their lives and support their families by obtaining an education.

This issue hits home for me. I met a woman named Artemisa, who attended a corrupt college in my district. She studied to be a nurse and graduated with $40,000 in debt, but no one would hire her. She is still paying off that debt to this day.

And it is not just Artemisa. Thousands of students at scam colleges across the country have similar stories. And if Secretary DeVos' new plan isn't stopped, these student borrowers may never get the justice they deserve. That is not what we do in this country.

If Secretary DeVos is concerned about cost, she should talk to her billionaire friends in the corrupt college industry. The criminals should not be putting the financial burden on the victims of this fraud.

I encourage everyone to vote to overturn the President's veto.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), the chair of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding for me. I rise to support this override.

Predatory for-profit colleges scam students and taxpayers out of millions of dollars. Predatory for-profit colleges account for 9 percent of students in postsecondary education but 33 percent of defaults.

To help students, the Department of Education under the Obama administration created a streamlined resolution process under the borrower defense to repayment provision of the Higher Education Act. Now, Secretary DeVos is breaking the process.

I will tell you what her goal is. It is to aid the perpetrators, not to help the victims. Under her new rule, borrowers lose out. They lose out if they cannot prove the school intentionally defrauded them, if they cannot file their claim fast enough, or if they cannot document their own financial harm.

As a result, as little as 3 percent of eligible debt will be forgiven now. What little relief there is now will likely be shouldered by taxpayers, not the schools committing the fraud.

Stopping the Secretary as we are pushing to do has wide support: 20 State attorneys general and nearly 60 advocacy groups for students, civil rights, and education. The American Legion has said: "Deception against our veterans and servicemembers has been a lucrative scam for unscrupulous actors."

So I say to my Republican colleagues who want to support the military: Support this override.

And to those of us who want to fight for racial and economic justice: Support this override.

In 2018, we wrote to the Secretary, alarmed about how this rule could hurt students of color: "Ninety-five percent of students at for-profit colleges took out student loans, and a staggering 75 percent of Black students who did not complete their programs defaulted."

We must act now for veterans, for students of color, for borrowers across this country. In Connecticut, 1,100 defrauded students are waiting to be made whole. They need this override, not that cruel policy. Vote to override.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, before I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island, I would like to remind...
our colleagues that just yesterday a Federal court ruled that the Department of Education must provide full relief for 7,200 defrauded Massachusetts student borrowers who attended Corinthian Colleges. Unfortunately, there are still borrowers around the country still waiting for relief.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. Cicilline), a member of the House Judiciary Committee.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I rise in strong support of the resolution to override the President’s veto.

In 2016, the Obama administration issued the borrower defense rule in order to provide relief to student borrowers defrauded by predatory for-profit institutions, which promised an education and credentials to pursue a career only to find these credentials did not have the value they were promised.

In the aftermath of the collapse of institutions like Corinthian Colleges and ITT Technical Institute, the Obama administration sought to provide relief to those students left out in the cold.

The Obama administration ended these protections and implemented a rule making it harder to obtain relief, siding with predatory for-profit institutions rather than the victims—the students and veterans who were cheated.

According to the Institute for College Access and Success, the number of student borrowers eligible to seek debt relief or loan forgiveness will drop from 53 percent of borrowers under the Obama-era rule to just 3 percent under the Trump rule.

In response, Congress, in a bipartisan way, came together to reject the administration’s rule change, rejecting efforts to leave defrauded students out in the cold. The President vetoed this relief. Now, Congress must once again step forward.

I urge adoption of the override resolution.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. Porter), a member of the Financial Services and Oversight and Reform Committees.

Ms. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding. Under the Higher Education Act, students who are defrauded by private predatory colleges are entitled to relief on their loans. The prior administration created a Streamlined process to help defrauded borrowers access relief and move forward with their lives.

Secretary DeVos tried to strip these protections away, but we fought back. Some of my Republican colleagues in the House and Senate voted with us to overturn Secretary Betsy DeVos’ new rule. We came together to defend students and to stand up against fraud, waste, and abuse.

But President Trump vetoed this important resolution. Instead of standing with students and taxpayers, President Trump stood with corrupt private colleges and Secretary DeVos.

Today, I ask my Republican friends: Do you want to stand with our country’s students and our workforce or our communities, or do you want to betray them to please the President? I think the choice is clear, and I hope you do, too.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, could you advise how much time is remaining on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Speaker pro tempore rises in support of this resolution in overriding the President’s veto.

I want to talk about two Iowans who tried taking a step forward but were knocked two steps back by a for-profit school looking for an easy buck and taking advantage of the hopes and dreams of my constituents.

Julie, a mother from Iowa, was looking to boost her career, and Jeff, an Army reservist and construction manager, was trying to continue his education. They bought into ITT Technical Institute’s promises, worked hard for new access and success, the number of students eligible to seek debt relief or loan forgiveness will drop from 53 percent of borrowers under the Obama-era rule to just 3 percent under the Trump rule.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Iowa (Ms. Finkenauer), a member of the Financial Services and Oversight and Reform Committees.

Ms. FINKENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution.

They bought into ITT Technical Institute’s promises, worked hard for new career opportunities, and took out loans to do it. Both had their lives turned upside down when ITT Technical Institute suddenly closed.

A 2016 Federal rule forgave loans for folks like Julie and Jeff, who were obviously taken advantage of.

Unfortunately, this administration decided to roll back the commonsense rule, weakening protections for borrowers.

In our State, there are more than 1,000 borrowers who were taken advantage of and who are still waiting for their cases to be resolved.

We must stand with them and override the President’s veto of this resolution.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. Tlaib), a member of the Financial Services Committee and Oversight and Reform Committee.

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

In January of this year, I stood here to speak against this administration’s continued attack on our students. Five months later, Secretary DeVos, with the support of this administration, continues to work on behalf of predatory for-profit institutions rather than the students they lied to that they scammed.

Instead of ensuring that students who were cheated out of their future by these fraudulent institutions receive debt relief, Secretary DeVos is fighting to ensure that these institutions are never held accountable.

Democrats and Republican Members alike agreed that if you were defrauded by one of these colleges, then your Federal student loan should be forgiven. We must stop this administration’s relentless efforts to protect the pockets of predatory corporations at the expense of our students. I am proud to support this veto override.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, contrary to the Democrats’ claims that we have heard today, the Trump administration and Republicans in the House are committed to providing relief to students who have been truly harmed by predatory practices.

The Obama administration’s borrower defense rule, though, was extremely difficult to administer. It left students and institutions confused, encouraged massive and unnecessary loan forgiveness, and created a hefty bill for taxpayers. Anyone who believes it was a streamlined process, I will show you some swampland in New Mexico, where President Trump worked to protect borrowers and taxpayers better. The 2019 borrower defense rule clarified standards and made a process more accessible.

If Democrats overturn the President’s veto, we will be left with the convoluted Obama rule. Under the rules associated with today’s legislation, there can be no revisions made even to improve or clarify the Obama rule.

We want all schools to serve students well. In particular, we want veterans and their education benefits protected.

In this administration, they will be.

Mr. Speaker, I have worked hard all my life to help people get a good education and have a better life. I would not be supporting the overturn of this rule if that was not the direction in which we were going. The Education Department’s borrower defense rule protects all student borrowers, including veterans; holds higher education institutions accountable; and saves taxpayers $11 billion.

Unfortunately, Democrats will stop at nothing to tear down meaningful reforms ushered in under President Trump’s leadership, even if itProspects at the expense of our Nation’s students.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot about $11 billion. Let me tell you exactly what that is. That is $11 billion...
that students who have been defrauded will now have to pay if this resolution fails.

According to the fraud formula from the Department of Education, even those who can prove fraud can expect relief, on average, to go from about 50 percent of their debt down to 3 percent of their debt. Many, because of that formula, will get absolutely nothing.

Mr. Speaker, now is the time that we have a choice. We can give relief to students, especially veterans who have been defrauded by predatory colleges or make them pay student loans even though they received a worthless educational experience.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to side with the students and vote “yes” on this resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The yeas and nays were ordered from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLER), on the motion to recommit on the bill of the State of Washington, D.C. into the Committee on Education and Labor.

Under the Constitution, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 238, nays 173, not voting 19, as follows:

(Roll No. 120)

YEAS—238

Adams
Arulogun
Barragan
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (EA)
Blumenauer
Beyer
Beatty
Bass
Barragan
Brown (MD)
Brown (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cardenas (NY)
Cartwright
Case
Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clayburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtesty
Cox (CA)
Craig
Crep
Crow
Cuellar

Matsui
McAdams
McEachin
McGovern
Mack
Meeks
Morelle
Moulton
Muñoz
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Norton
Nguyen
Norcross
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Palone
Panetta
Pappas
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Presley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Rouda
Ross (AL)
Rush
Ruppersberger
Ryan
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schiff
Schneider
Schneider
Scott (VA)
Scott (NV)
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sherman
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)

NAYS—173

Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Berman
Bizzarro
Bilirakis
Bishop (NC)
Boehlert
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (MD)
Brown (NY)
Brooks (GA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucholz
Budd
Burchett
Burges
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Chabot
Cheney
Clift
Cline
Cole
Comer
Connor
Coway
Crawford
Creigh
Crenshaw
DesJarlais
Dent
Eggers
Einhorn
Engel
Escher
Eshoo
Espaillat
Esper
Fall
Fangman
Farr
Farr
Farr
Farr
Farr
Farr
Farr
Garamendi
Garcia (IL)
Garcia (CA)
Garcia (CA)
Garcia (CA)
Garcia (CA)
Gohmert
Gordon
Gosar

NAY votes: 1.00001

Atwater
Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Berman
Bizzarro
Bilirakis
Bishop (NC)
Boehlert
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (MD)
Brown (NY)
Brooks (GA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucholz
Budd
Burchett
Burges
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Chabot
Cheney
Clift
Cline
Cole
Comer
Connor
Coway
Crawford
Creigh
Crenshaw
DesJarlais
Dent
Eggers
Einhorn
Engel
Escher
Eshoo
Espaillat
Esper
Fall
Fangman
Farr
Farr
Farr
Farr
Farr
Farr
Garamendi
Garcia (IL)
Garcia (CA)
Garcia (CA)
Garcia (CA)
Garcia (CA)
Gohmert
Gordon
Gosar

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

So (two-thirds not being in the affirmative) the veto of the President was sustained and the joint resolution was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against: Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I was un-avoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have “nay” on roll no. 120.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 965, 116TH CONGRESS

Axne
Cardenas
DeSaulnier
Deutch (NY)
Emanuel
Engel (NY)
Engel (Titus)
Fagnitude
Farr
Garner
Gosar
Gohmert
Gianforte
Gillum
Gohmert
Gillum
Goodman
Gosar

H2555

Gallagher
King (IA)
Marchant
Stevens
Soto
Swallwell (CA)
Takahashi
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Taib
Tambor
d
Torres (CA)
Torres Small (TX)
Tran
Trone
Underwood
Van Drew
Vargas
Velasquez
Villacis
Vasserman
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth
Young

Not voting—19

Bishop (IN)
Bross (IN)
Carlin
Carter (TX)
Curtis
Duncan
Emmer

Members present:

Adams
Adler
Axe
Axne
Barrasso
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (EA)
Blumenauer
Beyer
Beatty
Bass
Barragan
Brown (MD)
Brown (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cardenas (NY)
Cartwright
Case
Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clayburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtesty
Cox (CA)
Craig
Crep
Crow
Cuellar

Matsui
McAdams
McEachin
McGovern
Mack
Meeks
Morelle
Moulton
Muñoz
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Norton
Nguyen
Norcross
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Palone
Panetta
Pappas
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Presley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Rouda
Ross (AL)
Rush
Ruppersberger
Ryan
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schorr
Scott (VA)
Scott (NV)
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sherman
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)

NAYS—173

Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Armstrong
Arrington
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Berman
Bizzarro
Bilirakis
Bishop (NC)
Boehlert
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (MD)
Brown (NY)
Brooks (GA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucholz
Budd
Burchett
Burges
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Chabot
Cheney
Clift
Cline
Cole
Comer
Connor
Coway
Crawford
Creigh
Crenshaw
DesJarlais
Dent
Eggers
Einhorn
Engel
Escher
Eshoo
Espaillat
Esper
Fall
Fangman
Farr
Farr
Farr
Farr
Farr
Farr
Garamendi
Garcia (IL)
Garcia (CA)
Garcia (CA)
Garcia (CA)
Garcia (CA)
Gohmert
Gordon
Gosar

Not voting—19

Bishop (IN)
Bross (IN)
Carlin
Carter (TX)
Curtis
Duncan
Emmer

WASHINGTON, D.C. ADMISSION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The motion is on the question to reorder the vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 182, nays 227, not voting 21, as follows:

(Roll No. 121)

YEAS—182

Aderholt
Adrian
Adler
Amodei
Anderson
Andrews
Armstrong
Arrington
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Berman
Bizzarro
Bilirakis
Bishop (NC)
Boehlert
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (MD)
Brown (NY)
Brooks (GA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucholz
Budd
Burchett
Burges
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Chabot
Cheney
Clift
Cline
Cole
Comer
Connor
Coway
Crawford
Creigh
Crenshaw
DesJarlais
Dent
Eggers
Einhorn
Engel
Escher
Eshoo
Espaillat
Esper
Fall
Fangman
Farr
Farr
Farr
Farr
Farr
Farr
Garamendi
Garcia (IL)
Garcia (CA)
Garcia (CA)
Garcia (CA)
Garcia (CA)
Gohmert
Gordon
Gosar

Not voting—19

Bishop (IN)
Bross (IN)
Carlin
Carter (TX)
Curtis
Duncan
Emmer
The SPEAKER pro tempore. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 965, 116TH CONGRESS

Mr. SCHNEIDER, Ms. OCASIO-CORTÉZ, Mr. YARMINTZ, and Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL changed their vote from "yea" to "nay".

Mr. GONZALEZ OF Ohio changed his vote from "nay" to "yea".

So the motion to reconsider was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. GUSEN, as the Chairman of the Rules Committee, on behalf of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, presents the following bill; two in number; one relating to the impeachment of the President, and one relating to the removal of the Vice President:

[House Resolution No. 2...

NAYS—180

[House Resolution No. 2...
Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to be present in the House Chamber to cast my vote on two pieces of legislation.

The Motion to Recommit (RC 121), and "nay" on rollcall No. 120 (Veto message to accompany H.J. Res. 76—Borrower Defense CRA); "yes" on rollcall No. 121 (MTR on H.R. 51—Washington DC Admission Act); and "no" on rollcall No. 122 (Final Passage of H.R. 51—Washington DC Admission Act).

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted as follows: "no" on rollcall No. 120 (Veto message to accompany H.J. Res. 76—Borrower Defense CRA); "yes" on rollcall No. 121 (MTR on H.R. 51—Washington DC Admission Act); and "no" on rollcall No. 122 (Final Passage of H.R. 51—Washington DC Admission Act).
Fourth weekend will be reserved, as were the first weeks in June, for committees to do their work, in particular, the National Defense Authorization Act being considered by the House Armed Services Committee. The bill is obviously, very lengthy. It consists a little more than half of the discretionary spending, and we expect the committee to need substantial time to mark up that bill.

In addition, the Appropriations Committee will be marking up its 12 bills for consideration by the House.

Then, the last 2 weeks, we will be taking the products that will not be limited to the NDAA and the appropriation bills, and we will be primarily taking up the bill with other legislation that will be promoted and sent to the floor for consideration by the Committee.

Mr. FERGUSON. Madam Speaker, I very much appreciate that update.

Question: Does the gentleman expect to consider amendments to H.R. 2, the transportation bill, on the floor next week?

Mr. HOYER. Yes, I talked to Mr. McCARTHY yesterday. Obviously, because of the timeframe that the COVID-19 health structures have imposed upon us, it takes a long time to vote on amendments. So, rather than consider amendments individually, the leader and I talked about having amendments either in manager's amendment or in amendments that have a lot of individual amendments within them. And they will be considered en gros so that there may well be a lot of amendments, but we hope to hold the votes down to a manageable level.

As the gentleman knows, votes have been taking an hour. If we took every amendment seriatim, frankly, we wouldn't finish until September. So, we are trying to manage that, and we are working with the minority leader.

Mr. FERGUSON. Madam Speaker, I am happy to hear that. But it seems kind of odd that this week, when we were considering the police reform bill, there were no amendment considerations.

I believe the majority leader, Madam Speaker, said on the floor that we have constraints on amendments because of the coronavirus. So I ask, if there were amendment constraints this week, do those same constraints exist next week?

Mr. HOYER. No, it turns out that we considered the bill in the House the same way the majority leader in the Senate wanted to consider the Scott bill, or the Republican policing bill. So, both Houses wanted to consider them, apparently, in the same way.

Mr. FERGUSON. Well, I certainly appreciate that, but I was a little disappointed this week, in the fact that I thought we had a chance to make the police reform bill better. It was a genuine effort on both sides of the aisle to have this discussion.

But once again, the Republican voice was left out. There were some really good amendments and ideas from my side that simply did not gain consideration on the floor, and they should have.

One such example was the Cline amendment that really would have discouraged collective bargaining agreements with organizations that really kind of had poor officer disciplinary tactics, something that could have fundamentally changed how departments operate in police departments.

But anyway, it is a disappointment. I hate that we did not get to do that.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. We are hopeful that the Senate will pass a bill. I know that my friend will say, Well, yes, but it is the Democrats that stopped the bill.

Let me tell the gentleman, I genuinely hope that we will have a bill passed by the Senate, that we go to conference, and that we adopt a bill that can garner the support of the majority of the House and the Senate and can be signed by the President of the United States.

As I said on the floor when we considered the bill, KAREN BASS, the Congressional Black Caucus, and those of us who strongly supported the bill, we don't want to send a message. We want to make a difference. To the extent that making a difference requires us to have agreement between the two parties, I am hopeful we will get to that objective.

Mr. FERGUSON. Reclaiming my time, those words are fine now. But when we talk about having agreement and talk about having those discussions, Madam Speaker, clearly, the committee and this body should be considering it as an entire body. The opportunity for us to consider those amendments here on the floor of the House is really important.

But we understand that the minority in the Senate blocked debate and continuation of Mr. Scott's bill, Senator SCOTT's bill, which was, quite candidly, an excellent piece of legislation. If anyone has not seen the floor and his speech, I would highly encourage you to do it.

That was a disappointment. But then, to hear the majority leader say that a difference debate in this House simply to do it in conference, I think we deserve a better opportunity than that.

But I understand. You are in the majority, and that is the way that you all have chosen to do that. But, hopefully, we can get to that point where we can have those honest debates right here on the House floor.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. For just a minute.

Mr. HOYER. The gentleman will surely note that when his party was in power and was scheduling bills, you had the most closed rules of any Congress in the history of the Congress.

Mr. FERGUSON. It seems to me that I voted on a lot more amendments last year than I have this year. We probably did have more closed bills, but we also have a lot more legislative activity. It seemed to be a lot more productive.

But anyway, Madam Speaker, another thing that is concerning to me is that I am disappointed about what has transpired in the House over the recent weeks. For the first time in 230 years, Members had to elect to come to D.C. to represent their constituents, but they no longer need to do that. Instead, they can now turn their voting cards over to another Member, including Speaker Pelosi, or any other Member, and have them vote in their place using this new proxy vote scheme.

One thing that I am thankful for is that the covered period for this laid out by the Speaker comes to an end July Fourth, and we look forward to seeing all the Members come back to do their jobs.

Since many States are fully reopened, and even here in D.C., phase 2 reopening is in its place, and you can go to restaurants and gyms. As a matter of fact, we can even now go to the House gym again. And most employees are returning to work.

With that said, I would like to confirm with the gentleman that he does not plan to extend the July Fourth covered period and continue this absurd proxy voting scheme.

Mr. HOYER. First of all, of course, I reject emphatically the premise that this is absurd. As the gentleman knows, there were some 70, some weeks ago, who cast a vote. There were 30 today. They cast their votes because they were concerned about their health or families' health to whom they would return.

I think the gentleman probably has been reading, as well, and maybe listening to the extraordinary spike in cases that have been identified and the concern that hospital beds will be over-run.

We will end this when the medical community, not somebody who has no medical knowledge and very little command of the facts, tells us it is time to get together again. When he told people to do that, they did get together, 10 out of 10, apparently, for the White House who have gotten infected, and, frankly, spikes in Florida, Texas, Arizona, and, yes, even California and some other States as well, including Arkansas.

Now, I am not sure exactly what the future holds in the gentleman's State. But, Madam Speaker, I believe that we are going to continue to be concerned about the health of the Members, the health of the staff, the health of the people who cover us on behalf of the American people.

So, I can't tell the gentleman whether it is going to end because I can't tell you when the pandemic is going to end.
I can’t tell you when the spike in the numbers of people who are getting sick or people who are dying is going to end. But I can tell you that we will be very sensitive to the risks, and we will act accordingly.

Mr. FERGUSON. Well, certainly, we want to be safe and thoughtful about what we do. But I think America—I think we have done an excellent job of what we set out to do, which was not to stop the spread of this virus, but it was to slow the spread of the virus. Not a single one of us, not a single person in America, wanted to see one of our fellow Americans suffer because there wasn’t a bed in a hospital, or a bed in a healthcare facility where they needed it. And I think that we have done that. I think America has shown that they have had the discipline to say at home and to bend the infection rate curve down.

So, sure, there will be more Americans that contract COVID. But thank goodness that our healthcare system is strong enough and intact that we have the capacity to take care of the most vulnerable.

Speaking of that, I think, as I have watched a lot of the news, a lot of the data, I am very, very, very concerned about the most vulnerable in our Nation. I think one of the most horrific things that has happened seems to be the blatant disregard for rules from CDC and CMS by some Governors, where they returned COVID-positive patients to the nursing homes, where they were able to infect the most vulnerable. I tell my friend I am glad to know he is as committed to getting to the bottom of that as well, because I believe he is a man of honor and integrity. I believe his commitment to lead it to go where the data and facts are. I tell my friend I am awfully glad to hear that.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I hope the gentleman has as high an expectation for the President of the United States as he has of others.

Mr. FERGUSON. Oh, Madam Speaker, not only is there an expectation, there is gratitude for the work that the President and the administration have done to get information out, to expand testing, to go out to make sure that the resources were delivered to our colleagues in the great State of New York, resources there to build extra hospital beds that nursing home patients could have gone to but, unfortunately, were sent back to their nursing homes.

Yes, I am grateful for his commitment to America, but I am grateful for the fact that he has helped lead this country and will continue to lead this country back. So, yes, we should all expect a lot of ourselves. We should be committed to the greatness of this country, as I know that we all are.

Madam Speaker. I yield back the balance of my time.

PROTECTING YOUR CREDIT SCORE ACT OF 2019

Ms. WATERS. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1017, I call upon the Clerk 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, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House. The Clerk read the title of the bill. The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1017, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Financial Services, printed in the bill, modified by the amendment printed in part C of House Report 116-436, is adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 5332
Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the “Protecting Your Credit Score Act of 2020”.
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Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents. Sec. 2. Establishment of online consumer portal landing page for consumer access to certain credit information.

Sec. 3. Accuracy in consumer reports.

Sec. 4. Improved dispute process for consumer access to credit information.

Sec. 5. Injunctive relief.

Sec. 6. Increased transparency.

Sec. 7. Consumer reporting agency registry.

Sec. 8. Authority of Bureau with respect to consumer reporting agencies.

Sec. 9. Bureau standards for protecting nonpublic personal information.

Sec. 10. Report on data security risk assessments in examinations of consumer reporting agencies.

Sec. 11. GAO study on the use of social security numbers.

SECTION 2. ESTABLISHMENT OF ONLINE CONSUMER PORTAL LANDING PAGE FOR CONSUMER ACCESS TO CERTAIN CREDIT INFORMATION.

(a) In General.—Section 612(a)(1) of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681a(a)(1)) is amended by adding at the end the following:


“(I) in General.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this subparagraph, each consumer reporting agency described in section 603(p) shall jointly develop an online consumer portal landing page that gives each consumer unlimited free access to—

“A. the consumer report of the consumer;

“B. the means by which the consumer may exercise the rights of the consumer under subparagraphs (E) and (F);

“C. the ability to initiate a dispute with the consumer reporting agency, if any, that caused any inaccuracy or completeness of any information in a report in accordance with section 611(a) or 623(a)(6);

“D. the ability to place and remove a security freeze on a consumer report for free under section 605(a) and (b);

“E. if the consumer reporting agency offers a product to consumers to prevent access to the consumer report of the consumer for the purpose of preventing identity theft, a disclosure to the consumer regarding the differences between that product and a security freeze as defined under section 605(a); or

“F. if the consumer reporting agency obtains, modified by the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Financial Services, printed in the bill, modified by the amendment printed in part C of House Report 116-436, is adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.
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“(ii) NO ADVERTISING OR SOLICITATIONS.—A portal established under this subparagraph may not contain any advertising, marketing offers, or other solicitations.”

“(iv) CONFORMANCE.—The Bureau may allow the consumer reporting agencies an extension of 1 year to develop the online consumer portal landing page required under clause (i).”

“(v) OPT-OUT OPTION.—”

“(i) IN GENERAL.—If a consumer reporting agency provides consumer information in a manner that is not included in a consumer report, the consumer reporting agency shall provide each consumer with a method (through a website, by phone, or in writing) by which the consumer may elect, free of charge, to not have the information of the consumer so sold.

“(ii) NO EXPIRATION.—An election made by a consumer under clause (i) shall expire on the date on which the consumer expressly revokes the election through a website, by phone, or in writing.”

“(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 612(f)(1) of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681(f)(1)) is amended, in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by adding “or that is made available through a consumer portal landing page established under subsection (a)(1)(D),” after “subsections (a) through (d),”.

“SEC. 3. ACCURACY IN CONSUMER REPORTS.

Section 616 of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681t(e)) is amended to read as follows:

“(b) ENSURING ACCURACY.—”

“(i) IN GENERAL.—In preparing a consumer report, a consumer reporting agency shall follow reasonable procedures to assure maximum possible accuracy of the information concerning the consumer to whom the report relates.

“(ii) MATCHING INFORMATION IN A FILE.—In assuring the maximum possible accuracy under paragraph (1), each consumer reporting agency described in section 605(p) shall ensure that, when including information in the file of a consumer, the consumer reporting agency—

“(A) matches all 9 digits of the social security number of the consumer with the information that the consumer reporting agency is including in the file; or

“(B) if a consumer does not have a social security number, matches any information in the file that includes the full legal name, date of birth, current address, and at least one former address of the consumer.

“(iii) PERIODIC AUDITS.—Each consumer reporting agency shall perform periodic audits, on a schedule determined by the Bureau, on a representative sample of consumer reports of the agency to check for accuracy.”

“SEC. 4. IMPROVED DISPUTE PROCESS FOR CONSUMER REPORTING AGENCIES.

(a) RESPONSIBILITIES OF FURNISHERS OF INFORMATION TO CONSUMER REPORTING AGENCIES.—Section 623 of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681s-2) is amended—

“(1) in subsection (a)(3)—

“(A) in subparagraph (ii), by inserting “and consider” after “review”; and

“(B) in subparagraph (F)—

“(i) in clause (i)(II), by inserting “, and does not include any minor or additional information that would be relevant to a reinvestigation” before the period at the end; and

“(ii) by adding at the end the following new clause—

“(iv) NEW OR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION.—For purposes of clause (i)(II), the term “new or additional information” includes—

“(I) means information of a type designated by the Bureau; and

“(II) does not include information previously provided to the furnisher;

“(B) in subsection (b)(1), by inserting “and consider” after “review”.

“(b) BUREAU CREDIT REPORTING OMBUDSPERSON.—Section 611(a) of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681n(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(8) BUREAU CREDIT REPORTING OMBUDSPERSON.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this paragraph, the Bureau shall take steps to construct a position of credit reporting ombudsperson, whose specific duties shall include carrying out the Bureau’s responsibilities with respect to—

“(i) resolving persistent errors that are not resolved in a timely manner by a consumer reporting agency; and

“(ii) enhancing oversight of consumer reporting agencies by—

“(I) advising the Director of the Bureau, in consultation with the Office of Enforcement and the Office of Supervision of the Bureau, on any potential violations of paragraph (5) or any other applicable law by a consumer reporting agency, including appropriate corrective action for such a violation; and

“(II) making referrals to the Office of Supervision for supervisory action or the Office of Enforcement for enforcement action, as appropriate, in response to violations of paragraph (5) or any other applicable law by a consumer reporting agency.

“(B) REPORT.—The ombudsperson shall submit to the Bureau a report of the Bureau’s actions relating to consumer reports, as well as a summary of the supervisory actions and enforcement actions taken with respect to consumer reporting agencies during the year covered by the report.”

“(c) RESPONSIBILITIES OF CONSUMER REPORTING AGENCIES.—Section 611 of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681n) is amended—

“(1) in subsection (a)—

“(A) in (a)(1), by adding at the end the following:

“(D) OBLIGATIONS OF CONSUMER REPORTING AGENCIES RELATING TO REINVESTIGATIONS.—Commensurate with the volume and complexity of disputes about which a consumer reporting agency receives notice, or reasonably anticipates to receive notice, under this paragraph, each consumer reporting agency shall—

“(i) maintain sufficient personnel to conduct reinvestigations of those disputes; and

“(ii) provide training with respect to the personnel described in clause (i).”;

“(B) in paragraph (1), by amending clause (ii) to read as follows—

“(ii) a copy of the consumer’s file and a consumer report that is based upon such file as revised, including a description of the specific modification or deletion of information, as a result of the reinvestigation;”;

“(ii) by striking clause (iii) and redesignating clauses (iv) and (v) as clauses (iv) and (v), respectively;

“(iii) by inserting after clause (ii) the following—

“(iii) a description of the actions taken by the consumer reporting agency regarding the dispute;

“(iv) if applicable, contact information for any furnisher involved in responding to the dispute and a description of the role played by the furnisher in the reinvestigation process;

“(v) the options available to the consumer if the consumer is dissatisfied with the result of the reinvestigation, including—

“(I) submitting documents in support of the dispute;

“(II) adding a consumer statement of dispute to the file of the consumer pursuant to subsection (b);

“(III) filing a dispute with the furnisher pursuant to section 621;

“(IV) submitting a complaint against the consumer reporting agency or furnisher through the consumer complaint database of the Bureau or the State attorney general for the State in which the consumer resides;”;

“(C) by striking paragraph (7) and redesignating paragraph (6) as paragraph (7); and

“(D) in paragraph (7), as so redesignated, by striking “paragraphs (2), (6), and (7)” and inserting “paragraphs (2) and (6)”;

“(ii) by adding at the end the following new subsection—

“(D) NOTIFICATION OF DELETION OF INFORMATION.—A consumer reporting agency described in section 603(p) shall communicate with other consumer reporting agencies described in section 603(p) to ensure that a dispute initiated with one consumer reporting agency is noted in a file maintained by such other consumer reporting agencies.”.

“SEC. 5. INJUNCTIVE RELIEF.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681 et seq.) is amended—

“(1) in section 616 (15 U.S.C. 1681n)—

“(A) in subsection (a), by amending the subsection heading to read as follows: “DAMAGES”;

“(B) by redesigning subsections (d) as subsections (d) and (e), respectively; and

“(C) by inserting after subsection (b) the following:

“(C) INJUNCTIVE RELIEF.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—In addition to any other remedy under this section, a court may award injunctive relief to require compliance with the requirements imposed under this title with respect to any consumer.

“(II) ATTORNEY’S FEES.—In the event of any successful action for injunctive relief under this subsection, a court may award the prevailing party reasonable attorney’s fees (as determined by the court) incurred by the prevailing party during the action.”

“(2) in section 617 (15 U.S.C. 1681o)—

“(A) in subsection (a), in the subsection heading, by striking “(A) IN GENERAL.—” and inserting “DAMAGES”;

“(B) by redesigning subsection (b) as subsection (c); and

“(C) by inserting after subsection (a) the following:

“(B) INJUNCTIVE RELIEF.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—In addition to any other remedy under this section, a court may award injunctive relief to require compliance with the requirements imposed under this title with respect to any consumer.

“(II) ATTORNEY’S FEES.—In the event of any successful action for injunctive relief under this subsection, a court may award the prevailing party reasonable attorney’s fees (as determined by the court) incurred by the prevailing party during the action.”

“(2) in paragraph (6)(B)—

“(B) by redesigning subsection (b) as subsection (c); and

“(B) by striking clause (ii) and inserting “This section”.

“SEC. 6. INCREASED TRANSPARENCY.

(a) DISCLOSURES TO CONSUMERS.—Section 609 of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681o) is amended—

“(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking “section” and inserting “subsection”; and

“(2) in subparagraph (B), by striking “This section” and inserting “The section”.

“(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(A) supply the consumer with a credit score through the portal established under section

“SEC. 7. VOTER PROTECTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681 et seq.) is amended—

“(1) in subsection (a)(1)(B)—

“(A) in clause (i), by striking “and” at the end; and

“(B) by striking clause (ii) and inserting the following—

“(ii) the address and telephone number of the person; and

“(iii) the permissible purpose, as available, of the person for obtaining the consumer report, including the specific type of credit product that is not included in a consumer report, the

“(A) by amending paragraph (7)(A) to read as follows—
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that a credit score shall be provided free of charge to the consumer if requested in connection with a free annual consumer report described in section 610 of the Consumer Credit Protection Act, through the period at the end and inserting twenty-seven hundred and thirty days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(iii) by adding at the end the following new subparagraphs (G) through (P) as subparagaphs (C) through (F), respectively,

(B) in paragraph (1), by striking ``(2) NOTIFICATION IN CASES OF LESS FAVORABLE CONSUMER INFORMATION.—'' and inserting ``(2) NOTIFICATION IN CASES OF LESS FAVORABLE CONSUMER INFORMATION.—'';

(C) in paragraph (2), by striking ``(3) in section 502(a)'' and inserting ``(3) in section 502(a)(1)'';

(D) by redesignating paragraphs (6), (7), and (8) as paragraphs (7), (8), and (9), respectively; and

(E) by inserting after paragraph (5) the following:

``(6) REPORTS PROVIDED TO CONSUMERS.—A person who uses a consumer report as described in paragraph (1) shall notify and direct the consumer reporting agency to provide the consumer report to provide the consumer with the disclosures described in section 612(b).''.

(3) NOTIFICATION OF SUBSEQUENT SUBMISSIONS OF CONSUMER INFORMATION.—Section 623(a)(7)(A)(ii) of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681s–2(a)(7)(A)(ii)) is amended by striking ``(without giving additional notice to the consumer, unless another person acquires the right to repayment connected to the additional negative information. The acquiring person shall be subject to the requirements of this paragraph and shall be required to send consumers the written notices described in this paragraph, if applicable.)''.

SEC. 7. CONSUMER REPORTING AGENCY REGISTRY.

Section 621 of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681c) is amended by adding at the end the following:

``(h) CONSUMER REPORTING AGENCY REGISTRY.—''

``(1) ESTABLISHMENT OF REGISTRY.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Bureau shall establish a publicly available registry of consumer reporting agencies that includes—

``(A) each consumer reporting agency that compiles and maintains files on consumers on a nationwide basis;

``(B) each nationwide specialty consumer reporting agency;

``(C) all other consumer reporting agencies that are not included under section 603(p) or 603(c); and

``(D) links to any relevant websites of a consumer reporting agency described under subparagraphs (A) through (C).''

(2) REGISTRATION REQUIREMENT.—The Bureau shall establish a deadline, which shall be not later than 270 days after the date of the enactment of this subsection, by which each consumer reporting agency described in paragraph (1) shall be required to register in the registry established under such paragraph.''

SEC. 8. AUTHORITY OF BUREAU WITH RESPECT TO CONSUMER REPORTING AGENCIES.

Section 1024(a)(1) of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (12 U.S.C. 5514(a)(1)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

``(j) CONSUMER REPORTING AGENCY SAFEGUARDS.—The Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection shall not have authority to prescribe regulations with respect to the standards under section 501'; and

(3) in section 505(a)(4), by inserting ``other than in subparagraph (c) of section 207 after ‘‘section 501’’.

SEC. 10. REPORT ON DATA SECURITY RISK ASSESSMENTS IN EXAMINATIONS OF CONSUMER REPORTING AGENCIES.

Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection shall assess whether examinations conducted by the Director of consumer reporting agencies described under section 603(j) of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681s(j)) provide sufficient processes to assess data security risks to the consumers of such agencies on which such agencies maintain and compile files. Along with the first semiannual report required under section 1016(b) of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5496(b)) to be submitted after the 90-day period after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director shall submit to Congress a report containing the results of such assessment that includes—

(1) recommendations for improving the processes to address any such data security risks; and

(2) the progress of the Director in making any improvements described under paragraph (1).

SEC. 11. GAO STUDY ON THE USE OF SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBERS.

(a) STUDY.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall carry out a study on the feasibility of means of establishing social security numbers replacing the use of social security numbers as identifiers with another type of Federal identification.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than the end of the 2-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall submit a report to the Congress containing all findings and determinations made in carrying out the study required under subsection (a).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill, as amended, shall be debateable for 1 hour, equally divided among and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services.

The gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCMENNY) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

WATERS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their re marks on H.R. 5332 and to insert extraneous material thereon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentle woman from California?

There was no objection.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5332, the Protecting Your Credit Score Act of 2020.

I would like the thank Representative GOTTHEIMER, the bill’s sponsor, for all of his hard work and leadership on this important and bipartisan legislation. He worked extensively for most of last year to seek the input and support of our colleagues on both sides of the aisle, making improvements along the way.
Our credit reporting system is badly broken, and consumers have little recourse. It should be no surprise that consumer complaints regarding credit reporting errors and failed attempts to fix these errors are consistently a top complaint submitted to the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau and the Federal Trade Commission. This demonstrates that millions of consumers are frustrated with the current system and need our help.

H.R. 5332 would direct the nationwide consumer reporting agencies to create a streamlined, single online portal for consumers to have easy access to free credit reports, credit scores, dispute errors, and place security freezes.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 5332.

I want to first thank the gentleman from New Jersey for his work on this bill. I am disappointed we were not able to come to a bipartisan compromise. We worked for the better part of a year to try to achieve a good product that would likely be supported. This product does not represent that work, sadly. Unfortunately, we didn’t get there.

I believe that we are considering, today, a bill that is just another attempt for House Democrats to socialize the credit reporting and scoring industry. We are voting on a bill that will decrease competition, increase fraud, prop up the trial bar, and expand authority of an already unaccountable CFPB, Consumer Financial Protection Bureau.

First, this bill directs the three nationwide credit reporting agencies to create a shared online portal. This portal will allow unlimited and free consumers access to credit information—this is good—and credit freezes. This is good and allows consumers to initiate disputes.

That all sounds very good. In fact, Republicans support a one-stop shop for consumers to access important credit information. But we are talking about the three largest players in the industry, and this bill codifies their place—their oligopoly structure and their favored view of the current market. It strengthens them further into law with this outsized authority.

This bill condones their market structure by mandating that many of their services be merged into a single web portal. This doesn’t make things better; it makes it worse.

If Congress really wants to protect consumers, we should be working to promote more competition in the credit reporting and scoring industry. We should be promoting new ways to eliminate barriers to entry, not promoting what really comes down to less consumer choice.

Second, this bill requires the complete Social Security numbers be used to confirm the consumer’s identity. So here is the problem: The bill fails to set appropriate standards to protect that information. Specifically, the bill directs the credit reporting agencies to match all nine digits of a consumer’s Social Security number before including any information in consumer credit reports.

That sounds well, fine, and good, but we know hacks happen. As Federal employees, we have had our information hacked and sold. Just look at the credit reporting agencies. They have had their information hacked and sold. This is why we wanted to come to a bipartisan compromise.

There is something legitimate we should be doing, but today, not all data furnishers collect full Social Security numbers for submission for consumer credit information to the credit bureaus. That means this bill has a requirement now that they collect all the Social Security information to confirm the consumer’s identity. This will potentially have two negative consequences for consumers.

First, data that is not already linked to that Social Security number will be excluded from credit bureaus. That means negative financial information will be removed for no other reason than it is missing the Social Security number.

This will actually decrease the predictive power of credit files. That is a negative factor. Furthermore, that, in turn, will jeopardize the ability to get low-cost credit for consumers, especially for those who are on the margin where much of their information is derived by being a consumer and paying back regular consumer debt.

Second, data furnishers will start aggressively capturing and storing Social Security numbers for consumers just so the data can be used in the credit models. That means that our Social Security numbers are in more places and identity theft can then increase with more opportunities to steal our information. It means that consumers will be further at peril for fraudulent activities by bad and malicious actors.

So committee Republicans have consistently expressed concern with the private sector and government use of Social Security numbers for identity verification. I think we should all agree on that. This bill will only exacerbate the problem by statutorily directing an reliance on this very highly personal information.

Next, this bill creates an additional opportunity for trial lawyers to exploit the litigation system, ultimately raising the cost of credit for all consumers. The bill expands the private right of action under the Fair Credit Reporting Act to allow for injunctive relief. It further provides plaintiffs with compensation for attorney fees, and more litigation means increased costs associated with credit reporting.

Additionally, this bill allows consumers to continuously dispute information even if the account is verified as accurate, promoting an endless cycle of frivolous investigations and decreasing the effectiveness of credit reporting.

Lastly, this bill continues the Democrats’ goal of expanding the statutory authority of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, or the CFPB. The bill creates duplicative ombudsmen in the CFPB for credit reporting, something that they currently have, but the person has more than just consumer credit reporting responsibilities.

Since its creation, congressional Republicans have fought to place this unaccountable government agency under the annual appropriations process and have argued that the single-Director structure is unconstitutional. That is being litigated and will be decided by the Supreme Court this summer.

While the current CFPB Director is working to increase the accountability and transparency at the agency, we don’t know what he will do, if he or she will abuse his or her power. We should fix the CFPB before we expand their authorities.

Madam Speaker, I also want to take issue with a larger set of issues here.

The Democrats’ decision to report out a closed rule means that you can’t even have the ultimate goal of a bipartisan bill that can then get action in the Senate and then, potentially, get a signature by the President.

This, too, is a sad sign of the state of affairs in what seems to be a highly bipartisan legislative process that we are in the midst of. It further demonstrates my point that my colleagues, in particular, on the other side of the aisle have no interest in working with Republicans to craft a bill that protects consumers’ personal information.

We submitted amendments to the Committee on Rules that provide for targeted solutions:

- Eliminating this reliance on Social Security numbers;
- Removing paid non-elective debt from credit reports—which this bill fails to do;
- Allowing parents to electronically freeze their minor’s credit report—which this bill fails to do;
- Requiring sources for public record data in credit reports, which would then expand credit files so that those who are on the margins for credit-worthiness would have enhanced credit potential;
- Prohibiting the inclusion of adverse information relating to predatory mortgage lending;
- Financial abuse or fraud associated with private student loans in credit reports. This bill does not act;
- And directing the GAO to study and report to Congress on the use of non-traditional data and credit scoring, this is something that has bipartisan support in our committee and has been reported out in other measures, but not in this one.

And so those are sensible measures that could have been included if we had
an open amendment process. But then, again, we are wearing masks, we are conducting business in this odd way, where Members can vote for other Members that are not here on the House floor and we have to go through this long process. I understand they have agreed to rush, right, but this is an ill-conceived bill that will have a negative impact on every American—every American—if this is signed into law.

Madam Speaker, I think we need better credit information and a better product that could actually achieve a bipartisan outcome.

Let's vote “no” on this, and let's get on with the real work of the American people.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GOTTHEIMER), author of this bill and a member of the Committee on Financial Services.

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairwoman for allowing me to speak today on behalf of my bipartisan legislation, H.R. 5332, the Protecting Your Credit Score Act of 2020.

Madam Speaker, since I took office, I have been committed to helping protect seniors and other vulnerable communities from fraud and to protect their financial well-being. Like many of my colleagues, constituents in my district are feeling the economic pain caused by the ongoing pandemic.

Just this week, in fact, a constituent of mine, Patricia from Wantage, New Jersey, reached out to me to ask: What can we do as policymakers to help protect people’s credit during this crisis?

Madam Speaker, I am proud that we were able to provide Americans with debt and credit relief as part of the bipartisan CARES Act, protecting home-owners in forbearance and Federal student loan borrowers. We were able to continue to work to do so with the bipartisan HEROES Act, which has yet to become law. It is in the Senate now waiting action. And that act, including suspending negative credit reporting during the pandemic, giving Americans time to recover economically before there is a risk of being hit on their credit reports. It is also time that we look at the way hardworking Americans work to check and ensure accuracy in their credit reports so that their scores are where they need to be as we progress into our economic recovery.

Madam Speaker, I really want to thank Chairwoman Waters for her impactful leadership and partnership on this bipartisan bill and her incredibly supportive and smart team. I also thank Ranking Member MCHENRY for spending so many months working with me in such a productive and cooperative manner. My bill reflects a lot of his wise input. I, too, am sorry we weren’t able to find ultimate common ground. I also want to thank my good friend and co-chair of the Problem Solvers Caucus, Tom REED, for his work cosponsoring this important legislation.

Madam Speaker, after working on this bill for a year, I was proud when the bill was reported favorably out of the Committee on Financial Services on December 11, 2019.

I am also proud the House last night passed the landmark George Floyd Justice in Policing Act. We must continue to come together as a country to fight for racial justice on all fronts, and to combat inequalities that have plagued this Nation for too long, which includes the ability to access credit.

Credit affects all communities, impacting what Americans pay for a car, whether they can get a mortgage for a house, the rates on a credit card, and how much they can receive for a small business loan. The impact it has is especially strong on communities of color. And experts have testified to the Committee on Financial Services that the credit reporting system is biased, particularly against these communities.

Running this crucial part of our economy are three companies in the United States that literally hold the keys to the kingdom. It is an oligopoly. They decide Americans’ credit fate and whether they should get access to credit, and it is all done in a closed-off system behind the drapes. And we don’t know what goes on, how they develop those scores.

I am very glad the ranking member is interested in trying to get more competition into that process. And I am very eager—and I am sure the committee is, too—to work together on that front.

I am also glad that there are areas that he would like to go further on overall when it comes to access to credit. And I am also eager to sit down as well and be helpful. And that can take 3 to 6 months.

Madam Speaker, my bipartisan legislation with Congressman Tom REED from New York asked the private sector, not the government, to help fix this. And this is a big distinction here that I want to point out to the ranking member, this is driven by the private sector, not the government, to fix this issue. My bipartisan bill sets up a one-stop shop online portal to check your credit report for free at any time. It allows victims to show the identity of credit crooks from using your information to apply for credit under your name.

The portal will also provide the ability to initiate and resolve disputes between you and the credit bureau, and you will be able to see who the bureaus have sold your data to in the prior 2 years. Because, yes, they take your data and they go make money on your information.

Madam Speaker, the bill strengthens cybersecurity safeguards of information held by consumer reporting agencies, to help prevent a repeat of the
Madam Speaker, finally, let me say that during an economic downturn and throughout the years we are going to spend recovering from it, Americans’ financial security will and must be paramount.

We have already seen spikes in fraud throughout this pandemic, especially related to direct payments and different types of loans. And the chairwoman has worked overtime in all of our bills to make sure we do everything possible to protect Americans during this time. I am grateful for her leadership.

Madam Speaker, as we recover from this crisis, I want to make sure Americans can protect their credit and resolve disputes that may arise. As SEC Chairman Clayton testified just yesterday to the House Committee on Financial Services, for a consumer, the best thing you can do for yourself is understand your credit and get your credit under control.

We need a modernized system that empowers all consumers, especially those facing new challenges with this new pandemic, with transparency and the ability to protect Americans. The idea is to make it easier for consumers to dispute their credit reports, and to make sure everyone can have access to credit so that they can have a home, a car, and enjoy everything that everyone who works hard should have access to.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense bipartisan bill, which will help every American.

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Speaker, I highlight for the bill’s sponsor that first with the Equifax data breach, it is proof that the industry could use better data standards.

Second, making sure that they have the fullness of the Social Security numbers so they can have full action for fraudulent activity and identity testimony. That, we know, and it should have been addressed this bill, and it is a failure of this legislation and the reason why I oppose it.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LOUDERMILK), the ranking member on the Task Force on Artificial Intelligence.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Madam Speaker, I thank our ranking member for not only yielding, but his fine leadership in this committee.

I also appreciate my colleague, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, sponsor of this legislation. I appreciate his leadership on this, and I truly believe he did work very hard in a bipartisan manner to try to close that gap. And unfortunately, we just weren’t able to close that gap. And I hope that going forward we will be able to do that, because this is something that we do support on this side with the certain constraints to protect the consumers’ identity.

One of my major concerns on this is cybersecurity. As was spoken about earlier, the bill would create an online portal for consumers to access their credit reports from all three major credit bureaus in one place. The idea is a good idea, and very worth discussing and very worth pursuing. But in its current state, it exposes a massive amount of sensitive data in one place, so it must be done in a way that is cybersecurity to make sure that the information doesn’t lead to more fraud and more identity theft.

As someone who spent many years in the IT sector, as I know my good colleague, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, has as well, I am very concerned about the potential of breaches of this portal.

We all remember the 2017 Equifax data breach that exposed the financial information of millions of Americans, and the last thing we should be doing is increasing the chance of that kind of event happening again. But this bill has the potential to do that very thing because it does not include robust cybersecurity protections to make sure the information on the portal is secure.

Another worthy goal of the bill is to make it easier for consumers to dispute errors in their credit reports. But the bill actually requires consumers to repeatedly dispute the same information on their credit reports, even if it is found to be accurate, which would lead to unnecessary and frivolous disputes.

Another significant concern I have with this bill is that it would expand the authority of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau. The CFPB is an unaccountable regulatory agency that took many rogue actions under the previous administration.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle know that expanding the CFPB’s power is a nonstarter for Republicans; therefore, I cannot support this bill. I ask my colleagues to oppose this bill.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GOTTHEIMER).

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. Madam Speaker, just one point I want to bring back up, if I may. I want to thank my friend for his comments, and I appreciate his work and our efforts together here.

The one point about the Social Security number that I want to raise is, the bill requires a study at the GAO to see what the best answer is, whether if that is a Federal identifier number or a Social Security number, whatever the best answer is.

So if the GAO comes back and says that we need to develop a new Federal identifier so that we keep it separate from the Social Security number, then, to me, that would be the best outcome. That is exactly why the bill requires the GAO to study it.
Mr. MCHENRY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. MCHENRY. What I am highlighting is the fact that, in one section of the bill, you mandate immediately that they need the fullness of the Social Security numbers in order for the data to be included. That is what I am highlighting, and that is one of the rubs that I have with the bill.

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. Reclaiming my time.

Yes, they also have a period of time to develop the site. It is not going to happen overall. In that period of time, we will get direction on what the best outcome is in terms of using a Federal identifier, and they will execute against that as we develop this site.

Back to the site. If the oligopoly of the three bureaus—if right now our concern is that their sites are not secure. We need to have them immediately and have them take us through their sites again. Because if you are still concerned about this—

Mr. MCHENRY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. MCHENRY. I commend Chairwoman WATERS for bringing the three CEOs in.

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. Right, right. I remember that.

Mr. MCHENRY. We, on a bipartisan basis, beat them up, which is a rare thing in Congress. We beat them up because they had a massive data breach that exposed our data. That is why I sincerely wanted to get to the bottom of this and have a bipartisan bill.

This is not a result of this product.

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. Reclaiming my time.

Just one question on that. Do you feel now that the three are still insecure? And are you concerned about them?

Mr. MCHENRY. For sure, for sure.

That is why I want to get to a solution. This bill, sadly, incorporates none of the conditionality that I wanted.

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. Reclaiming my time.

Does the gentleman agree that we should have them back in immediately, again, to talk to them and find out if they have made progress?

Mr. MCHENRY. The point is, we could have had a massive vote on something that reformed them rather than bringing them in and wag our finger again.

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. The whole point is that, because they are still insecure, we better let people actually have access to their data all the time. That is what this bill does, so they can find out, instead of having to pay 10 bucks or 15 bucks every time to see if these sites are secure. That is my concern.

I thank the gentleman. I think we are good.

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

What I would say, very simply, Madam Speaker, is that we could have had a bipartisan solution here. That is what I was offering. Give up the private right of action, so you don’t have more lawsuits, and give up your view of a government-centric portal that basically enacts these big three. Those are two additions.

The final kicker is this: End the reliance on Social Security numbers and put the date in the future, and the technology solution will be there. That is an industry mandate that I offered as a matter of compromise.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUDD), my colleague from Davie County, North Carolina, a great leader on the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. BUDD. Madam Speaker, I want to rise in strong opposition to H.R. 5332, the Protecting Your Credit Score Act of 2019.

Although I will not be supporting the gentleman from New Jersey’s legislation, I want to make sure that people know that I consider him a friend, and I thank him for his efforts to try to bring reform to the credit reporting industry.

There are some good ideas in this bill, such as the one-stop-shop approach for consumers to freeze and unfreeze their credit for all three national bureaus. But I have just talked about, as well as access to credit reports and scores.

But even this idea is taken too far in the bill, and it leaves too many unanswered questions about exactly how it is going to be carried out.

Now, it is really unfortunate that a bipartisan compromise was not reached. I know the ranking member and his staff worked tirelessly on this with the gentleman from New Jersey and his staff.

But there are a few other points I want to make. You know, it is a chief priority for committee Republicans to protect consumers’ personal information. That is something that both sides have brought up.

Yet, we are preparing to vote on a bill that still makes Social Security numbers the primary way to identify a person, despite the fact that we know Social Security numbers are not consumers’ personal information. Worse yet, the bill will mandate furnishers to match all nine Social Security digits.

Another concern with this bill is the creation of yet another ombudsman at the CFPB to deal exclusively with consumer reporting agencies. This provision is unnecessary and duplicative.

The CFPB already has an ombudsman to deal with consumer-facing issues. There is no logical reason why the proposed authorities cannot simply be assigned to the current ombudsman. This is simply another move by the Democrats to expand the statutory authority of the unaccountable CFPB.

Madam Speaker, I urge opposition to this bill.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CASTEN), a member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. CASTEN of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5332, the Protecting Your Credit Score Act. I support this bill because, like so many Americans, I personally know the frustration of dealing with erroneous marks on your credit report and thought I would share a recent story.

About a month ago, I got a letter from a bank where I don’t have an account, the Bank of America. They were thanking me for something that I didn’t recognize. So, I did what all good Americans do: I threw it in the recycle bin and moved on with my day.

The next day, I got a similar letter from Navy Federal Credit Union, where I also do not have an account. This one had a summary of my credit score and was shortly followed with another note saying that my account was overdrawn by $2,250.

I am going to be honest. The only reason that the Navy Federal Credit Union letters got my attention and didn’t end up in the recycling bin is because they were addressed to Lieutenant Commander SEAN CASTEN. I have been called a lot of things in this job, but that is a rank that I have never earned.

A few phone calls and a similar overdraft notification from Bank of America later, and I had fraud alerts placed on both accounts.

On the advice of the banks, I called TransUnion to ensure this wouldn’t show up on my credit report. The agent was helpful. At the end of the call, she said: “Is there anything else I should know?”

And I just couldn’t resist telling her: “Only that I am a member of the House Financial Services Committee with oversight of you, and I appreciate how helpful you have been.”

Now, I tell that story because I was able to correct this. But I can imagine a lot of other scenarios where I didn’t check the recycling, where I am not alleged to be a commissioned naval officer, where I hadn’t been in enough committee hearings on this subject to recognize fraud early on. And in all those scenarios, this story has a much less happy ending.

But those incidents happen every day to an awful lot of Americans. We know 21 percent of consumers had verified errors or other issues in their credit reports. Thirteen percent had errors serious enough to cause them to be denied or pay more for credit. But those are only the accounts we know about.

Many don’t know where to turn or have the resources or the time to correct them. Fraudulent or accidental marks on a credit report can have a life-altering consequence, so it is important that the Bank of America is held accountable.

But credit scores and reports are a critical gatekeeper for Americans’ financial well-being and access to the
most basic building block of the American Dream.

It is determinative in setting premiums for auto and homeowner’s insurance. It informs landlords on which renters they want to rent their apartments to. Your score determines if you must leave a bigger deposit to get your utilities.

That is why this bill is so important. It creates an online consumer portal where consumers will have free and unlimited access to their consumer reports and credit scores.

Allowing consumers the ability to initiate disputes about credit report accuracy—rather than all the rigmarole I had to go through—and to place or remove a security freeze, is a critical tool that allows Americans the control and the ability to remedy those errors.

It is 2020. It is long past time to modernize the way that consumers address errors on their credit scores.

I thank Representative GOTTHEIMER for introducing this bill, and I urge my colleagues to vote “yes.”

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. Riggleman.

Mr. RIGGLEMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 5332, the Protecting Your Credit Score Act.

I would like to thank the ranking member for his leadership, but also my colleague from New Jersey. Not only is he a good friend, but I respect him very much, and I do applaud his efforts on this legislation.

I share his interest in ensuring credit reports are complete, accurate, and transparent, but I believe this bill fails to achieve that goal.

The passage of H.R. 5332 will have harmful and unintended consequences for consumers. It is, simply put, yet another veiled attempt to socialize the credit reporting and scoring industry that will cause harm to hardworking Americans.

This bill is disguised as pro-consumer, but H.R. 5332 will decrease competition, increase the cost of credit for consumers, provide opportunities for trial attorneys to exploit the litigation system, and expand the authority of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau.

It undermines the Fair Credit Reporting Act and our ability to maintain control, and credit reporting system that benefits businesses and consumers. This bill would create a conflicting patchwork of interpretations of the Fair Credit Reporting Act that will lead to confusion among financial institutions and raise costs for all consumers.

While my colleague named this bill the Protecting Your Credit Score Act of 2019, it does little to protect consumers and their data. Quite to the contrary, it expands and increases the risk of harm to consumers affected by a data breach.

This bill mandates the three nationwide credit reporting agencies create a shared online portal and would create significant cybersecurity vulnerabilities for consumers and companies, all while creating opportunities for bad actors to manipulate and take advantage of our consumer data.

I know a little bit about this because I have done this for about 22 years.

Creating a one-stop-shop for the credit report, personal information, and Social Security number of every individual would be in the event of a cyber hack or data breach.

We need to find targeted solutions that focus on increasing the cybersecurity capability at credit reporting agencies, increase competition, and increase access to credit for consumers and businesses, rather than put forward proposals that undermine the consumer reporting system and further empower unelected bureaucrats at the expense of the free market.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. STEIL).

Mr. STEIL. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague from North Carolina for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the act.

Like many of my colleagues, I am committed to ensuring that all consumers can have faith in the validity of their credit score. Unfortunately, the bill fails to achieve that goal. It puts consumers at greater risk of having their information stolen.

It threatens to increase the cost of credit by creating more opportunities for trial lawyers and by making scores less protected.

Further, it expands the jurisdiction of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, which is completely unaccountable to Congress.

Credit scores are an essential part of our financial system. Both Republicans and Democrats, I believe, agree on that point. We also agree that many Americans have difficulty accessing their credit due to their poor or insufficient credit histories.

With that in mind, we should work together to enhance cybersecurity at credit reporting agencies, reduce fraud, and help consumers get the relief they need in times of crisis.

Our ranking member has been a leader on this issue, introducing amendments and standalone legislation to move the ball forward. Unfortunately, his ideas and the ideas of those on our side of the aisle and other constructive suggestions have not been included in this bill, making it a flawed bill. I urge my colleagues to oppose the legislation.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Speaker, I would inquire through the Chair if my

It is, once again, another reason why we need a place for consumers to go to get free access to their reports, to file complaints immediately, to contest issues when they see them, and to make sure their credit isn’t sold off to someone else right underneath them.

That is the point. And why we are having a GAO study is to make sure we find the best way, the most secure way, to do this going forward.

This legislation protects consumers; it protects Americans; and it doesn’t protect credit against its own. We need more competition there. It looks out for the American consumer, and that is the point.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Speaker, I would like to ask my colleagues to oppose the legislation.

Mr. MCNALLY. Madam Speaker, I think that since this is such a critical issue, we should count up how many hearings we had in the Financial Services Committee. We had one in February of 2019.

We could have gotten to the bottom of these things if we actually had multiple hearings to figure this stuff out. Instead, we got a parsing bill on the floor that doesn’t achieve the things that needed to be achieved.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. STEIL).

Mr. STEIL. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague from North Carolina for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the act.

Like many of my colleagues, I am committed to ensuring that all consumers can have faith in the validity of their credit score. Unfortunately, the bill fails to achieve that goal. It puts consumers at greater risk of having their information stolen.

It threatens to increase the cost of credit by creating more opportunities for trial lawyers and by making scores less protected.

Further, it expands the jurisdiction of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, which is completely unaccountable to Congress.

Credit scores are an essential part of our financial system. Both Republicans and Democrats, I believe, agree on that point. We also agree that many Americans have difficulty accessing their credit due to their poor or insufficient credit histories.

With that in mind, we should work together to enhance cybersecurity at credit reporting agencies, reduce fraud, and help consumers get the relief they need in times of crisis.

Our ranking member has been a leader on this issue, introducing amendments and standalone legislation to move the ball forward. Unfortunately, his ideas and the ideas of those on our side of the aisle and other constructive suggestions have not been included in this bill, making it a flawed bill. I urge my colleagues to oppose the legislation.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Speaker, I would like to ask my colleagues to oppose the legislation.

It is, once again, another reason why we need a place for consumers to go to get free access to their reports, to file complaints immediately, to contest issues when they see them, and to make sure their credit isn’t sold off to someone else right underneath them.

That is the point. And why we are having a GAO study is to make sure we find the best way, the most secure way, to do this going forward.

This legislation protects consumers; it protects Americans; and it doesn’t protect credit against its own. We need more competition there. It looks out for the American consumer, and that is the point.

Mr. MCNALLY. Madam Speaker, I think that since this is such a critical issue, we should count up how many hearings we had in the Financial Services Committee. We had one in February of 2019.

We could have gotten to the bottom of these things if we actually had multiple hearings to figure this stuff out. Instead, we got a parsing bill on the floor that doesn’t achieve the things that needed to be achieved.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. STEIL).

Mr. STEIL. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague from North Carolina for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the act.

Like many of my colleagues, I am committed to ensuring that all consumers can have faith in the validity of their credit score. Unfortunately, the bill fails to achieve that goal. It puts consumers at greater risk of having their information stolen.

It threatens to increase the cost of credit by creating more opportunities for trial lawyers and by making scores less protected.

Further, it expands the jurisdiction of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, which is completely unaccountable to Congress.

Credit scores are an essential part of our financial system. Both Republicans and Democrats, I believe, agree on that point. We also agree that many Americans have difficulty accessing their credit due to their poor or insufficient credit histories.

With that in mind, we should work together to enhance cybersecurity at credit reporting agencies, reduce fraud, and help consumers get the relief they need in times of crisis.

Our ranking member has been a leader on this issue, introducing amendments and standalone legislation to move the ball forward. Unfortunately, his ideas and the ideas of those on our side of the aisle and other constructive suggestions have not been included in this bill, making it a flawed bill. I urge my colleagues to oppose the legislation.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Speaker, I would like to ask my colleagues to oppose the legislation.

It is, once again, another reason why we need a place for consumers to go to get free access to their reports, to file complaints immediately, to contest issues when they see them, and to make sure their credit isn’t sold off to someone else right underneath them.

That is the point. And why we are having a GAO study is to make sure we find the best way, the most secure way, to do this going forward.

This legislation protects consumers; it protects Americans; and it doesn’t protect credit against its own. We need more competition there. It looks out for the American consumer, and that is the point.
colleague has any remaining speakers on his side.

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Speaker, I do.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA), the ranking member of the Investor Protection, Entrepreneurship, and Capital Markets Subcommittee.

Mr. HUIZENGA. Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 5332, and it is not because I don’t believe that there isn’t a motive behind this that isn’t intended to help consumers. I just don’t think it is going to hit the target.

This bill requires the three largest nationwide credit reporting agencies to create a single shared online portal to allow consumers one-stop access to consumer reports, credit scores, and credit alerts as well as to initiate disputes. This portal would contain information on consumer rights and directions on how to dispute a credit report.

The bill requires credit reporting agencies to match all nine digits of a consumer’s Social Security number with the information included in a consumer file.

In addition, the bill codifies the CFPB’s supervision of credit reporting agencies and expands their authority to establish “administrative, technical, and procedural safeguards” currently under the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act, to all credit reporting agencies.

The bill provides injunctive relief to allow a court to compel a credit reporting agency to fix an error or remove inaccurate information from a consumer report.

Furthermore, the bill creates an additional ombudsman at the CFPB tasked with resolving persistent errors on reports that are not addressed in a timely fashion and allows the ombudsman to make referrals to the Office of Supervision and Enforcement for corrective action.

We are all supportive of increased access and availability on credit reports, scores, and file freezes, but this legislation is just overly broad and prescriptive.

I, too, like one of my other colleagues who just talked about having mysterious things show up in the mail, have frozen my credit as well, so I’m not immune to that. I was reminded of the old adage: Why would you rob a bank? Because that is where the money is. Why would you go after a database? Because that is where the digital gold is.

What we are doing is, we are putting more digital gold into a new database. So we are increasing that vulnerability. We need to be working to promote more competition in the credit reporting and scoring industry, not less. I think this is what this bill, unfortunately, is doing.

Instead, we should be debating more targeted solutions, such as H.R. 3821, which would bolster cybersecurity capacity at credit reporting agencies, encourage an alternative to use of Social Security numbers, protect minors against fraud, and help consumers who may be facing medical debt as a result of the global pandemic.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to reject this bill.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Speaker, I reserve the right to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to my Democrat colleagues.

Madam Speaker, as I said in my opening, this is yet another attempt by House Democrats to socialize the credit reporting and scoring industry.

We had an opportunity for a bipartisan bill, and this is not the work of that product. This bill will decrease competition in the industry, increase fraud risk related to consumers’ personal data, prop up the trial bar, and expand the authority of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau.

If Congress really wants to protect consumers, we should be working together to promote more competition in the credit reporting and scoring industry. We should be promoting new ways to eliminate the barriers to entry, not promoting what really comes down to less consumer choice.

We marked up this bill in the Financial Services Committee back in December. The committee Democrats noted in their report on the bill: “It has been more than 15 years since Congress enacted comprehensive reform of the consumer credit reporting system, and there have been numerous shortcomings with the current system identified during that time that need to be addressed.”

Yet, since the Democrats took over in 2019, the House Financial Services Committee has held one hearing on credit reporting that had a bipartisan consensus on the things that needed to be done and the challenges therein. This hearing featured a public grilling of the CEOs of the three nationwide bureaus. The hearing discussed structural problems within the industry, yet this bill did not address any of those issues.

The number one complaint in the CFPB consumer complaint database is about consumer issues with credit reporting.

Why are we reinforcing the current structure of this industry by legislating that? We should promote more competition in the system, not perpetuate an obviously broken one.

The Democrats took issue with the market failure in credit reporting, an issue I agree on. However, their legislative response does not do the things necessary to increase competition and consumer choice and protect our data.

The fact that Democrat leadership decided this bill was perfect and needed no amendments on my point. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle have no interest in working with Republicans to craft a bill that will really protect consumers’ personal information. This bill is about catering to the credit card industry.

Madam Speaker, I will reiterate, like I have with so many bills that have passed the House: This bill has no chance of being passed by the Senate or signed into law.

Preserving access to and making available low-cost credit options to consumers should be Congress’ priority. We should be working toward bipartisan solutions, and we should prioritize those things. We should be working toward those solutions, and that is why I urge a “no” vote on this bill.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD letters in opposition to this bill by the Consumer Data Industry Association, the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, the National Taxpayers Union, and the Consumer Bankers Association.
for lenders to determine whether a consumer has an ability to repay, increase loan losses and ultimately result in higher prices, especially for those who previously received the best prices on loan products after a lifetime of on-time payments.

The bill: could make the cost of borrowing more expensive and limit access to credit. The bill could introduce new threats to consumers’ information and physical security; and introduce unnecessary and expensive burdens into the credit reporting system, making it harder for consumers disputes to be processed in a timely fashion.

The bill could make the cost of borrowing more expensive and limit access to credit.

Section 4 of the bill could lead to higher costs of credit for the overall market, and specifically for consumers who pay their bills on time. This section of the bill would allow consumers who have not paid their bills on time to continue disputing information, even if the accuracy is verified as accurate. This would increase the likelihood that accurate, though negative information, will be excluded from credit scores, thereby impeding lenders from making informed decisions.

This bill could introduce new threats to consumers’ information and physical security.

Section 6 would require CRAs to effectively mail a credit report to a consumer every time an adverse action occurs in a credit transaction. For example, if a consumer applies for a mortgage and receives a rate higher than the lowest possible rate due to the consumer’s higher credit utilization rate, then each credit bureau would be required to physically mail a report to the consumer, whether the consumer requested it or not.

And if the consumer applied to several mortgage companies, CRAs would afterward mail the report to the consumer’s last known address each time. This would create data security issues, as thousands of credit reports could be sent, by mail, to people who didn’t ask for them, don’t want them, or don’t need them. Also, tens of millions of consumers move each year, increasing the vulnerability of CRAs to identity theft.

Existing protections for consumers’ information already exist in the consumer credit market and protect consumer credit scores.

On behalf of America’s credit unions, I am writing regarding H.R. 5332, the Protecting Your Credit Score Act of 2019. The Credit Union National Association (CUNA) opposes this legislation because it could increase the frequency of meritless lawsuits under the Federal Credit Reporting Act (FCRA). When entities are subject to frivolous litigation, resources are distracted from providing services, increasing the cost of service to all consumers. In the case of credit unions, frivolous litigation means that access to safe and affordable financial services becomes more expensive and potentially less available for credit union members.

We also have concerns that the online portal mandated under this legislation would pose significant cybersecurity risks for consumers, financial institutions, and companies. The portal created would have no direct connection with credit agencies to create an online portal for consumers to dispute errors. It would also divert resources from the possibility of consumers either being rejected from the portal or a nefarious actor abusing the system.

Finally, we question the need for this legislation. Under the FCRA, consumers can dispute the accuracy of information on their credit reports. They can either raise the dispute directly with the credit reporting agency or with their creditor. The FCRA requires these disputes to be resolved in a timely manner. And if the information in question is not correct, the information in question is eliminated from the report. As such, consumers already have significant tools to dispute information and correct errors in their credit reports.

On behalf of America’s credit unions, thank you for the opportunity to share our views.

Sincerely,

JIM NUSSLE,
President & CEO

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
June 26, 2020

To the Members of the U.S. House of Representatives:

The Fair Credit Reporting Act (FCRA) requires each consumer reporting agency (CRA) to achieve maximum possible accuracy in compiling a consumer report. Every CRA also has a legal obligation to safeguard the personal information that they hold. The Chamber supports efforts to streamline the legislation where companies to jointly establish an online consumer portal with its own authentication and security, without a specific owner. This portal would provide a significant amount of cybersecurity vulnerabilities for consumers and companies—making it impossible for CRAs to meet existing obligations. Further, the authentication of the portal could potentially expose credit reports to abusive credit repair.

If the authentication is tuned too high, then real consumers would be rejected from the website. If the authentication is too loose, then it could be abused.

The Chamber supports efforts to streamline access to credit data for consumers; however, it must be done in a responsible way that does not prevent access to credit. While we appreciate the extensive efforts of
Rep. Gottheimer to resolve our concerns, the Chamber remains opposed. Sincerely,  
NEIL L. BRADLEY.  
AMERICAN BANKERS ASSOCIATION,  

Hon. Nancy Pelosi,  
Speaker of the House.  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

H.R. 5332 will make it even easier than it is today for individuals to flood consumer reporting agencies and lenders with false claims of inaccuracies that must be resolved in a timely manner. The resulting degradation of the credit reporting system that benefits businesses and consumers. 

While we appreciate Representative Gottheimer’s efforts and welcome discussion of these issues, we must oppose H.R. 5332 as currently drafted. Sincerely,  
JAMES C. BALLENTINE.  
NATIONAL TAXPAYERS UNION,  

The National Taxpayers Union urges Representatives to vote ‘NO’ on H.R. 5332, the ‘Protecting Your Credit Score Act of 2020’. Though well-intentioned, this legislation would cede more power to the unaccountable Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, jeopardizing the accuracy and reliability of credit scoring models and potentially weakening underwriting standards. Accurate and complete credit reports are the foundation of this country’s robust and competitive consumer credit market. Most, if not all, lenders rely upon credit history data found in credit reports to identify and evaluate potential risks a consumer may pose before entering into a financial relationship with that consumer. That information is critical for lending decisions, including the applicant’s ability to repay, interest rates, and other loan terms. Since many home loan borrowers will have their mortgage guaranteed by the federal government, lenders must be cautious in their reforms to the Fair Credit Reporting Act (FCRA) to avoid adding undue credit risk onto the government-sponsored enterprises. Perhaps the most problematic provision of H.R. 5332 is the requirement for the three major credit bureaus, which are entirely private businesses, to jointly create an online consumer portal for consumers to access their credit reports and scores, dispute errors, and place or lift security freezes. While a one-stop shop may seem to offer consumer protections, including rights to challenge and have corrected any inaccuracies in their reports. Thus, consumers have ample legal means to challenge the accuracy of information in their credit reports. 

We are concerned about the abuse of these protective provisions to remove accurate but negative information, not only by credit repair organizations and those hoping to erode accurate negative information from credit reports to improve their ability to obtain credit, but also by individuals, including those involved in organized crime, seeking to defraud lenders. 

H.R. 5332 will make it even easier than it is today for individuals to flood consumer reporting agencies and lenders with false claims of inaccuracies that must be resolved in a timely fashion or, if not, the information is deleted. Thus, consumers have ample legal means to challenge the accuracy of information in their credit reports. 

Additionally, this bill establishes a second, duplicative ombudsman at the CFPB who will interfere with prudent risk assessments and reduce people’s ability to get loans. In addition, allowing courts to award injunctive relief will promote questionable lawsuits and replace the current single-interpretaion regime with inconsistent interpretations that vary across the country. 

While we appreciate Representative Gottheimer’s efforts and welcome discussion of these issues, we must oppose H.R. 5332 as currently drafted. Sincerely,  
RICHARD HUNT,  
President and CEO.  
CONSUMER BANKERS ASSOCIATION,  

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,  
Speaker of the House,  
Washington, DC.  

H.R. 5332 will make it even easier than it is today for individuals to flood consumer reporting agencies and lenders with false claims of inaccuracies that must be resolved in a timely manner. The resulting degradation of the credit reporting system that benefits businesses and consumers. 

While we appreciate Representative Gottheimer’s efforts and welcome discussion of these issues, we must oppose H.R. 5332 as currently drafted. Sincerely,  
RICHARD HUNT,  
President and CEO.  
CONSUMER BANKERS ASSOCIATION,  

On behalf of the Consumer Bankers Association (CBA), I am writing to share our views on H.R. 5332, the Protecting Your Credit Score Act of 2020. The retail banking industry whose products and services provide access to credit for consumers and small businesses. Our members operate in all 50 states and serve over 150 million Americans, and collectively hold two-thirds of the country’s total depository assets. CBA opposes the Protecting Your Credit Score Act of 2019. Section 5 of the bill, “Injunctive Relief for Victims,” is especially concerning because it undermines the CFPB and Federal Trade Commission’s (FTC) primary authority to enforce the Fair Credit Reporting Act (FCRA) in a manner consistent with maintaining a nationwide credit reporting system that benefits businesses and consumers. Congress enacted PCRA in 1970 with emphasis on ensuring fairness, accuracy, and efficiency within the banking system. In doing so specifically protected federal regulators’ sole authority to pursue injunctive relief for violations, to avoid any possibility of multiple courts issuing conflicting orders. Under this deliberate design is unnecessary given the serious and existing penalties already in place under the FCRA and court discretion to correct credit market impacts on consumer credit reports. As depository institutions supervised by prudential federal regulators with deep expertise and experience in financial markets, CBA members are concerned with the potential for unlimited injunctive authority to impair national financial systems. 

CBA is also troubled by Section 4, “Improved Dispute Process for Consumer Reporting Agencies.” The FCRA already has authority to enforce fines for FCRA violations, and this proposal would complicate existing cost effective and efficient processes. Existing processes are mandated to use federal dispute resolution processes and false claims of inaccuracy will be resolved in a timely manner. Ultimately, this proposal shifts the burden on dispute resolution from the individual onto the credit bureaus. In addition, Section 7, “A One-Stop Shop for Consumers,” allows consumers to dispute adverse information found in their credit reports, allowing individuals to flood credit reporting agencies and lenders with false claims of inaccuracies that must be resolved in a timely manner. Ultimately, this proposal shifts the burden on dispute resolution from the individual onto the credit bureaus. 

NTU also questions the need for such legislation, as the FCRA currently provides consumers ample opportunity to dispute inaccurate information in credit reports. The FCRA already requires these disputes to be resolved in a timely manner and, if the disputed information is incorrect, the information must be corrected from a report. In essence, this legislation does not bring any new meaningful benefits to the credit reporting system. NTU also questions the need for such legislation, as the FCRA currently provides consumers ample opportunity to dispute inaccurate information in credit reports. If you have any questions, please contact NTU Policy and Government Affairs Manager, Thomas Atello. 

THANK YOU FOR YOUR CONSIDERATION OF OUR VIEWS. CBA REMAINS EAGER TO ASSIST YOUR EFFORTS TO IMPROVING OUTCOMES FOR ALL BORROWERS. Sincerely,  
Mr. McHENRY. Madam Speaker, I urge a “no” vote on this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.  

RANDY HUNT,  
President and CEO.
Ms. WATERS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, it has been nearly 17 years since major reform legislation to address common problems with credit reporting has been enacted into law. To that end, I am pleased that, earlier this year, the House passed H.R. 3821, the Comprehensive Credit Reporting Enhancement, Disclosure, Innovation, and Transparency Act.

Representative GOTHENBERG’s bipartisan bill complements those efforts to ensure a fully-functioning credit reporting system that is streamlined and easy to use and that better protects the data of all consumers.

Republicans were in charge when Equifax exposed sensitive data of 150 million Americans. What was their response? Nothing.

Earlier this year, the House passed the Comprehensive CREDIT Act to overhaul our broken credit reporting system and enhance cybersecurity of the three credit-reporting bureaus. Republicans voted no.

Representative GOTHENBERG offered this bill that would strengthen cybersecurity of Equifax and other credit bureaus, and now Republicans are saying no.

We have some Republicans who oppose giving the CFPB expanded authority, although I would note Ranking Member MCHENRY introduced H.R. 3621 that would do just that, giving the CFPB supervisory authority over the credit bureaus. The bill before us would do the same.

I would urge Republicans to reconsider their opposition to the bill. I urge an aye vote on this commonsense bill.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD support for this bill from the Americans for Financial Reform, the National Consumer Law Center, Consumer Action, Consumer Federation of America, Consumer Reports, Consumer Federation of America, Center for Responsible Credit, National Consumer Law Center, Converse 

June 26, 2020

DEAR CHAIRWOMAN WATERS: The undersigned consumer organizations write to support H.R. 3322, the Protecting Your Credit Score Act of 2019 (Gothemberg). This bill will address serious problems in the credit reporting system and empower consumers by providing them with much greater access to and control over their own information.

Credit reporting scores play a huge role in determining a consumer’s financial health. Not only do they determine a consumer’s ability to obtain credit at a fair price, they also can be used by many other sectors—insurance companies, landlords and even employers. Despite their importance, credit reports are also full of errors, which can cost a consumer thousands of dollars in higher-priced credit, or worse yet, result in the denial of a job, insurance coverage, an apartment rental, or the ability to open a small business.

The Federal Trade Commission’s definitive study showed that 21% of consumers had verified errors in their credit reports, 13% had errors that affected their credit scores, and 5% faced serious errors serious enough to cause them to be denied or pay more for credit.

Trying to fix these errors can be a Kafkaesque nightmare in which the Big Three nationwide consumer reporting agencies (CRAs)—Equifax, Experian and TransUnion—simultaneously and sometimes in collusion with a debt collector (“the furnisher”) over the consumer. As documented in NCLC’s report Automated Injustice Redux (2019), some of the most onerous problems include consumers having their credit files “mixed” with the wrong person, being unable to remove negative information even after court judgments in their favor, the aftereffects of identity theft when CRAs don’t believe the victim, and being labeled as dead when they are alive and breathing.

The report also documents that the credit and consumer reporting complaints to the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau (CFPB) over 380,000 since July 2011, which is often the top category of complaints to the CFPB.

The irony of these problems is that credit reports consist of our information. Yet consumers are only entitled to free access to this information once a year and in certain other limited situations, despite the fact that the Big Three nationwide CRAs are making tens of millions selling our financial information. Moreover, we are entitled to our own credit scores for free, while these same scores are being sold to creditors and others for hefty profits.

Last, but not least, there are serious issues with data security at the nationwide CRAs, of the type that led to the massive Equifax data breach. Data security issues have not yet been adequately addressed.

The Protecting Your Credit Score Act of 2019 would address these problems by:

Fixing the broken system for credit reporting by (1) creating a CFPB ombudsperson that will have the power to resolve persistent case-by-case CRAs that don’t fix them properly, and to make referrals to the Office of Supervision or the Office of Enforcement for supervisory or enforcement action when CRAs don’t comply with their dispute investigation responsibilities and (2) requiring CRAs to dedicate sufficient resources and proper training to personnel who handle disputes.

Giving consumers the tools they need to access their rights, understand their creditworthiness, and make financial decisions by (1) giving consumers the right to unlimited free credit reports and free credit scores online; (2) requiring the Big Three nationwide CRAs to provide a free-to-use portal tool to access online credit reports and credit scores, as well to exercise other important rights such as placing a security freeze, initiating a dispute, and opting out of prescreening (i.e., the use of credit report information to generate offers of credit).

Improving credit reporting accuracy by (2) requiring CRAs to conduct periodic audits to check for accuracy and (2) mandating that Big Three nationwide CRAs use all 9 digits of the consumer’s Social Security number when matching information from a lender to a consumer’s file, thus preventing mismatched files, which are one of the worst types of errors.

Improving data security for credit reports by giving the CFPB the authority to write rules under the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act to govern the disclosure of consumer information. Give consumers a tool to compel CRAs to fix a credit report by providing them with a right to seek injunctive relief so that a court could order CRA to correct an error or otherwise follow the law.

There are a number of other important reforms in the bill, such as giving consumers the right to prevent the sharing of information about them that does not fall into the FCRA’s current definition of “consumer report” and creating a comprehensive registry of all consumer reporting agencies.

The above reforms are urgently needed in order to ensure that consumers are treated fairly by the credit reporting system and that they have the access and control that they should be entitled to. Thus, we support the Protecting Your Credit Score Act of 2019 and look forward to working with you to swiftly enact it into law.

Thank you for your attention. If you have any questions about this letter, please contact Chi Chi Wu (cwu@nclc.org) at (617) 542-8010.

Sincerely,

Representative GOTHENBERG, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE GOTHENBERG: On behalf of the 1.4 million members of the National Association of REALTORS® (NAR), I am pleased to support several provisions of H.R. 5332, the Protecting Your Credit Score Act of 2020.

NAR has a long history of involvement in issues concerning the use and disclosure of consumer credit data. Nearly 90 percent of home sales are financed, and a borrower’s credit report and credit score form a critical gateway to obtaining a mortgage. Unfortunately, inaccurate credit reports and unfair credit reporting methods raise the cost to borrow and/or limit access to mortgage credit for many prospective borrowers.

REALTORS® believe that access to free credit scores, transparency in the reporting process and use of consumer credit information, high standards for vetting consumer credit information, and a reliable method for contesting and correcting inaccurate information are critical to a vibrant housing market and overall economy.

To this end, NAR applauds your efforts in H.R. 5332, the Protecting Your Credit Score Act of 2020. We are particularly supportive of sections two through six, which respect NAR’s principles for reporting.

While NAR has no position on the primary regulator of the CRAs, we appreciate your efforts in clarifying that important point.

Creditors and consumer confidence are critical in the home financing process, and our nation’s housing market and overall economy benefit tremendously from balanced financial regulation and consumer protection.

Thank you for your diligent work to improve the accuracy and accountability of consumer credit information.

Sincerely,

VINCE MALTA, 2020 President, National Association of REALTORS®

Ms. WATERS, Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 1017, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.
The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of H.R. 5332 is postponed.

**PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF RULE SUBMITTED BY OFFICE OF THE COMPTROLLER OF THE CURRENCY RELATING TO ‘‘COMMUNITY REINVESTMENT ACT REGULATIONS’’**

Ms. WATERS. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1017, I call up 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 ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1017, the joint resolution is considered read.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. Res. 90

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Congress disapproves the rule submitted by the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency relating to “Community Reinvestment Act Regulations” (85 Fed. Reg. 43734; published June 5, 2020), and such rule shall have no force or effect.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The joint resolution shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services.

The gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

**GENERAL LEAVE**

Ms. WATERS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.J. Res. 90 and to insert extraneous material thereon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The Madam Speaker. I rise in support of H.J. Res. 90, a Congressional Review Act resolution of disapproval to nullify the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency’s rule undermining the Community Reinvestment Act.

I introduced this resolution with our Consumer Protection and Financial Institutions Subcommittee chair, Representative MEeks, and I am proud we are joined by 70 other Members who have cosponsored the resolution.

The Community Reinvestment Act is a civil rights act. It is a law enacted in 1977 to prevent the discriminatory practice of redlining, in which banks discriminate against prospective customers in nearby neighborhoods, often based on their racial or ethnic background. The law requires banks to invest and lend responsibly in low- and moderate-income communities where they are chartered.

Unfortunately, implementation of the Community Reinvestment Act has not been robust. Today, 98 percent of the banks routinely pass their Community Reinvestment Act exams. However, research has shown that more than 60 metro areas across the country are now experiencing modern-day redlining today. These findings clearly demonstrate the need to strengthen the implementation of the law. Unfortunately, the OCC’s rule would do the opposite.

Despite the warnings of a wide range of stakeholders, former Comptroller Otting rushed to finalize this rule in his final days on the job. So, without the support—without the support—of the Federal Reserve or the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the other banking regulators were responsible for enforcing the law.

Mr. Otting appears to have been determined to undermine the Community Reinvestment Act. Largely, the law complicated his efforts to quickly obtain regulatory approval for OneWest Bank, a bank that he ran with Treasury Secretary Mnuchin, to merge with another bank in 2015.

I am deeply concerned that the OCC’s final rule will harm low-income and minority communities that are disproportionately suffering during this crisis, effectively turning the Community Reinvestment Act into the community disinvestment act.

If this resolution is not adopted, we will have different rules for different banks, leading to regulatory arbitrage and a lack of predictable standards that will only hurt the people the law is intended to help.

Notably, the OCC rule was adopted with insufficient and incomplete data, and it incentivizes large deals at the expense of smaller and more continuous financial transactions that truly benefit LMI communities.

For example, the OCC final rule allows CRA credit to be given for activities in LMI-qualified opportunity zones, but the rule does not ensure that these activities promote community development that includes affordable housing or small business economic development. This can lead to the unacceptable result of banks receiving CRA funding for building luxury housing in opportunity zones, providing no direct benefit to LMI communities.

Additionally, the OCC concedes it does not have all the data it needs to properly implement its new CRA framework, with the rules stating that the OCC will need to issue yet another notice of proposed rulemaking in the future to help set specific benchmarks, thresholds, and minimums. It doesn’t speak highly of a rule when the office says it is half baked.

A wide range of stakeholders have criticized the final rule出台, a group of civil rights and consumer groups issued a statement noting: “The new OCC rules stick with an overly simplistic metrics system that creates a loophole for banks to exploit, allowing them to get a passing CRA rating by making investments in communities where they can reap the largest rewards, while leaving too many credit needs unmet for underserved consumers and neighbors.”

During these difficult times, communities across the country have taken to the streets to demand justice and to tell their elected officials that they can no longer ignore the needs of communities of color. In a letter supporting this resolution from various organizations led by the Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights and National Community Reinvestment Coalition, they wrote: “In the weeks since the OCC finalized this rule, Mr. Otting has been facing a long overdue reckoning with our troubled legacy of racial and ethnic discrimination. . . . Now is certainly not the time to weaken the most important civil rights laws we have at our disposal to correct those disparities.”

Congress must block any effort by the Trump administration to weaken our civil rights laws and send a strong message to Federal regulators that they should be doing all they can during this pandemic to help, not hurt, low- and moderate-income communities, and especially communities of color.

By passing this resolution, Congress will block the OCC’s harm rule so that, once the pandemic passes, banking regulators can renew efforts to collaborate, modernize, and strengthen the Community Reinvestment Act with a new joint rulemaking that truly benefits the community the law was intended to help.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues in the House to vote “yes” on H.J. Res. 90.

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

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I rise in opposition to the resolution.

Madam Speaker, as I said, I rise in opposition to this resolution. First, before I get into the contents of my discussion here, I want to thank Chairwoman WATERS for her steadfast and long-time leadership in supporting minority, rural, low- and middle-income communities, LMI communities. Her service in the California Assembly and Senate and Congress has been commensurate with that work and that focus.

Committee Republicans share the chairwoman’s goal of strengthening
Madam Speaker, the Community Reinvestment Act was enacted in 1977, nearly 43 years ago. Its purpose was to ensure depository institutions like banks and savings associations help meet the needs of their local communities. The law tasks the OCC, as well as the other bank regulators, with issuing rules to carry out that purpose. However, the last time the CRA regulations were meaningfully updated was in 1995.

First, the rule provides for a public list of activities that will count for CRA credit so the community can understand, and we, as elected officials who have oversight of this program, can understand, too. And they will have that list public on what counts for CRA credit. This list will eliminate regulatory ambiguity and provide certainty over the types of investments that will lead to a good exam. With more certainty, banks will naturally make more investments. That is how capitalism works. This change alone is likely to increase community reinvestment across the board.

Second, the rule provides a better model for where the activity can count. Banks will be incentivized to invest where they take deposits instead of only around their branches. Let me explain.

Previously, a bank was only evaluated on its lending and investment in an area around its physical footprint, but banking today is very different than it was a generation ago when this regulation was written. Banking today, with the help of new technology and innovation, has changed substantially. So, if an online bank chooses a headquarters in one State—let me give you an example: Utah. Utah has a lot of online banks and they domicile in Salt Lake City, so that is where the community giving is around Salt Lake City, even if they take most of their deposits from Chairwoman WATERS’ district or my district. So, if you have that headquarters for an online bank, it is not working for them to make investments in other States or localities that desperately need capital.

Under the final rule, banks will get credit for investing in so-called banking deserts. This has been a priority of mine for the last decade, to help those who are in communities where they can’t get ready access. We know food deserts in urban areas, and if you can’t get access to fresh food, you can’t have a healthy diet.

That is a huge issue. It is a huge issue in rural areas, it is a huge issue in urban areas. We have banking deserts now, and this rule prioritizes those banking

These communities. For example, we know that community development financial institutions and minority depository institutions play critical roles in getting necessary funds to the smallest of small businesses in these communities.

Committee Republicans support the reforms made in the underlying final rule promulgated by the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency will continue to support minority, rural, and LMI communities into the 21st century.

Committee Republicans believe the reforms made in the underlying final rule promulgated by the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency will continue to support minority, rural, and LMI communities into the 21st century.

At the same time, CRA exams have gotten more complex and less transparent. Banks can only guess which of their community investments will receive credit, because the exams are quite highly subjective. The written evaluations can be thousands of pages long, and yet the regulators and the public have no clear data to help understand where all the CRA money has gone.

But there are, sadly, a few things that have not changed in the last 25 years—sadly—including socioeconomic conditions in the poorest communities, economic opportunity, and the persistent lack of capital in those communities. The CRA is intended to help address those issues, and that is why it is a vital and important law and, properly structured, can deliver in a better way.

But, clearly, we know the status quo is not working for the communities that we care desperately about giving opportunity to, economic opportunity to, and that is really what this is driven towards with this law.

Modernizing this regulatory framework is long overdue. Here are a few aspects of the rule that I believe represent major improvements over the old regulations.

First, the rule provides for a public list of activities that will count for CRA credit so the community can understand, and we, as elected officials who have oversight of this program, can understand, too. And they will have that public list on what counts for CRA credit.

This list will eliminate regulatory ambiguity and provide certainty over the types of investments that will lead to a good exam. With more certainty, banks will naturally make more investments. That is how capitalism works. This change alone is likely to increase community reinvestment across the board.

Second, the rule provides a better model for where the activity can count. Banks will be incentivized to invest where they take deposits instead of only around their branches. Let me explain.

Previously, a bank was only evaluated on its lending and investment in an area around its physical footprint, but banking today is very different than it was a generation ago when this regulation was written. Banking today, with the help of new technology and innovation, has changed substantially. So, if an online bank chooses a headquarters in one State—let me give you an example: Utah.

Utah has a lot of online banks and they domicile in Salt Lake City, so that is where the community giving is around Salt Lake City, even if they take most of their deposits from Chairwoman WATERS’ district or my district. So, if you have that headquarters for an online bank, it is not working for them to make investments in other States or localities that desperately need capital.

Under the final rule, banks will get credit for investing in so-called banking deserts. This has been a priority of mine for the last decade, to help those who are in communities where they can’t get ready access. We know food deserts in urban areas, and if you can’t get access to fresh food, you can’t have a healthy diet.

That is a huge issue. It is a huge issue in rural areas, it is a huge issue in urban areas. So we have banking deserts now, and this rule prioritizes those banking
economic suppression of racial minorities in America, a legacy of prejudice and economic exclusion that we are seeing all-too-clearly still echoes to this day, which is why many of the individuals you see in the streets today want to correct this structural problem that plagues us in our Nation.

At its core, the Community Reinvestment Act is a civil rights bill. It was the fourth in a series of banking bills passed to address systemic discrimination in banking, including the Fair Housing Act of 1968, the Equal Credit Opportunity Act of 1974, and the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act of 1975.

These bills built on the findings of the 1961 report from the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, and community-led civil action in Chicago to hold banks accountable for rampant discrimination in lending in Black and Hispanic communities.

Any efforts at reforms and modernization must remain true to this legacy, particularly given the overwhelming evidence of continued discrimination in banking and access to finance.

We must make sure that when we look at the CRA, the CRA is creating an opportunity for minority banks to thrive and strive and investing further in their communities; that affordable housing is something that is there, not something where we are investing and driving people out so they can't be housed in the community. It must be relevant to the community and keeping the people in the community so that they can see a better life.

Under Comptroller Otting’s leadership, the OCC’s work on CRA modernization has systematically failed to remain true to the law’s civil rights roots. In fact, the very way in which the rule was finalized and published by the OCC was symptomatic of the agency’s broader approach from the start. It was rushed, unfinished, unsupported by data, and not done in coordination with the other prudential regulators.

And to cap it all off, Comptroller Otting abandoned his post within the very same week of publishing this rule, drawing their position that the current CRA rules lack objectivity, transparency, and fairness. These are the central themes to the OCC’s modernization effort.

Second, this update to the CRA is needed and more than ever. One large bank’s CEO recently noted that due to COVID-19, the bank has seen somewhere between a 17 and 35 percent increase in online banking activity that normally would have been conducted in the branch. Americans are turning to online banking resources now more than ever.

The OCC’s rule takes steps to be able to ensure that CRA dollars go into low-to-moderate income communities where banks do not have branches, not only where they have bank branches. This change is forward-looking and should mark significant new opportunities to be able to invest in underserved communities.

Third, the OCC regularly and meaningfully engaged with critics in the rulemaking process. The OCC met with community, consumer, and academic groups to listen to their concerns about the proposal.

These meetings resulted in real changes to the OCC’s final rule, including a raised exemption threshold for community banks, changes to the treatment of mortgage origination and sale on the secondary market for purposes of the CRA, and raising the bar for a passing grade in CRA examinations.

This rule creates greater accountability between banks and the communities they invest in under the CRA. It adds transparency in what activity counts towards CRA credit, creates fairer and more timely examinations, and allows CRA performances to be measured assessment over assessment and against other banks. It also allows banks to reach new constituencies with their CRA dollars, most notably disabled, Tribal, rural, and farm populations.

By increasing regulatory certainty and reducing subjectivity, the OCC CRA modernization rule can equalize greater lending and investment in underserved communities.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on the measure. Ms. WATERS and I both know that the CRA was not born to create luxury homes in opportunity zones. The CRA was not birthed to provide opportunities for banks to make loans in redlined areas that may not be LMI communities.

The CRA was born to correct the harm that the government had done in the 1930s. At that time, the government, by and through the FHA, decided that it would craft maps, and these maps had red lines on them. These red lines became communities that were undesirable, but more appropriately, they were deemed unsafe, and lending institutions would not lend in these redlined areas.

The CRA was born to end the discrimination, the redlining, but this bill takes a step back to the 1930s.

This bill does not undo the harm that was done; it will increase the harm. I cannot support it.

The CRA was created to help LMI, low-to-moderate income, communities have banking privileges that they were denied under the law.

This bill doesn’t help us with the LMI. It is giving those big guys an opportunity to acquire these funds. I stand against it.

Madam Speaker, I support the chair of the committee and I stand for justice for the LMI communities.

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA), my friend and the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Investor Protection, Entrepreneurship, and Capital Markets.

Mr. HUIZENGA. Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.J. Res. 90, which is an effort to overturn a long-overdue regulatory update of the Community Reinvestment Act.

Frankly, it is ludicrous to compare this modernization effort to bringing us back to 1930s banking policy. I don’t understand how my colleagues on the other side can possibly equate that.

So we all agree the fundamental purpose of the Community Reinvestment Act is to combat unacceptable, discriminatory redlining, and demand that banks meet the credit needs of
their communities. There is no disagreement on that. My friend from New York laid out that history very, very well. It is the reason why we support the CRA and modernizing it.

However, the regulations promulgated throughout the implementation the CRA haven’t been meaningfully updated since 1995. Now, earlier we were talking about credit reporting, and the chair cited the fact that we had not addressed this in 17 years, as to why we needed to pass the bill on the floor. Well, we haven’t addressed the CRA in any meaningful way for 25 years. We have 8 years on that on this particular issue.

So in May of this year, the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency issued a final rule that modernizes the Community Reinvestment Act regulations for the 21st century.

The final rule provides clarity to banks on what activities count for a Community Reinvestment Credit, updated the geographic definitions of a bank’s community, as well as accounts for the technological transformation of banking services that we have seen. This will ensure that banks’ reinvestment will be in those communities that need it most.

The final rule establishes new performance standards and metrics that will allow OCC bank examiners to measure performance objectively and produce more consistent, useful, and timely Community Reinvestment Act evaluations to provide more clarity to banks.

Now, I understand that some of my colleagues want to have this “let’s move the target to my pet project; kind of a way of evaluating where a bank is going, but that is not what it is intended to do.

Lastly, this modernization introduces objective reporting measures that will allow comparison over time and between banks, which has never been possible in the history of the CRA. What is a good project in one neighborhood should be viewed as a good project in an adjacent neighborhood, and that isn’t the case today.

By using the Congressional Review Act to overturn this critical final rule, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will only delay progress and harm the very communities that I know they want to protect. Those are the same communities that I serve as well.

I urge all of my colleagues to vote against this partisan attempt to overturn much-needed reform and modernization of the Community Reinvestment Act, and I am hopeful that we are going to be able to come together and work on truly meaningful, actual reform in the long run.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HECK), a senior member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. HECK. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairwoman for introducing this important measure, of which I am a proud cosponsor.

This resolution is especially timely as we reconcile with the legacy of discrimination in our country. In that process, we must consider how housing policy has contributed to systemic inequality.

For decades in this country, we allowed a Federal agency to legitimize racial discrimination by creating those color-coded maps indicating where investments would be profitable, “greenlined,” or where it would not be, “redlined.”

We built institutional obstacles for Black families trying to purchase a home, and that resulted in devastating, intergenerational financial disadvantages.

Redlining prevented access to the single most important wealth-building tool an American has access to, that is, owning a home. The result? Black families have a median net worth of $17,000, compared to $171,000 for White families. In fact, homeownership by Black families is 44 percent, and by White families, 74 percent.

We have a responsibility to do everything we can to correct this. After all, we created it.

Yet, in the middle of a pandemic that has made racial disparities all the more pronounced, the OCC rushed out a final rule that undermined the legislation that made redlining illegal, and they even did it without the support of the Federal Reserve or FDIC.

The OCC’s definitions and overly simplistic metrics do not do justice to what a crucial role homeownership and housing policy have played in racial inequality.

Their approach takes us backward. If you don’t want to go backward, vote “yes” on this measure. If you believe homeownership should be available to all Americans, regardless of skin color, vote “yes” on this matter. If you oppose redlining, vote “yes” on this measure. If you want to stand for racial justice, vote “yes” on this measure.

Mr. MCHenry. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Michigan an additional 1 minute.

Mr. HUIZENGA. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the ranking member doing that. Let me just wrap up.

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

Mr. MCHenry. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Michigan an additional 1 minute.

Mr. HUIZENGA. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the ranking member doing that. Let me just wrap up.
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Ms. WATERS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HECK), a senior member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. HECK. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairwoman for introducing this important measure, of which I am a proud cosponsor.

This resolution is especially timely as we reconcile with the legacy of discrimination in our country. In that process, we must consider how housing policy has contributed to systemic inequality.

For decades in this country, we allowed a Federal agency to legitimize racial discrimination by creating those color-coded maps indicating where investments would be profitable, “greenlined,” or where it would not be, “redlined.”

We built institutional obstacles for Black families trying to purchase a home, and that resulted in devastating, intergenerational financial disadvantages.

Redlining prevented access to the single most important wealth-building tool an American has access to, that is, owning a home. The result? Black families have a median net worth of $17,000, compared to $171,000 for White families. In fact, homeownership by Black families is 44 percent, and by White families, 74 percent.

We have a responsibility to do everything we can to correct this. After all, we created it.

Yet, in the middle of a pandemic that has made racial disparities all the more pronounced, the OCC rushed out a final rule that undermined the legislation that made redlining illegal, and they even did it without the support of the Federal Reserve or FDIC.

The OCC’s definitions and overly simplistic metrics do not do justice to what a crucial role homeownership and housing policy have played in racial inequality.

Their approach takes us backward. If you don’t want to go backward, vote “yes” on this measure. If you believe homeownership should be available to all Americans, regardless of skin color, vote “yes” on this matter. If you oppose redlining, vote “yes” on this measure. If you want to stand for racial justice, vote “yes” on this measure.

Mr. MCHenry. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Michigan an additional 1 minute.

Mr. HUIZENGA. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the ranking member doing that. Let me just wrap up.
of banks since the original rule was proposed in 1977, and the CRA rule was connected to those bank branches. That is another reason for modernizing the rule.

Since we created this bank branch closure to our economy, shrinking the number of banks, due to regulation and the like, it is a double whammy, so let’s make sure that our banks can get credit for doing a good job on accessing of all of our communities, particularly our minority, low-to-middle-income, and rural areas served by those institutions.

Let’s fix this problem by having the certainty that we have an effective CRA rule, that it is implemented properly, and that we can all see our constituencies benefited by that.

Let’s let the Comptroller of the Currency do their job. They are the banking experts. They are the ones who have been managing this work. Congress should not be undermining it.

I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on the resolution but support the work of the Community Reinvestment Act.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY), a member of the Financial Services Committee.

Ms. PRESSLEY. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of this critical resolution reversing a rule tainted by conflicts of interest and callous disregard for the communities most affected.

As hundreds of thousands take to the streets, as the cries for a reckoning with this Nation’s past and present grow louder, this administration believes that the future is deregulation.

Today, we reject the administration’s position that it is banks that are deserving of our time and sympathy as “too big to fail.” I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on this resolution.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ), who is also a member of the Financial Services Committee.

Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. Madam Speaker, I thank Chairwoman WATERS for her continued leadership on the Community Reinvestment Act. Over the last several weeks, our Nation has been gripped by the uprisings against anti-Black racism and systemic racial injustice across the United States. But there is a difference between saying that we believe in the inherent dignity, equality, and value of our Black brothers and sisters and actually committing to it. The Community Reinvestment Act is one such commitment.

Our Nation has an unconscionable racial wealth gap that is directly rooted in the racist financial practice of redlining, whereby Black communities had red lines drawn around them on a map and were systematically denied banking, housing, and economic opportunities.

As a result, generations of White communities were given a head start at homeownership, which was the foundation of generational wealth, while Black communities were denied. This fuels a runaway generational wealth gap that haunts the United States today. It is a practice that continues, with over 60 metro areas, in this very moment, having banks that deny Black applicants at significantly higher rates than they do White applicants.

Now, the CRA is an antiracist, anti-poverty policy that seeks to remedy some of the damage done.

Yet, while this administration and the Republican Party paid lip service to Black and Brown communities with toothless policing legislation, behind everyone’s back, the OCC made moves to gut rules around the CRA and advance the continued economic oppression of Black people in the United States. In fact, these rule changes advance gentrification and value luxury housing over investment in Black lives.

Well, to that move, we have four words: Not on our watch. That is because, in this House, in the 116th House, under the leadership of Chairwoman WATERS, we will value Black lives.

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

Ms. WATERS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GARCIA), a member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. GARCIA of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I thank Chairwoman WATERS for this opportunity.

I rise in support of this resolution and join my colleagues in opposition to the Trump administration’s new rule that weakens implementation of the Community Reinvestment Act.

That move is an outrage that the Trump administration’s OCC issued this rule that guts a historic law in the midst of an unprecedented pandemic.

To add insult to injury, former Chairman Otting resigned his post immediately after issuing the rule so that he will avoid cleaning up the fallout from this mess. It is up to Congress to clean it up, and that is what we are seeking to do.

The Community Reinvestment Act was enacted more than 40 years ago and has been one of our most powerful tools against redlining and the perpetration of systemic racism and poverty.

Like so much of our country’s history, the story of the CRA runs through Chicago, where a local community organizer in the Austin neighborhood, Gale Cincotta, led the fight against discriminatory housing injustice and earned the nickname “Mother of the CRA.” Through her neighborhood association and National People’s Action, Cincotta fought against redlining and disinvestment from our communities using some of the innovative and confrontational tactics that we recognize in today’s protest movements.

My district is a working-class immigrant district, and Gale Cincotta and organizers like her across the country fought to pass the CRA so that communities like mine will not be left behind by financial institutions.

The OCC’s rule allows lenders to count activities that have nothing to
do with improving our neighborhoods toward their requirements to serve low- and moderate-income communities, decrease transparency, and make it even harder to hold these institutions accountable. That is why we opposed the rule.

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Speaker, I am prepared to close.

May I inquire if there are further speakers on the majority side.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Speaker, I have additional speakers.

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRIST), who is a member of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. CRIST. Madam Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to thank Chairwoman WATERS for promoting access to capital for minority borrowers. Since the murder of George Floyd, our Nation has embarked on a true, broad-based push to defeat institutional racism. America is coming to realize that racism did not end with emancipation, and it did not end with civil rights. It is still very much with us all today.

So, as we commit ourselves to Black Lives Matter, we need to also ensure Black communities matter, Black homeownership matters, Black wealth matters, and Black businesses matter.

My hometown of south St. Petersburg, Florida, was founded by a large and vibrant Black community where, despite their strength, pride, character, and entrepreneurial spirit, we are still working to overcome institutional racism. Underinvestment in the community, food deserts, and redlining exist. This past weekend, I witnessed the unveiling of the Black Lives Matter mural in front of the Dr. Carter G. Woodson African American Museum. It is right near one of my favorite restaurants on the south side, Chief’s Creole Cafe.

While the art moved me beyond words, reality quickly set in. The owners of Chief’s Creole, the Brayboys, were faced with their bank that they couldn’t get a PPP loan, not because they didn’t qualify, but because the big banks are leaving behind the smallest businesses, businesses overcrownd by Black, women, and veteran owners. If the banks aren’t making PPP loans to Black-owned businesses when they don’t have skin in the game, how can we trust them to do the right thing when it is their own money at risk?

That is why the Community Reinvestment Act is so vitally important. That is why we need it to work for the communities it was actually designed to serve.

The OCC got it wrong. Vote “yes” to repeal the rule.

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

Ms. WATERS. Madam Speaker, if Mr. MCHENRY has no more speakers, I am prepared to close.

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may con- sume.

So, in closing, the Community Reinvestment Act, we agree, is an important law that is intended to support underserved communities across America. Maintaining the status quo also ignores the innovation and the needs of our country as we move into the 21st century.

The innovations taking place to financial services and to banking over the last 25 years need to be addressed, but also the fact that we are not actually meeting the needs desperately roved in communities surrounding our district, both the urban and rural.

The new regulations will increase investment and capital in communities and provide more clarity and transparency to all parties involved in the process. That is why it is a good update.

As we work to ensure a strong economic recovery for all Americans, it is critical we encourage financial institutions to provide services for those most in need. The OCC’s final rule will play an important role in this recovery effort by encouraging more capital, investment, and lending services in the communities hardest hit by COVID–19.

The OCC took a very thoughtful approach, embracing input from other agencies and stakeholders over the course of several years. The final rule builds in nearly all of the constructive criticism the agency has received through the open comment process. In fact, this shows the agency is willing to compromise but not willing to settle for the status quo.

The OCC’s modernization of the CRA regulation is a long overdue update that will help our communities come into the 21st century stronger and healthier. The last time these regulations were revised was in 1995, when the OCC modernized the law to make it more flexible by changing the way banks receive most of their deposits through branches, and as such, the old regulations that are on the books still rely heavily on branch locations.

Quite frankly, what we have seen over the last 100 days in America is that banks have been and they were in previous generations, because most of these branches have been shut down in our States because our States are trying to do the right thing to address this health crisis. That is why we are wearing masks, that is why we are social distancing, and that is why we are trying to be responsible to one another and be thoughtful in our approach to one another.

But, unfortunately, this bill before us is a very straightforward up-and-down. I will say let’s not support the status quo. Let’s support innovation and an update to our regulation to meet the needs of our communities and to meet the needs that are so desperately need-

vote against this resolution and support the underlying rule.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Gentlewoman from California, has 8½ minutes remaining.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Speaker, before I move into my closing, I would like to correct Mr. MCHENRY, who said he approved the OCC rule this week. That is not correct. My staff just called the FDIC to confirm that they did not approve the rule.

Mr. MCHENRY. Will the gentle- woman yield?

Ms. WATERS. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. MCHENRY. I misspoke. I said they supported the CRA.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Ms. WATERS. I include in the RECORD multiple letters from dozens of consumers, community and civil rights groups in support of H.J. Res. 90.

CHIEF COUNSEL’S OFFICE, OFFICE OF THE COMPTROLLER OF THE CUR- RENCY,

Attention: Comment Process

We are writing to oppose the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC) and the Office of Comptroller of the Currency’s (OCC) proposed changes that would seriously weaken the Community Reinvestment Act (CRA). The U.S. Conference of Mayors has strong policy supporting the CRA. The law was passed in 1977 to end redlining, and to meet the credit needs of communities where banks do business. Discrimination in lending still exists. But the FDIC and OCC proposed changes would make the banks less accountable to their communities through complex and confusing performance measures on CRA exams while oversimplifying how bank’s performances are measured. Moreover, public input into the process will be difficult and limited. This will result in significantly fewer loans, investments and services to communities most in need of more credit and capital.

The CRA has been of enormous benefit to low- and moderate-income Americans. For example, since 1996, CRA-covered banks issued more than 27 million small business loans in low-and moderate-income tracts, totaling $1.093 trillion, and $1.06 trillion in affordable housing and economic development projects benefitting low- and moderate-income communities.

While such results are very good, the proposed rule will make it all but impossible to continue such impressive results. Moreover, much more can be achieved by regulations that modernize the CRA to take into account changes in the banking industry and the economy. For example, independent mortgage companies not covered by CRA make more than 50 percent of the home mortgages in our nation. If anything, the CRA should be strengthened to reflect changing demographics and changes in the financial industry, and not weaken the CRA as the proposed rule would do. We strongly encourage you to reconsider a proposed rule, and instead, modernize CRA that will truly benefit low and moderate income citizens.

Sincerely,

Justin Wilson, Alexandria, VA; Satya Koneru, Miami, FL; Alan L. Nagy, Newark, CA; Alan Webber, Santa Fe, NM; Sam Weaver, Boulder, CO; Carlo DeMaria Jr., Everett, MA; Robert Garcia, Long Beach, CA; Steve Beebe, SC; Jerome A. Prince, Gary, IN; Brian C. Wahler, Piscataway, NJ; Gregory J. Oravec, Port St.
Lucie, FL; Steve Adler, Austin, TX; Robert Donchez, Bethlehem, PA; Jack W. Bradley, Lorain, OH; David J. Berger, Lima, OH; Scott Conger, Jackson, TN; Joe Coveli, Cape Coral, FL; Daniel P. Doyle, Philadelphia, PA; Hillary Schieve, Reno, NV; Trey Mendes, Brownsville, TX; Patrick J. Purye, Torrance, CA; Marcia A. Leclerc, East Hartford, CT; Jesse M. Ecker, Jacksonville, FL; Ryan O. Elicker, Phoenix, RI; Juan Carlos Bermudez, Doral, FL; Frank C. Ortis, Pembroke Pines, FL; Bryan K. Barnett, Rochester Hills, MI; Jacob Frey, Minneapolis, MN; Michael M. Viney, Las Vegas, NV; John Cranley, Cincinnati, OH; Debra March, Henderson, NV; and other essential financial services. The CRA requires banks to undertake reasonable efforts to lend to and invest in all of the income communities out from home loans in areas where they do business. The law has helped to spur increased investments in formerly-redlined communities. It did not, however, prevent non-bank lenders from making subprime loans and other credit products to communities of color with toxic subprime mortgages in the years before 2008; and research shows that racial disparities in lending—which cannot be explained away by differences in credit scores—persist to this day.

Even before the NPRM was published, a wide range of stakeholders weighed in with both the OCC and FDIC to raise concerns and to ask for more data justifying the changes. Those concerns were not addressed, and the rule was never reversed. While the NPRM was published, the United States and the world were just beginning to learn about the growing threats posed by a dangerous new respiratory virus. In the coming weeks, it became clear that the virus had not been contained, and it spread rapidly to multiple countries including the United States. As stakeholders and the public began devoting more and more resources and attention to the health, social, and economic fallout of the growing pandemic, and many urged the OCC to temporarily suspend rule making related not to COVID-19, the agencies continued plowing ahead, only agreeing to make not related to COVID–19, the agenda more and more resources and attention to these issues and your consideration of our views.

Very Truly Yours,

KEVIN STEIN,
Deputy Director.

Abundant Housing LA, AnewAmerica Community Development, Asian Pacific Islander Small Business Program, ASIAN, Inc., CAARMA Consumer Advocates Against Reverse Mortgage Abuse, Cabrillo Economic Development Corporation, California Capital Financial Development Corporation, California Coalition for Rural Housing, California Housing Partnership, California Reinvention Community Credit Needs by Creating Opportunities for Homeownership, small business ownership, job creation, financial capability, and affordable housing and community development in neighborhoods that have been otherwise excluded from the financial mainstream and the American dream.

The OCC’s harmful rule will reverse these gains by substantially lowering the bar and enabling banks to get passing grades through activities that are further and further removed from low-income communities, homeowners, tenants, and small businesses. The OCC takes this damaging action during a pandemic that has had a disproportionate impact on the very communities meant to benefit from CRA.

We urge all members of Congress to cosponsor and vote in favor of this important resolution and protect communities ravaged by redlining and systemic racism has never been more important.
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of color—the very communities the CRA was intended to help—at a rate several times higher than the population at large; the U.S. Surgeon General warned the public to prepare for a COVID-19 pandemic, and models predicted 100,000 or more deaths in the United States alone. Only 41 days after the comment period ended, and even though only a minority of the respondents voiced support for the new framework, the OCC rushed through a final rule that left it largely intact. The FDIC, too, elected to finalize its version of the rule at this time.

In the weeks since the OCC finalized its rule, our nation has been facing a long-overdue reckoning with our troubled legacy of racial and ethnic discrimination. While much of the conversation has rightly been focused on police brutality and the impact of over-punishment of communities of color, this conversation is inexorably tied to the lasting economic, social, and legal legacy of redlining and other forms of racial discrimination.
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90, a disapproval resolution that would overturn a poorly constructed rule change on the Community Reinvestment Act (CRA) hastily finalized in May, days before Comptroller Otting resigned from the agency, and published this month.

At the outset, it is critical to note that the Trump administration’s plan is split on the CRA final rule. With a lack of interagency coordination among the nation’s bank regulators, different banks will be held to different reinvestment standards depending on their regulator—an outcome that both banks and advocates have cautioned against. Federal Reserve Chairman Jerome Powell testified just last week that he expects the agency to move forward with CRA updates intended to garner “broad support among the community of intended beneficiaries” something he considers a “non-negotiable condition for it.” The OCC’s final rule achieved no such support or consensus. The vast majority of public comments—about 90 percent—opposed the OCC’s cumulative rating measure and preemptive ratings framework that remains at the heart of the final rule, but the OCC adopted it anyway.

The OCC’s final rule makes a series of changes to the CRA regulatory framework that reduce incentives for banks to lend to low- and moderate-income (LMI) families and invest and serve LMI communities: homebuyers and homeowners, small businesses, community development projects that primarily serve LMI people. It also expands the number of banks that will have no review of how they open and close bank branches and provide key bank services in LMI and underserved neighborhoods.

These harmful changes could not come at a worse time. The ongoing COVID–19 pandemic and widespread social unrest that is gripping the nation has hit LMI and communities of color the hardest and brought gaping disparities to the forefront. The changes to the CRA have pushed through by the OCC would do little to address the pressing national priorities of reducing the racial wealth gap, of better serving those traditionally underserved by the nation’s financial system or stimulating an economic recovery from COVID–19 that is equitable. While the OCC claims its aim is to increase CRA activity, the lack of any credible agreement among this Administration’s regulators should serve as a dire warning about that claim. We do not yet know the full impact of COVID–19 on local mortgage markets, small business resiliency, or how LMI households, local jobs, and key sectors will recover. Weakening CRA at this moment is a crisis after the crisis.
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threat to our recovery from the COVID-19 re-
cession and undercuts the purpose and intent of CRA, harming underserved communities throughout the nation.

As NHC stated in its formal comment letter on the CRA Act on April 8, we have no idea how severely the pandemic will impact our economy, the financial system and communities throughout the nation. Committing resources to the current initiative that does not directly support our national response to the COVID-19 pandemic is a dangerous distraction; On April 27, NHC joined 14 other major national organizations, including the National Association of REALTORS and the National League of Cities, to urge regulators to refrain from committing resources to regulatory initiatives that do not directly sup-
port our national response to the COVID-19 pandemic.

Notably, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC) and the FDIC Board refused to join the OCC on this ill-
timed decision. As FDIC Chairman Jenella McWilliams noted in her March 19, 2020 letter to the committee, FDIC and the GCC, financial institutions “will face unique difficulties over the coming weeks and months to adequately staff customer-facing functions; ensure that deposit, loan, and IT systems operate normally; help bor-
rowers that are experiencing unanticipated cash flow difficulties; and address the earn-
ings challenges of near zero percent interest rates and a potential surge in borrowers who are unable to meet con-
tractual payment terms.” We could not agree more.

CRA modernization is a once-in-a-genera-
tion opportunity. There is much to improve, as the law and most recent regulations were written before the proliferation of interstate banking, internet banking and the revital-
ization of America’s cities; the latter being the opposite trend of one of the two major reasons for CRA’s adoption—urban disinvest-
ment. As the OCC’s final rule makes clear, financial institutions can now make investments in borrowers who are unbanked in the United States. Mis-
surably, the OCC’s final rule moves the OCC has been a critical tool for HOPE to leverage the resources it needs to serve low-income communities and for the communities to leverage the OCC’s (CRA) final rule overhauling the
Community Reinvestment Act.

HOPE is a Black-led, women-owned com-
munity development financial institution, credit union, and policy institute in Jack-
son, Mississippi. HOPE was established 25 years ago to ensure that all people regardless of where they live, gender, race, or place of birth have the opportunity to sup-
port their families and realize the American Dream. HOPE has generated over $2.5 billion in financing that has benefited more than 1.5 million people throughout Alabama, Ar-
kanas, Louisiana, Mississippi and Ten-
nessee.

The Community Reinvestment Act (CRA) has been a critical tool for HOPE to leverage the resources it needs to serve low-income communities, rural communities, and commu-
nities of color in the Deep South. Unfor-
tunately, the OCC’s final rule moves the CRA—and economic opportunity for our communities—further out of reach in three ways:

- Diverting investments to activities far
- From the CRA's original intent of redressing redlining.
- As just one example, the OCC’s failure to
- Prioritize bank branches in low-income and rural areas will be acutely felt in the Deep South, where already much of the region is already in a banking desert and includes areas with the highest percentage of persons who are unbanked in the United States. Mis-
sissippi and Louisiana, with over 15% of
- Unbanked residents, have the highest per-
- centage among all states. The rate of
- Unbanked Black households is even higher, at 26% both states. As made plain during COV

- In COVID-19, these banking relationships lay the foundation for broader disparities in access to capital for
- Small businesses and individuals.
- Ultimately, the OCC’s final rule widens the
- Wealth gap and further inhibits economic op-
- Portunity in already hard-pressed areas of the country, particularly here in the Deep South.

HOPE, (Hope Enterprise Corporation/Hope
Credit Union/Hope Policy Institute) supposes
the OCC’s final rule undermines what has been a core strength of CRA for 40 years—the
encouragement of bank engagement and dia-
logue with stakeholders in local commu-
nities, including community-based organiza-
tions, community development corporations, and others, to understand and better serve the very underserved areas. For this rea-
son and more, we support your committee’s Congressional Review Act resolution to over-
turn the rule change.

Sincerely,
FRANK WOODRUFF,
Executive Director,
National Alliance of Community Eco-

nomic Development Associations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired. Pursuant to House Resolution 1017, the previous question is ordered. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolu-
tion. The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the joint resolu-
tion. The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. WATERS. 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. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, fur-
ther proceedings on this question will be postponed.

HONORING THE LIFE OF MARNY
XIONG

(Ms. McCOLLUM asked and was granted permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. McCOLLUM. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Marny Xiong, the chairwoman of the Saint
Paul Public Schools Board of Educ-
ation, who passed away from COVID-
19 on June 7 at the age of 31. We mourn the loss of this young woman, a rising star whose legacy was an inspiration to us all.

Marny was a trailblazing activist and a proud member of Saint Paul’s Hmong community. She was a dedicated advo-
 cate for young people, and she stood up for equality and racial justice. She un-
derstood the disparities that students of color face in our State, and she worked to ensure that every child had an opportunity to succeed.

As chairwoman of the board, her leadership was critical to successfully resolving the district’s first ever teachers’ strike. When confronted with the COVID-19 pandemic, Marny helped to steer the district’s unprecedented transition to distance learning for 37,000 students.
It is heartbreaking that this pandemic has taken one of our community’s rising leaders.

Madam Speaker, please join me in extending condolences to Marny’s parents, her seven siblings, her extended family, and her friends at this time of great grief.
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POLICING IS STATE AND LOCAL RESPONSIBILITY

(Mr. ARRINGTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ARRINGTON. Madam Speaker, the vast majority of law enforcement across the country are good. They are competent. They are professional. And when they do respect the law, that is, treat all citizens, they must be held accountable. And it is that starts at the local level.

Policing is a State and local responsibility, not a Federal responsibility. When law enforcement fail to do their job and do not hold accountable accountable, the system breaks down. You have incidences of abuse and, sometimes, cultures of corruption.

So what is the solution? It is not another one-size-fits-all from Washington, D.C.

We don’t need to Federalize policing. We need to hold our local law enforcement accountable. We need to come alongside them at all levels of government to make sure that we don’t recycle the bad actors. So we get rid of them. And if we do, then the 1 percent won’t take the 99 percent that are protecting and serving us and risking their lives to do so.

IN MEMORY OF DR. JAMES HENRY NEELY

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

Mr. KELLY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the life of Dr. James Henry Neely, who passed away on Monday, June 22, in Oxford, Mississippi.

Dr. Neely was born August 8, 1932, in West Point, Mississippi. His many accomplishments began at Mary Holmes College High School. He was the editor of the school newspaper, secretary of the senior class, president of the athletic club, and member at large of the student council. He took his successes to the senior class, president of the athletic club, and member at large of the student council. He took his successes to the West Point Trinity United Presbyterian Church. He was not only a prominent figure in the medical field, but in the community in which he served.

Left to cherish his memory is his wife, Elaine; his son, James; his grandchildren; his four children; and many others.

Dr. Neely led a life that should be admired. He affected change in Mississippi and this Nation by his life of public service.

IN HONOR OF MONSIGNOR J. GASTON HEBERT’S 60TH ORDINATION

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

Mr. HILL. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Monsignor J. Gaston Hebert’s 60th ordination as a priest as well as to salute his lasting contributions to our Catholic diocese in Arkansas.

He was baptized and received his First Communion at St. Mary Church in Hot Springs, where he also celebrated his first mass as an ordained priest in 1960.

I was privileged to have Monsignor Hebert as my teacher at Catholic High School in Little Rock, where he served as an English and drama teacher from 1960 to 1965.

Even after he retired from serving as the pastor of Christ the King Church in Little Rock for 20 years, he continued to serve the diocese in Arkansas as vicar general under Bishop Andrew McDonald and Archbishop J. Peter Sartain. And again, importantly, as our diocesan administrator from 2006 to 2008, prior to the Holy Father’s appointment of Bishop Anthony Taylor.

Monsignor Hebert has served our community faithfully, and I thank him for his love, dedication, and years of service.

Madam Speaker, we miss seeing him and are forever grateful.

REMEMBERING DEPUTY JAMES BLAIR

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

Mr. GUEST. Madam Speaker, last week, we were reminded once again of the great sacrifice made by the men and women of law enforcement as families. And here we are, her fellow officers grieving for her, who devoted his life to his family, his community, to law enforcement.

We have seen George Washington statues, the Father of our country, who valued freedom above all else, knocked down. Ulysses S. Grant, the Commanding General of the Union Army, who helped stop the slavery effort of the South, who signed the Civil Rights Act of 1867, and the ratification of the 15th Amendment, was toppled in San Francisco. Abraham Lincoln, who freed so many from slavery. Even down the street from here, they are having to guard the Mary McLeod Bethune statues down there at Lincoln Park, along with Mr. Lincoln. And there was a key element of FDR’s original Federal Council of Negro Affairs, otherwise known as the “Black Cabinet.”

There is not even any logic on the vandalize and chaos that is going on here when they are tearing down statues on all sides of the issue. It needs to be stopped, and there needs to be harsh penalties for those doing this.
IN RECOGNITION OF SID MARTIN BIOTECH UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA

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

Mr. YOHO. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Sid Martin Biotech at the University of Florida for winning the Randall M. Whaley Incubator of the Year Award, the top award given by the International Business Innovation Association.

This marks the third time in the last 10 years that Sid Martin Biotech has been honored as the top incubator in the world. Even more, Sid Martin Biotech is the only program in the world to win more than one Randall M. Whaley award. This is a tremendous feat, and I am proud that this program is located in North Central Florida in Florida’s Third Congressional District.

Sid Martin Biotech has incubated 106 startups since its first opening. These companies have raised over $8.8 billion in funding and created over 8,000 high-tech jobs.

Madam Speaker, I congratulate the entire team at Sid Martin Biotech for this great accomplishment, and I am confident that this success will continue in the future.

Go Gators.

UNITE AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. DEAN). Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentleman from Arizona (Mrs. LEOKO), the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. NORTON), a Member but represents Washington, D.C., has introduced legislation to have a statue of Abraham Lincoln taken down, a statue that was funded by the freed slaves.

What has our country come to? We need to return to a semblance of civility in our country. And so that is why I call on Democrat-run cities to clamp down on these criminals. No more autonomous zones. No more looting. No more destructing statues. Let’s bring back law and order.

That is why I stand with President Trump and his calls to arrest and prosecute criminals. Let’s stop the lawlessness. Let’s try to heal our country.

Mr. BIGGS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman, and I appreciate her comments.

We do see an increase in the amount of lawlessness. We have moved from peaceful protests, which I support, I understand. That is what the guarantee of the First Amendment is for. We all get a right to assemble with whom we want to assemble with. We get a right to speak. We get a right to seek redress of grievances from the government. All of those are important rights that we support, we stand for.

But we move from rioting, looting, mayhem. There has been murder. There has been assaults. There has been brutal violence.

I have heard some of my colleagues in this body call those protests. It is not protesting. That is lawless rioting, and it needs to be curbed and checked.

I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, the coronavirus pandemic reminded us that we are in this together. Despite serious and, as yet, unresolved ongoing questions about policy responses to that event, we have stayed home and sacrificed for our neighbors’ health. We have seen these problems.

But in the past month, we are seeing the worst of us: violent mobs Stoning business owners, Federal agents shot to death, looting occurring nationwide, and avowed Marxist activists openly declaring and promoting it, six blocks down a major U.S. city ceded to anarchists.

I don’t recognize this America. People experience fear repeatedly of the...
wanton destruction of their livelihoods, their cities on fire or being canceled by social media mobs; government buildings attacked; monuments and memorials spreading the breadth of our history, from Washington to Lincoln to Roosevelt, torn down or threatened by riotous mobs.

And this is not impasioned, heat-of-the-moment destruction. It is a targeted, organized, and methodical purge of figures who represent ideas they wish to disparage. Such as all people are endowed by our creator with inalienable rights to life, liberty, and property, and that government by, for, and of the people shall not perish from the Earth.

We have seen this deliberate tactic throughout history, in communist China's cultural revolution, in the theocratic purge of Afghanistan's Taliban, even in the terror campaigns of the Reconstruction and Jim Crow South.

What distinguishes America is how this Nation responds to such lawless and purposeful attacks. We hold, it is declared, that government's very purpose is to secure the inalienable rights of all and that, when order falls apart, so, too, does our Nation.

What we have seen in recent weeks begs the question: How is government serving its core purpose?

Local and State officials have flouted that purpose, abandoned that responsibility. But in those circumstances, the Federal Government has the tools to secure the rights of the people.

Attorney General Barr, chapter 13 of the United States Criminal Code, provides all the authority you may need. FBI Director Wray, the evidence of criminal conspiracies is in plain sight.

The Department of Justice and the FBI must act without delay. This government must restore the America we know.

Word is the Department of Justice is leading over 500 investigations, and that is good news. We are counting on them, and we know they are up to the task.

Mr. BIGGS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina for his comments, and I echo his sentiment that what needs to happen to restore order here is one must arrest malefactors who are committing crimes. We must then charge them and prosecute them and give them due process. But without a restoration of order, no one in this country has freedom.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Weber).

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Madam Speaker, some history from our country.

Yesterday was June 25. On June 25, 1868, the State of Virginia ratified the U.S. Constitution. It became the 10th State of the United States. Virginia willingly joined the Union. Virginia willingly left the Union and then willingly eventually rejoined the Union, a reminder from our past. Do we take down or erase anything about Virginia? Certainly not.

Madam Speaker, on June 25, 1868, Florida, Alabama, Louisiana, Georgia, North Carolina, and South Carolina were readmitted to the Union. Again, they had willingly joined the Union; they willingly left the Union; and, yes, they willingly rejoined that same Union. Reminders from the past. Do we do away with all reminders?

On May 18, 1896, the Supreme Court in Plessy v. Ferguson upheld the constitutionality of racial segregation for public facilities as long as they were separate but equal. In 1962, the Supreme Court ruled that the use of unofficial prayer in public schools was unconstitutional. They got it wrong twice, just two examples. Do we do away with any mention of the Supreme Court?

Madam Speaker, in 1973, June 25, again, yesterday, John Dean, White House Counsel for President Richard Nixon, admitted that President Nixon was involved in the coverup. Do we do away with all mention of President Nixon?

Madam Speaker, how about President Bill Clinton, who was accused of several sexual harassments and was found guilty of lying under oath and, as I recall, tampering with a witness or obstruction of justice? Are all mentions of President Clinton gone? No, not him, not Nixon. They were Presidents of this United States.

Madam Speaker, in 1999, on June 25, Germany's Parliament approved a national Holocaust memorial to be built in Berlin, a painful but necessary reminder from the past.

And we could go on. We could talk about professional entertainers—and I use the word “professional” loosely—who have been accused. And the list is Bill Cosby, Harvey Weinstein, and on down. You go right down that list. Do we demand any and all of their works, their mentions, their movies, their shows be blotted out from memory?

We could talk about professional athletes—and again, I use the word “professional” loosely—who have been accused of sexual assault, beating their wives up, their girlfriends up, caught with drugs, performance-enhancing drugs, gambling, cheating. Do we blot them out from all memory and all mentions? No.

Madam Speaker, even churches—the Catholic Church, the Baptist Church, the Methodists, other churches, other denominations—scandals, military sex scandals, the sex scandals, every occupation, every race, color, creed, and religion, none is perfect. Where does it end?

Should we pull down and attempt to erase all mentions of countries like Japan, Germany, France, Spain, Italy, China? The list is endless.

Madam Speaker, George Floyd had a criminal record, but he did not deserve execution at the hands of an errant police officer. And then again, those whose lives and/or their livelihoods are being destroyed by vandals, looters, and rioters don’t deserve to have their families and their livelihoods and their lives ruined either.

It is time for the violence to stop. Peaceful protests, yes; violence, no. The Governors and the President should send in troops when requested and needed. I stand with the President in that.

Those criminals and lawbreakers deserve to be dealt with in a manner consistent with their behavior and the law. They are pulling down statues that were paid for with tax dollars, erected with the consent of the governed, no matter what community or timeframe. Those thugs simply think they can tear them down.

Do we acknowledge there are those who have an improper mindset? Of course. Those are thugs tearing things down. Of course we do.

Do we also acknowledge that Black lives matter? You bet we do. I cannot even begin to understand the fear of parents and their children who live in that fear that some day they may suffer that same fate.

But let’s have that conversation within the framework of a civilized people who earnestly desire what President Lincoln called “a more perfect Union.”

Violence, property destruction, vandalism, governmentalloping, and, yes, killing others is hardly what I think we would want or call a more perfect Union, Madam Speaker.

So how about a new reset? Looking backwards will only leave us hating everyone and everything. Statues and symbols of our great country should remind us how far we have come, but, more importantly, how far we have yet to go.

We should be taking pride in how far we have come. Actually, let us hope in the promises of where we can go, while being saddened as to some of the things that have had to happen to get us to this point.

Madam Speaker, how about a reset? □ 1745

George Orwell once said:
The most effective way to destroy people is to deny and obliterate their own understanding of their history.

Madam Speaker, as we reassess our shared experience, let us learn from the past in order to make a better, brighter future. America's history is imperfect. But projecting contemporary norms through violence while rejecting the experiences of our past does a disservice to the sacrifices of the great men and women like President Lincoln, who fought for equality for all.

We must not erase our history. We must learn from it. This is one of the promises and the highest callings of America the beautiful.

Mr. BIGGS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments, particularly relating to history. I am reminded, as I was pondering that, that each of us has a history. Each of us has a personal history that is not perfect. Sometimes, we have flaws that seem almost insurmountable in our own lives. But if we deny our history,
then we deny who we are and who we can become.

When I hear folks out there attacking our history and saying, let’s bring down this statue or let’s do this or let’s do that, some of it is so acontextual. By that, I mean it is as if there was no history. And I think that, if we’re ever standing in the world can we be so narcissistic that we don’t accept the flaws of our own past and build upon the promise of the future?

We have problems, for sure, but it does not inure to lawlessness, rioting, murder, and mayhem. It should, instead, inure to the better angels within us.

Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. Biggs) for leading this tonight and appreciate my colleague from Arizona (Mr. Lamalfa).

I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. Biggs).

By that, I mean it is as if there was no discussion, the mayhem, the destruction, the vandalism. It should, in fact, be interpreted in 2020 as something that is hateful. That same statue was paid for by emancipated slaves back then who were inspired by what Mr. Lincoln had done.

They even have a fence around Mary McLeod Bethune right next-door because they are afraid that might get vandalized because there is indiscriminate vandalism happening to any statue, to any memorial, to any monument just because it is a mayhem out there. That same statue was paid for by emancipated slaves back then who were inspired by what Mr. Lincoln had done.

Even something so simple or silly as a garage door. In no way does it meet the signal needs to be sent that We have a little bit of immunity because a cop doesn’t know what he is walking into. They are out there every day trying to find the balance between how to defend the public, how to defend their own life when they knock on a door or walk up to a car—they don’t know what is going on inside there—and also being a good ambassador for somebody who they just need to talk to.

How are we going to come out of this? How are we going to have a good conversation about how we can improve things with law enforcement for the impound law enforcement for what they are doing? They are out there every day trying to find the balance between how to defend the public, how to defend their own life when they knock on a door or walk up to a car—they don’t know what is going on inside there. Well, certainly, the right thing needs to be said, that we are not going to tolerate the violence, the mayhem, the destruction, the vandalism. Severe penalties need to be coming down upon those who we already have on camera or other ways to identify in anything going forward.

I just came from Lincoln Park about 10 blocks east of here, and they have to put fencing and have guards out there for the statue of Abraham Lincoln, who is shown there putting a hand up for a slave depicted in that statue, an emancipated slave. He is still wearing the chains. He is looking up at Mr. Lincoln, who is lifting him and going to take him to a better place.

Yet, that was misinterpreted in 2020 as something that is hateful. That statue was paid for by emancipated slaves back then who were inspired by what Mr. Lincoln had done.

We don’t get a lot of talk about that. What is that going to do for morale when frauds like this go on. Yet, we have this legislation that is going to be, basically, sue a cop. That is not going to help anything.

What are we supposed to do? Stand and watch what is going on here? No. We are not going to watch this any longer. We are not going to go along with it. Severe penalties need to be had for these people inflicting this mayhem upon their own Nation, upon their own neighbors, upon neighborhoods. It needs to be harsh.

When we can get the violence stopped, maybe we can get back to the table and have a real conversation about how we are going to improve the situations with race.

It grieves me that young Black males feel like they are going to be victimized by the term “driving while Black.” That is an awful feeling for them and for us. I think, to see that happen.

Our great colleague over on the other side, Senator Tim Scott, when he brought forth a bill he has been working on very hard for a long time, looking for bipartisan efforts, his JUSTICE Act, and then someone tells him it is a token effort. What the heck does that mean? That really struck him deeply, that people would say that about that and not even give him the opportunity to have that bill developed further in the Senate. What a shameful moment that was.

Yet, now we have legislation here that is trying to eviscerate the ability of cops to operate how they need to, to have a little bit of immunity because a cop doesn’t know what he is walking into or what she is walking into. They don’t have the latitude, nor the latitude we saw in Minneapolis, but one to simply operate.

Doctors need latitude in order to work on patients and not be sued to death. Yet, we have this legislation that is going to be, basically, sue a cop. That is not going to help anything.

What is that going to do for morale for keeping cops on the force, for recruiting new ones? Do we want this mayhem we keep seeing happening right here in D.C., Minneapolis, L.A., any other large cities, and we don’t have some kind of law enforcement there?

Social workers do have their place in certain situations, and they can be
helpful. But we don’t take money away. We don’t defund the cops who are already shorthanded in rural areas like mine, sheriffs, police, in order to try and change the whole game.

We have a lot of listening to do to each side. Not everybody with light-colored skin is a racist, and I think a lot of people around this country are really feeling, after the unity we had, after the George Floyd ugly incident in Minneapolis, this is a time to get together and listen to each other.

If this is allowed to continue to happen, it is going to make it awful hard for people to listen to each other because they are feeling under fire themselves for something they never did, never stood for. Instead, they have always stood for the greatness of that flag right up there. In God we trust. I appreciate the time.

Mr. BIGGS. Madam Speaker, I thank you for yielding.

Mr. POSEY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. TRUHILL) for her passionate and heartfelt words.

It is my pleasure now to yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. POSEY).

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

"With America back." Those were just a few of the lyrics of a song written by a group named The Steeles in 1996. Some of the lyrics said: "Something is wrong with America. This Nation is like a runaway train. Headed down the wrong track...And it concludes, in part, with: I love America. But I do not love what she has become.

Circumstances seemed pretty despairing back then, but they pale in comparison to what we are seeing going on across our country today, perpetrated by Marxists, anarchists, and those malcontents who are funding them.

Today, the malcontents are using George Floyd’s death to neuter the ability to enforce the law. So far, they have been successful in getting the police out of the way.

Without law enforcement, their mobs are free to move in, smash businesses, injure people, and cause chaos. Those aren’t peaceful protesters, and they are not peaceful protests.

Their outcry for justice makes sympathetic, or perhaps even cowardly, corporations and stupid movie stars send money to them. Now they are tearing down the statues, pillaging the public and politicians into accepting their unfetched demands, and giving them even more power.

Circumstances are advantageous for them right now because we are in the midst of a pandemic so they have a free rein of the streets. Who could have ever imagined sanctuaries cities where America’s rule of law is ruelfully ignored by government officials?

Who could have ever imagined some elected officials would allow domestic terrorists or wannabe revolutionaries to commandeer a complete takeover and rule of both public and private property and have dominion over other unwilling citizens of the United States in so-called autonomous zones.

Give me a break.

Then, the lawbreakers have the audacity to say they defunded or reimagined, whatever the heck that means. It sounds insane. It is really a campaign to drive our duly-elected President Donald Trump from office. Anyone who stands in their way they will destroy.

We can expect it to get worse and worse until November 3, when they hope to put an end to the prosperity created by the President. You have to suffer from the world’s worst case of Potomac fever, or belated brain drain, to think they are fooling anybody.

Meanwhile, the leadership and majority in this Chamber have been silent. I have not heard a single word, syllable, or letter uttered by them in opposition to the miscreants. It is past time for them to condemn their activities, and it is time for law enforcement across this Nation to enforce it. In every State, in every county, in every city, in every town, everywhere, community, and the rural areas in-between to put an end to this lawlessness.

If you don’t start acting soon, there wouldn’t be anything left to tear down. I would like to take a bunch of these wannabe revolutionaries to South or Central America for a few days to see how their game would end if they were successful in having it their way.

\[1800\]

If you have ever traveled throughout those socialist countries there, it is a very eye-opening experience. The State Department, and even their own officials, warn you, don’t wear any jewelry, don’t carry much cash, because there is a good chance you are going to get robbed. And if you are approached by a robber, hand over everything. Hold back nothing, because they would just as soon shoot you and kill you as not. Shoot you and kill you.

There is a lot of lawlessness, and they don’t fear justice. They don’t fear the police. They are going to take, and you are going to give, or you are going to die. And you know what the State Department and the local officials tell you next? If you get robbed, don’t call the police. It is not like in our country where, if there is a problem, you call the police. There, they tell you not to call the police because they are all corrupt and they don’t take anything the robbers missed.

One common denominator of the countries that I visited, which was Brazil, French Guiana, Suriname, and Trinidad, was a common denominator that every single house that I saw, large or small, urban or suburban, no matter how far out you went into the country, every single house that was more than a cardboard box had bars on every window and most of the doors. Why? Because that is what lawlessness brings.

They truly go to bed every night in those socialist countries with the expectation that if they did not have bars, they wouldn’t wake up in the morning; or if they did, every possession that they had that was worth anything would be gone.

Very little police, high crime, high unemployment, bars on all the windows. Is that what we really want for our future?

We have been blessed to live in the land of opportunity, the most free and prosperous nation in the history of the world. Many, many, many people have risked their lives and the lives of their wives, their grandparents, their parents, their children, family members to come here. This place is really that good that people would risk their life just to come here, a chance at coming here. We cannot stand back and let it be destroyed. We want America back.

Mr. BIGGS. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentleman for his thoughts and taking time to share them with us.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. POSEY) for his words.

Mr. POSEY. Madam Speaker, I thank my good colleague from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS) for putting this on. I really do appreciate it because it is so timely.

Growing pains, I think that what we can say we are going through is growing pains again as a nation, a nation birthed over 200 years ago.

And for anybody who watched yesterday’s debate, Madam Speaker, on the House floor, I think it was interesting to see the amount of, I guess, race-baiting that was coming from the other side, from my colleagues, which I found very unreasonable that, for some reason, if you are a Black man, you have to tell your children how to act with the police.

My mom and dad had that talk with me, probably for good reason, too, and they said: If you get pulled over, “Yes, sir.” “No, sir.” and then when you get home we want to know what happened and why you got pulled over. I had to have that talk with my children. So that is nothing new, and I think that we sometimes overplay that.

Does it happen maybe more with minority communities? Yes, I think it does, but nobody is immune to that. When I came into Congress, I got stopped multiple times to see if I had the right credentials. That has happened to me.

Since we have been up here, the divide in this country has gotten so much worse, and it has been since Donald Trump has gotten elected. And people will blame the President for doing this, but we can go back to other Presidents where we have seen this happen. We are Americans. We need to come together as a nation.

I have had the great fortune of being in Congress. This is my last term. I will have served 8 years. I was the chairman of the Asia-Pacific Subcommittee last year, last Congress; I am the ranking member this year. I have been able to travel the world. I have been in the Democratic Republic of the Congo.
Africa is a continent of 1.2 billion, yet today, in the 21st century, 650 million people do not have electricity. I suppose they have a reason to protest. I suppose they have a reason to complain. But do they have the right to protest?

Being on the Asia-Pacific Subcommittee we got to travel to a lot of the Asian countries. We all know what is going on in Hong Kong today. Hong Kong is a province of China. There was an agreement of one country, two systems. Hong Kong was supposed to be a semi- or a self-ruling area with an independent judiciary committee. Yet, 23 years into that agreement, Xi Jinping, the leader of the Communist Party, said that is null and void, and they have put the heavy hand of the Communist Party in there.

These young students are out there holding up that flag behind you, Madam Speaker, holding up that flag for liberty and freedom because they have tasted that is all they have ever known. Yet the Chinese Communist Party wants to take that away because it scares them. Free thought, independent thinking, freedom, they know the Communist Party cannot survive if they are going in there to squash that.

These students are holding those signs up. Our flag is up. They have been in my office here in the Washington Capitol. They have a reason to protest, but they do not have the right. You talk about Venezuela, somebody talked about it. Go down to Cuba and talk against the Castro regime. You don't have the right. Talk about religion in those countries. You do not have the right.

But then I look at this country, and I am as guilty as anybody else in this country. We have the right to protest. The First Amendment, but sometimes I think—and this is where I feel like I am guilty, like a lot of us. I think we try, and it is being flamed by people—a lot of times coming from this side, and this side over here is accusing that side of pandering to our audience.

So what that meant to me when I was with those Ambassadors from Indonesia and Malaysia, what it meant to me was do you know what? America is bigger than the Presidency. It is bigger than the Democratic Party. It is bigger than the Republican Party. It is those ideals that this country stands for that we all need to fight to hold on to.

I want to read something that one of my constituents sent me. It says: 'The lesson taught at this point by human experience is simply this, that the man who will get up will be helped up, and the man who will not get up will be allowed to stay down. . . . Personal independence is a virtue and it is the soul of which comes the sturdiest manhood. But there can be no independence without a large share of self-dependence, and this virtue cannot be bestowed. It must be developed from within.'

I had an African-American man, a conservative Republican who is afraid to tell people he is a conservative Republican because he gets labeled Uncle Tom. You have been put on the plantation. Those are not my words. These are words coming from him.

But that quote came from somebody I wish we could go back and meet, Mr. Frederick Douglass, a person born into slavery who picked himself up by the bootstraps, who educated himself. He stood beside President Lincoln when they dedicated the Emancipation statute.

And I have got these people out here who loathe, despise, disdain this country. They are being blamed by people, and I can't blame just people, the Democrats. There are people out there who just hate this country, but they are using that to tear this country apart instead of remembering the ideals that this country is built on. And those are American ideals—not conservative, not liberal, not Republican or Democrat, American—and I think it is time that we all come together and realize we are Americans and we are one group. Who are they?

Mr. BIGGS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his passionate comments about freedom.

Madam Speaker, those of us who have had the good fortune of studying history, we know that it bums and claws along. We can see progress sometimes, and we also see devolution sometimes. What we are seeing today, though, reminds me of an awful lot of a revolution that took place in the early part of the 20th century. It was not a large revolution; it was a small revolution. It was the Bolshevik Revolution. It was funded by some of the bourgeoisie who did not like the form of government in then-Russia. It was not a massive revolution. It wasn't widespread, but it changed that entire nation's form of government.

I am reminded that it was Trotsky who prevented the military from interfering against the last revolution. What I am seeing here today reminds me an awful lot of that. This is a small revolution that is violent in nature, is anti-American in nature.

And so when my colleagues mention the police and what they need to do, what happens is there has been an emasculation of the police. They don't really want to get involved because, should they get involved, there is a legitimate concern that they will be sued, arrested, et cetera. So when you get rid of the blue line of defense against lawlessness, then you basically destroy the foundation of the protection of your freedoms.

President Trump called certain groups antifa, domestic terrorists. In our debate in the Judiciary Committee, some of my colleagues said antifa is a fiction. So I said: Well, you know, is it a fiction?

So I went to CNN because I knew they were on the fence on FOX. Once I referred to FOX, nobody was going to believe that that was not biased. So I went to CNN because I wanted to find out what they said, and you can go through and find extensive interviews where the conclusion is clear: antifa is a real organization. It is a group. And the group sometimes chooses to resort to violence.

What do you have? They are definitely domestic. They are committing terrorist activity in this country. Thus, they are domestic.

And what would terrorism be? Terrorism is the use of force, intimidation, violence to change or alter behavior for a particular purpose.

So you begin to see you have domestic terrorism going on.

18 U.S. Code, Section 2389A, I call on FBI Director Wray to begin using that statute, make the arrests necessary to restore order. And I call on Attorney General William Barr to use that same section to charge and prosecute these individuals who are attempting to intimidate Americans out of their freedom.

A lot of these Federal monuments and statues that are coming down, these memorials that are being ripped to shreds, destroyed are on Federal property.

And you know what? 18 U.S. Code 1369 is the statute that Director Wray should be having his Federal agency make arrests under. And then I call on Attorney General Barr to have his U.S. attorneys charge and prosecute under 18 U.S. Code 1369 for destruction of veterans' memorials. And we can go forward.

But why do I even bring that up? It is because I believe sincerely that this country is built on the idea that each
of us should have agency, will, choice. It hasn’t always worked out really well or perfectly. There are those who have had their choices and will taken away from them. That is inexcusable, of course.

But if we are going to have will and choice and freedom, then we are part of this great social contract where I delegate my right to defend myself because I can’t do it all the time. There are people who are stronger or more vicious or are more malevolent who want to control us, do something or take something from me.

We delegate police authority to police. It is not carte blanche. It is reasonable.

We have got to restore respect for the law, for the police, for the courts, and for process.

It is imperfect. I worked in that system for a lot of years on both sides, prosecuting and defending. It is not a perfect process.

The reality is, though, it is as Winston Churchill said, Democracy is the worst form of government except for all those others.

It is the best humankind has come up with.

To destroy our history seems so anti-theoretical to making progress, eradicating our history, erasing it.

College professors are now saying we have got to go through and remove books from the library.

Remove them from the library, because they have unpopular ideas in them. They may be unpopular ideas, but you know what is better than taking them out and burning them or removing them and throwing them ala Adolf Hitler and the Nazis? It is letting us read them, discuss them, and point out their flaws, and rehabilitate us, our hearts.

Artwork being removed from museums, being removed from this House. Why? Because some were not 2020 politically correct. What they did was, to some, unconscionable and abominable. Let’s have the discussion.

Removing your history allows you to repeat the mistakes of your history. I simply don’t understand it.

We have now moved beyond a motivational or some kind of philosophical attempt to remove historical items. Now we are seeing indiscriminate action.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD a series of articles.

A greater percentage of U.S. registered voters believe Confederate statues, which have been targeted by protestors in recent weeks, should remain standing despite activists’ demands to remove them, a Morning Consult poll released this week revealed.

The survey, taken June 6-7, showed that a greater number of Americans believe Confederate statues should remain standing, 44 percent, as opposed to the 32 percent who say they should be removed. Twenty-three percent expressed no opinion on the matter.

There was a slight shift in opinion over the last three years. In August 2017, 52 percent of voters indicated that the statues should be left alone, with just over a quarter, 26 percent, indicating otherwise.

However, Morning Consult reported that the purported increase in support over the years is largely driven by Democrats.

The rise in support for removing the statues was driven by Democrats, a majority of whom now take that position, and independents, who still say the statues should remain standing by a 10-point margin. Eleven percent of GOP voters say the statues should be removed, virtually unchanged since 2017. The vast majority of Republicans, 71 percent, believe the Confederate statues should remain standing, whereas the majority of Democrats said previously they should be taken down. Forty percent of independents believe they should remain standing, with 30 percent vying for their removal and 30 percent expressing no opinion.

The survey was taken among roughly 1,900 voters, with a margin of error of +/- 2 percent.

The survey comes as protestors vandalize and, in some cases, tear down Confederate statues and others they deem offensive, including statues of Christopher Columbus.

House Speaker Nancy Pelosi has also embraced the calls for change, requesting in a letter on Wednesday the removal of Confederate statues occupying the U.S. Capitol, or showing them, “monuments to men who advocated cruelty and barbarism to achieve such a plainly racist end.”

“Monuments to men who advocated cruelty and barbarism to achieve such a plainly racist end are a grotesque affront to these ideals,” she said in a letter to Committee Chair Roy Blunt (R-MO) and Vice Chair Zoe Lofgren (D-CA). “Their statues pay homage to hate, not heritage. They must be removed.”

Interestingly, Pelosi has remained silent on her own family’s role in a dedication ceremony of a Confederate statue in Baltimore’s Wyman Park in 1948.

As Breitbart News detailed:

However, her father, Thomas D’Alesandro Jr., oversaw the dedication of such a statue in Baltimore’s Wyman Park—the Stonehew Jackson and Robert E. Lee Monument—as mayor of the city in 1948. At the time, the Speaker’s father said people could look to Jackson’s and Lee’s lives as inspiration and Jackson and Lee’s sacrifice to save America from Jackson’s own example and stand like a stone wall against aggression in any form that would seek to destroy the liberty of the world.”

World Wars I and II found the North and South fighting for a common cause, and the generalship and military science displayed by these two great men in the War between the States and who were applied in the military plans of our nation in Europe and the Pacific areas,“ D’Alesandro said at the dedication ceremony, as detailed by the Baltimore Sun.

Today with our nation beset by subversive groups and propaganda which seeks to destroy our national unity, we can look for inspiration to the dedication of Lee and Jackson to remind us to be resolute and determined in preserving our sacred institutions ... remain steadfast in our determination to preserve freedom, not only for ourselves, but for other liberty-loving nations who are striving to preserve their national unity as free nations.

Pelosi’s office did not return Breitbart News’s request for comment.

[From Fox News, Aug. 21, 2018]

WHICH CONFEDERATE STATUES WERE REMOVED? A RUNNING LIST

(By Christopher Carbone)

More than 30 cities across the United States have removed or relocated Confederate statues and monuments amid an intense nationwide debate about race and history.

After a “Unite the Right” rally in Virginia in August to protest against the removal of a statue of Robert E. Lee resulted in the death of a woman who was demonstrating against white supremacists, authorities in the state have decided to remove Confederate statues.

Many of the controversial monuments were dedicated in the early twentieth century or during the height of the Civil Rights Movement. Discussions are under way about the removal of monuments in Houston, Atlanta, Nashville, Pensacola, Florida, Jackson, South Carolina, Florida, Richmond, Alabama, and Charlottesville, Virginia.

Here is a running list of all the monuments and statues that have been removed and the cities that have taken them down:

ANNAPOLIS, MD.

Under cover of darkness, city workers removed a statue in August 2017 of former Supreme Court Justice Roger Taney that had been on the State House’s front lawn for 145 years. Taney authored the Supreme Court’s 1857 Dred Scott decision, which held that African-Americans could not be U.S. citizens. The city’s Republican mayor said through a spokesman that it was removed “as a matter of public safety.”

AUSTIN, TEXAS

The statues of four people with ties to the Confederacy—Robert E. Lee, Albert Sidney Johnston, John H. Reagan and former Texas Gov. James Stephen Hogg—were removed from pedestals on the University of Texas campus on Aug. 17, 2017. UT’s president said in a written statement the deadly clashes in Charlottesville made it clear “Confederate monuments have become symbols of modern white supremacy and neo-Nazism.”

Separately in 2008 the Confederate President Jefferson Davis that was removed from UT’s campus in 2015 has now returned to the campus, at the Briscoe Center for American History.

The Austin school board voted to strip Confederate names from five district schools, though they haven’t been renamed yet. The board had previously renamed Robert E. Lee Elementary School in 2016.

The Austin City Council approved renaming Robert E. Lee Road and Jeff Davis Avenue.

BALTIMORE, MD.

Baltimore Mayor Catherine Pugh told reporters she wanted to move “quickly and quietly” to take down Confederate statues or monuments—statues or monuments—statues of Lee and Thomas, J. “Stonewall” Jackson and monuments for Confederate Soldiers and Sailors and Confederate Women—from the city’s public spaces. Although the plan had been in the works since June 2017, the Baltimore City Council approved the plan only two days after the deadly events in Charlottesville.

On March 10, 2018, the space where the Confederate statues had stood was rededicated to abolitionist and civil rights pioneer Harriet Tubman.

BRADENTON, FLA.

Mantee County removed a Confederate soldier memorial obelisk on Aug. 24 after the city commission voted to take it down and place it in storage. The monument, which had stood there for more than 90 years, was accidentally broken into two pieces during city workers tried to remove it. The removal came after days of protests from residents and activists, most of whom were in favor of taking it down, and it cost $12,700 to remove.

BROOKLYN, N.Y.

Plaques honoring Lee were removed from an episopal church’s property on Aug. 16.
A bronze statue of Robert E. Lee, formally called the Robert Edward Lee Sculpture, was removed in mid-September 2017 from Robert E. Lee Park, which was also named in honor of the Confederate general. The Dallas City Council voted 13–1 to remove the statue, which has stood in Lee Park for 81 years.

The park was dedicated to Lee by President Franklin Delano Roosevelt in 1938 during a renaming ceremony of the park.

**DALLAS, TEXAS**

Three Confederate monuments were removed from a city park Friday morning. A city spokesperson said the plaques were going to be cleaned up and taken to a nearby museum. The decision to remove them did not require public input, the spokesperson told FOX35, because they were donated and not purchased with taxpayer funds.

**CHAPEL HILL, N.C.**

Protesters toppled the “Silent Sam” statue that has stood on the University of North Carolina’s Chapel Hill campus since 1913 on Aug. 20. More than 2,000 people had gathered and were chanting “hey, hey, ho, ho, this racist statue has got to go.” In a statement, UNC Chancellor Carol Folt called the act “unlawful and dangerous,” adding that law enforcement were investigating the incident. The statue had been a source of controversy, with school officials claiming that state law prevented them from removing it.

**DURHAM, N.C.**

A nearly-century old statue of a Confederate soldier was toppled not long after Charlottesville by protesters associated with the Workers World party. North Carolina Central University student Takiyah Thompson, along with three others, were arrested and charged with felonies in the days following the statue lay crumpled on the ground, protesters could be seen kicking it on social media. A Worthington assistant city manager said the community seeks to be one that “promotes tolerance, respect and inclusion.”

A statue of Lee was removed from the entrance to Duke University Chapel on Aug. 19, 2017 and is set to be preserved in some way to study the university’s “complex past.”

“I took this course of action to protect Duke Chapel, to ensure the vital safety of students and community members who worship there, and above all to express the deep and abiding values of our university,” university President Vincent Price wrote in statement to the school.

**FRANKLIN, OHIO**

A monument to Lee was removed in August 2017 by Franklin workers. Gainesville, Fla.

A chapter of the United Daughters of the Confederacy paid for the removal of a monument to Confederate soldiers known locally as “Old Joe” that stood in front a building in downtown Franklin for 113 years. It was moved to a private cemetery outside the city in August 2017.

**HELINA, MONT.**

The state’s capital city on Aug. 18, 2017 removed a Confederate monument that had been in a public park since 1916. The granite fountain, which was dismantled, had been donated by the United Daughters of the Confederacy. City Parks and Recreation Director Amy Teegarden told the Spokesman-Review that the fountain initially will be stored in a city warehouse but it could be reassembled at a future date.

**KANSAS CITY, MO.**

A Confederate monument was boxed up in summer 2017 and is slated to be removed. The city council had previously requested that the American Historical Society for Great Americans ask Kansas City Parks and Recreation to find a new home for it.

**LEXINGTON, KY.**

Two 130-year-old Confederate statues were removed from downtown Lexington on Oct. 18 after the state’s attorney general issued an opinion giving the city permission to take them down and move them to a private cemetery. Lexington used private funds to take the statues, of Confederate General John Hunt Morgan and John Breckinridge, a long time Virginia senator. The statues had been, in the words of the city spokesperson, “offensive to the community.” New leaders said “OK, we’ll take the plaques down,” ’’ said Ron Nirenberg following the council vote. "San Diegans stand together against Confederate symbols of division.”

**LOUISIANA, CALIF.**

A large stone monument commemorating Confederate veterans was taken down Aug. 16 from the Hollywood Forever Cemetery after hundreds of people demanded its removal. The statue, which was loaded into a pickup truck and taken to a storage facility, was given away.

**LOUISVILLE, KY.**

A statue of a Confederate soldier was removed from the University of Louisville campus after a legal battle between the city residents, the mayor and the Sons of Confederate Veterans. It was relocated to Brandenburg, Kentucky, which hosts Civil War Reenactments.

**MADISON, WIS.**

A plaque honoring Confederate soldiers were removed Aug. 17 from a cemetery not long after residents began calling for it to be taken down. “The Civil War was an act of insurrection and treason and a defense of the deplorable practice of slavery,” said Paul S. Gilson in a statement. “The monuments in question were connected to that action and we do not need them on city property.”

**MEMPHIS, TENN.**

Crews removed two Confederate statues from Memphis parks on Dec. 20 after the city sold them to a private entity. The City Council voted unanimously earlier in the day to sell both Health Sciences and fourth Bluff Parks where the Confederate statues, of Confederate General Nathan Bedford Forrest and Confederate President Jefferson Davis, were located.

**NASHVILLE, TENN.**

The Legendary Ryman Auditorium, where stars like Dolly Parton, Patsy Cline and Loretta Lynn made their Grand Ole Opry debuts, quietly moved a sign on Sept 21 hanging the venue’s upper level that read “1897 Confederate Gallery.” Honoring an 1897 reunion of Confederate veterans at the Ryman, the sign was removed over the years but has now been permanently removed from the main auditorium and added to a museum exhibit that explains the history of the 125-year-old music hall. A plaque that mentioned the AEM church massacre to a historic site commemorating a nearby Civil War battle.

**NEW ORLEANS, LA.**

New Orleans city workers removed four monuments in April dedicated to the Confederacy and opponents of Reconstruction. The city council had previously requested the monuments a public nuisance. The monuments removed were of Confederate General P.G.T. Beauregard, Davis and Lee. Also removed was the Liberty Place Monument, which commemorated a Reconstruction Era white supremacist attack on the city’s integrated police force. The mayor pledged to replace it with a statue of “New Orleans’” first African American police officer.

**NEW YORK, N.Y.**

Busts of Lee and Jackson were removed overnight on Aug. 17 from the Hall of Fame at the New York Military Academy at West Point. The school’s president, Bro x Borough president Ruben Siaz Jr. said “there is nothing great about two men who committed treason against the United States to fight to keep the institution of slavery intact.”

**ORLANDO, FLA.**

A Confederate statue known as “Johnny Reb” was moved in June 2017 by officials from Lake Eola Park to Greenwood Cemetery in response to public outcry about it being symbolic of hate and white supremacy. A spokesperson for Orlando’s mayor told Fox News that city officials with historians on a new inscription to put the monument “in proper historical perspec-

**RICHMOND, VA.**

The Richmond school board voted 6-1 on June 18, 2018 to rename J.E.B. Stuart Elementary School to Barack Obama Elementary School. The process began several months prior and involved input from students, teachers, administrators and local stakeholders. Virginia is home to the largest number of Confederate monuments and symbols in the country.

**ROCKVILLE, MD.**

A 13-ton bronze Confederate statue that had stood for decades next to Rockville’s Red Brick Courthouse was relocated in July next to a privately run Potomac River ferry terminal. The relocation cost about $100,000, according to the Washington Post.

**SAN BERNARDINO, CALIF.**

A plaque honoring Davis was quietly removed Aug. 16, 2017 from a downtown park. “This morning I ordered the immediate removal of a plaque honoring the Confederacy at Horton Plaza Park,” Mayor Kevin Faulconer told the San Diego Union-Tribune. “San Diegans stand together against Confederate symbols of division.”

**SAN ANTONIO, TEXAS**

A Confederate statue was removed from Travis Park overnight on Aug. 16, 2017 after the City Council voted 10-1 in favor of taking it down the previous day. There were no protesters during or after the removal, according to local media reports. “This is, without context, a monument that glorifies the causes of the Confederacy, and that’s not something that a modern city needs to have in a public square,” said San Antonio Mayor Ron Nirenberg following the council vote.

**SAN ANTONIO, TEXAS**

A Jefferson Davis highway marker was removed in 2016. **ST. LOUIS, MO.**

The Missouri Civil War Museum oversaw the removal in late June 2017 of a 32-foot granite and bronze monument from Forest Park, where it had stood for 108 years. It shouldered the costs of removal and will hold the monument in storage until a new home can be found for it. The agreement stipulates the monument can be re-displayed at a Civil War museum, battlefield or cemetery. In Boone County, a rock with a plaque honoring Confederate soldiers that had been removed from the University of Missouri campus was returned in November 2018 after a second time the monument was stolen, and a defense of the deplorable practice of treason against the United States to fight to keep the institution of slavery intact.”

The monument can be re-displayed at a Civil War museum, battlefield or cemetery.
ST. PETERSBURG, FLA.

St. Petersburg Mayor Rick Kriseman ordered city workers to remove a bronze Confederate marker at noon on Aug. 15, 2017 after determining that it was on city property. The statue, held in storage until a new home can be found for it. "The plaque recognizing a highway named after Stonewall Jackson has been removed and we will attempt to acquire," Kriseman said in a statement to the Tampa Bay Times.

WASHINGTON, D.C.

The stewards of the National Mall announced this week that the exhibit alongside the Thomas Jefferson Memorial will be updated to showcase his status as both one of the country's founders and a slaveholder. "We can reflect the momentous contributions of someone like Thomas Jefferson, but also consider carefully the complexity of who he was," an official with the Trust told the Washington Examiner. "And that's not reflected right now in the exhibits."

New Jersey Sen. Cory Booker introduced a bill in Sept. 2017 to remove Confederate statues from the U.S. Capitol Building. The special counsel voted that same month to take down two stained-glass windows of Confederate generals. The removal could take a few days and workers seen putting up scaffolding around the windows to start the process.

Florida Gov. Rick Scott, a Republican, signed a bill to replace a statue of a Confederate statesman at U.S. Capitol with one of Mary McLeod Bethune, a black woman who founded a school that became Bethune-Cookman University in Daytona Beach. The statue will become the first black female to be honored in Statuary Hall.

WASHINGTON, OHIO

Worthington removed a historic marker Aug. 18 outside the former home of a Confederate general.

[From the Huffington Post, Aug. 23, 2017]
POLL FIND LITTLE SUPPORT FOR CONFEDERATE STATUE REMOVAL—BUT HOW YOU ASK MATTERS

(By Ariel Edwards-Levy)

Americans are generally unsupportive of attempts to remove Confederate memorials, new polling shows—although the way the question is framed may make a significant difference.

In a YouGov poll, a third of Americans favor removing statues and memorials of Confederate leaders, new polling shows—although the way the question is framed may make a significant difference.

Some viewed the Confederate flag as a symbol of Southern pride (36 percent) or racism (35 percent), with the rest unsure or saying it represents neither. But even if Americans don’t recognize the flag as a symbol of racism, there’s also little widespread enthusiasm for its use. Just 34 percent of Americans say they approve of displaying the Confederate flag in public, while 47 percent disapprove.

Opinions on the Confederate memorials are divided along racial lines, but to an even greater degree along political ones. Black Americans are 18 percentage points likelier than white Americans to favor removing statues of Confederate leaders—but the gap between Republicans and Democrats on the question is 46 points. And the difference between Hillary Clinton voters and those who supported President Donald Trump in last year’s election was 58 points.

Within the Democratic Party, white and black people are about equally likely to favor removing the statues: 64 percent and 63 percent, respectively, say they’d like to see them taken down. There are differences, however, by ideology among the party’s members: 77 percent of self-described liberal Democrats, but just 40 percent of self-described moderates or conservatives—want to see the statues removed.

Most other changes proposed in the past few weeks find at best modest support for removing Confederate memorials, although two distinctively-worded questions stand out in these results.

The strongest support for keeping memorials in place came in the poll conducted by Marist for NPR and PBS NewsHour, which gave respondents two options: letting statues “remain as a historical symbol” and removing them “because they are offensive to some people.” (Arguably, the question might have been better balanced had the first option been written as “because some people view them as a historical symbol.”

The only poll to find majority support for removing some monuments, conducted by the Democratic firm Public Policy Polling, adopted a framework far more sympathetic to those arguing against their “relocation” rather than their “removal.”

PPP found voters split—39 percent to 31 percent—on whether to support or oppose monuments honoring the Confederacy. But those voters were largely willing to relocate Confederate monuments if the issue was instead presented as an effort to move them “to museums or other historic sites where they can be viewed in proper historical context.” Unlike other questions, PPP also asked specifically about monuments on government property, rather than a broader question about public spaces.

Opinions surrounding Confederate symbols have also proven to be fairly mutable in response to current events. After a white supremacist killed nine members of a black church in Charleston, South Carolina, two years ago, support for the Confederate flag dropped quickly and significantly.

That doesn’t appear to have happened yet following the violence earlier this month in Charlottesville, Virginia, sparked by a white nationalist rally opposing efforts to remove a statue of Confederate Gen. Robert E. Lee. But if the issue remains a flashpoint in the election, it might have been better balanced had the messages in place came in the poll conducted by PPP.

Younger Americans are generally unsupportive of attempts to remove Confederate memorials, new polling shows—although the way the question is framed may make a significant difference.

A 2019 poll found . . . that “more than 80 percent of Americans ages 39 and younger could not say what rights the First Amendment protects, and three-quarters of that age group also cannot name any feminist leaders.” A 2019 poll found “just 57 percent of millennials believe the Declaration of Independence ‘better guarantees freedom and equality’ than the Communist Manifesto.” A 2016 Federalist article notes, “40 percent of recent grads were unaware that Congress has the right to declare war and 10 percent think Judge Judy is on the Supreme Court.”

In February, I presented more evidence:

Today, 4 in 10 Americans who are younger than 39 disagree that the United States “has a history we should be proud of,” according to a 2019 poll by FLAG/YouGov. The poll also found that half of all Americans agree the United States is a sexist and racist country, including two-thirds of millennials. Millennials showed the lowest level of agreement with the statement, “I’m proud to be an American.” Thirty-eight percent of younger Americans do not agree that “America has a history that we should be proud of,” according to an annual poll from the Victims of Communism Memorial Foundation found that 37 percent of millennials think the United States is divided among the most unequal societies in the world.

The anti-American group of recent graduates is not a fringe element. It is a substantial and ominously growing group of voting-age adults.

The recent riots have given us many more indications that America’s educational institutions do not merely keep kids ignorant, but actively teach them to hate their country. Just refer to any of the emails and websites of the Memorial Foundation found that 37 percent of millennials think the United States is divided among the most unequal societies in the world.

These messages reveal that the nation’s leadership class has all been re-educated every generation. Nazi Propaganda functions in all the same ways that it did in the past—by spreading false information and less likely to instead increase racism.

This prejudiced ignorance appears to be widespread, and unchecked by local authori- ties. Of the dozen prominent figures are of abolitionists, including the Great Emancipator Abraham Lincoln, as Tristan Justice reported Thursday.

"[In Boston, demonstrators also vandalized a monument to the 54th Massachusetts regiment, the second all-black volunteer regiment at the outbreak of the Civil War.] . . . Add to the growing list of civil rights freedom fighters defaced by social justice protesters a Minnesota memorial to three black men who were lynched in 1920 following false rape accusations from a white woman.

These mob actions are not the result of accidental ignorance, but of cultivated prejudice. One month ago, I collected just a few pieces of evidence pointing in this direction:

A 2019 poll found “just 57 percent of millennials believe the Declaration of Independence ‘better guarantees freedom and equality’ than the Communist Manifesto.” A 2016 Federalist article notes, “40 percent of recent grads were unaware that Congress has the right to declare war and 10 percent think Judge Judy is on the Supreme Court.”
some of them can identify Woodrow Wilson and Franklin Delano Roosevelt as bona fide, deep-eyed racists. Not one of them know one of the first acts of Congress—the Congress that established the first national capital where the Constitution was—and that pre-dates the Constitution—was to pass a massive document outlawing slavery in territory newly acquired from Great Britain during the war.

But they all have heard of Audre Lorde, whose great contribution to society is basically being black and gay. They are all up on movies directed by black women like Ava DuVernay and books by pathos-filled but fact-challenged black writers like Ta-Nehisi Coater. In 2017, some of the preyed upon ultimately turned predator themselves after identifying their ideological enemies of our country.

Seventy years later, God and man are still torn down by protesters from its spot in the pedestal where it had been erected since its construction in 1964.

In the wake of the violence that took place in Charlottesville over the weekend, numerous activists and politicians have called for the destruction of more historical monuments, although a significant majority of Americans (62 percent) think the monuments should stay put. Only 27 percent of Americans think these statues should be removed for fear of offending some people. As usual, public opinion’s not stopping liberals from pursuing an unpopular agenda.

Though by no means comprehensive, here’s a list of the monuments that are facing calls for removal of monuments.

5. STONE MOUNTAIN
Baltimore Mayor Catherine Pugh had Civil War monuments removed from the city in the cover of night, without any public hearings or any public discussion process. Pugh told The New York Times that “One of the U.S. presidents whose visages are carved into the mountainside are problematic by today’s standards.”

8. CONFEDERATE SOLDIERS MONUMENT IN WILMINGTON, NORTH CAROLINA
North Carolina Gov. Roy Cooper has called for the removal of the monument commemorating Civil War officer John B. Castleman from Louisville, Kentucky.

11. ‘OLD JOE’ STATUE IN GAINESVILLE, FLORIDA
In Gainesville, Florida, a statue of a Confederate soldier was removed Monday from outside a county administrative building.

12. STATUES IN LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY
The City Council of Lexington, Kentucky voted unanimously on Tuesday to remove Confederate statues from the lawns in front of the county courthouse.

15. TWO STATUES VANDALIZED IN WILMINGTON, DELAWARE
In Wilmington, Delaware, protestors gathered in favor of removing a statue of Robert E. Lee and Stonewall Jackson to be abandoned because the third president of the United States and author of the Declaration of Independence was a slave owner.

B. Castleman from Louisville, Kentucky.

It’s time for a new, non-racist boycott, diversion—satisfaction—satisfaction for taxpayer-funded education. Liberate public funds from indoctrination into political violence.

The U.S. presidents whose visages are carved into the mountainside are problematic by today’s standards.

The monuments throughout the state of North Carolina.

In a statement released Wednesday afternoon, Virginia Gov. Terry McAuliffe is asking state legislators and city officials to tear down monuments throughout the Old Dominion.

1. JEFFERSON MEMORIAL IN WASHINGTON DC
In a PBS interview, Al Sharpton called for the Jefferson Memorial in Washington DC to be abandoned because the third president of the United States and author of the Declaration of Independence was a slave owner.

2. STATUES IN THE CAPITOL
Rep. Nancy Pelosi (D-Calif.) and Sen. Cory Booker (D-N.J.) have both called for statues commemorating Confederate officers to be removed from the U.S. Capitol.

3. MOUNT RUSHMORE
In response, a white nationalist group is reportedly planning a protest.

4. MONUMENTS IN BALTIMORE
In Baltimore, protestors have called for monument commemorating a Confederate officer.

5. STONE MOUNTAIN
Democratic gubernatorial candidate Stacey Abrams called for a frieze depicting Robert E. Lee and Stonewall Jackson to be abandoned because the third president of the United States and author of the Declaration of Independence was a slave owner.

6. ALBERT PIKE STATUE IN WASHINGTON DC
In Washington DC, a group of protestors gathered on Sunday to call for the removal of the Albert Pike, a Confederate general, to be torn down.

7. CHICAGO PARKS NAMED AFTER WASHINGTON
A Chicago pastor has asked the mayor to remove the names of two former presidents—George Washington and Andrew Jackson—from city parks because both men owned slaves.

8. CONFEDERATE SOLDIERS MONUMENT IN DURHAM, NORTH CAROLINA
The Confederate Soldiers Monument was torn down by protesters from its spot in front of the old Durham County Courthouse on Monday.

Four have been arrested in connection to this instance of vandalism. The Workers Party released a statement charging that it should be their right to tear down the monuments.

9. MONUMENTS THROUGHOUT THE STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA
North Carolina Gov. Roy Cooper has called for the removal of all Confederate monuments in the state and is asking the state legislature to repeal a 2015 law that prevents the destruction of Civil War monuments.

10. MONUMENTS THROUGHOUT THE STATE OF VIRGINIA
In a statement released Wednesday afternoon, Virginia Gov. Terry McAuliffe is asking state legislators and city officials to tear down monuments throughout the Old Dominion.

1. ‘OLD JOE’ STATUE IN GAINESVILLE, FLORIDA
In Gainesville, Florida, a statue of a Confederate soldier was removed Monday from outside a county administrative building.

12. STATUES IN LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY
The City Council of Lexington, Kentucky voted unanimously on Tuesday to remove Confederate statues from the lawns in front of the county courthouse.

15. TWO STATUES VANDALIZED IN WILMINGTON, DELAWARE
In Wilmington, Delaware, protestors gathered in favor of removing a statue of Robert E. Lee and Stonewall Jackson to be abandoned because the third president of the United States and author of the Declaration of Independence was a slave owner.

A white flag was inscribed on the gun of the statue and its head and feet were spray painted.” WECT reports. “Officers were called back to the scene and found a rope around the statue’s neck. Upon examination, officers said they believe it was likely tied to a vehicle in an attempt to pull the statue over.” Another statue was marked with graffiti.

16. A CEMETARY MARKER IN LOS ANGELES
A statue that stood in the Confederate section of Hollywood Forever Cemetery for more than 90 years was toppled on Wednesday.
How can we erase our history? We must face our history squarely and openly and build upon that history to the great promise of the ideals of this Nation if we are going to persist as a Nation.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

JUNE IS LGBTQ PRIDE MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, and still I rise. I am here for a special purpose, and I shall not deviate from the cause that has brought me to this podium tonight, but I do assure you there are things that I shall say to you that should be said at an appropriate time, I will respond to.

Tonight, I rise to call to the attention of this House H. Res. 1014, Encouraging the celebration of the month of June as Pride Month.

Madam Speaker, I want to thank the many original cosponsors of this resolution. There are 60. I would like to thank the Human Rights Campaign for the work that it has done to help us construct this resolution. I would like to thank the Center for Transgender Equality, the Equality Caucus, and Dignity Houston.

I rise tonight because 51 years ago, the Stonewall riots in New York heralded the beginning of the end of a shameful period in our history, because 51 years ago, Madam Speaker, in June 1969, police raided The Stonewall Inn, a gay bar in Greenwich Village, New York, causing a civil uprising and clash between the police and thousands of protesters.

Those historic events catalyzed a generation of activists who birthed a civil rights movement for LGBTQ equality.

I rise tonight because I am an ally of the LGBTQ-plus community.

I rise tonight because I didn't get here by myself. There were people of all stripes who made it possible for me to stand here in the House of Representatives.

I rise tonight because 51 years ago being gay, lesbian, bisexual, or transgender was illegal in most States in this country. Another way of putting it is that it was illegal to be who you were in this country.

Fifty-one years ago, no Federal or State laws existed to secure the rights of lesbian and gay people to live openly in a relationship with their partner.

Fifty-one years ago, no law precluded even the most overt discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation or gender identity.

Fifty-one years ago, our legal system afforded LGBTQ-plus persons no protections under the law to live free from discrimination in employment, in housing, in finance, in education, or in healthcare.

I rise tonight because 51 years ago, there were few openly gay politicians or public figures in this country.

I am honored to say that the Honorable Barney Frank, whom I served with in Congress, has been and continues to be a part of this resolution. Each resolution that I have sponsored has honored the Honorable Barney Frank, a Member of Congress from 1981 to 2013, and recognized him as an honorary cosponsor of this resolution.

I rise because 51 years ago, being openly gay was a finable offense, a crime, in many Federal agencies and a per se bar to obtaining a Federal security clearance.

But today, thanks to the resolution and thanks to the revolution that began this month 51 years ago at Stonewall, I am proud to say that several openly gay persons serve proudly on my congressional staff. I am proud to have them, and I am proud of the work they do.

Today, I am even more proud that as of last Monday, when the Supreme Court decided Bostock v. Clayton County, each member of my staff and all LGBTQ persons in the United States of America now enjoy the same legal protections against employment discrimination as all other persons without regard to sex, sexual orientation, or gender identity.

In that historic 6-3 decision, the Bostock court resoundingly affirmed that the prohibitions of Title VII bar all discrimination in employment on the basis of sex, including sexual orientation or gender identity.

Today, we recall the painful, bloody, and often deadly toll of the 51 formative years between Stonewall and Bostock.

Today, we remember each LGBTQ-plus victim of discrimination, violence, and prejudice in the intervening years—51 years, I might add—who were shut out, subjugated, or even killed.

Today, I am proud that each one of the Black transgender women who have been murdered in this year alone.

And today, with consideration of this Pride resolution, we continue the tradition that I began as an original sponsor of Congress' Pride Month resolution.

I am proud of how far we have come as a Nation in our struggle for full LGBTQ-plus equality. And in this season of Pride, it is fitting to celebrate that remarkable hard-won progress.

But today, I also recognize that, although we have come a long way in 51 years, we still have far to go. Today, we must ensure that full inclusion for LGBTQ-plus persons does not take another 51 years or even 51 weeks. It is now time that we must complete the march toward full legal equality for all persons, without regard to sexual orientation, or gender identity.

Today, I call upon the Senate to take up and pass the Equality Act, H.R. 5, without further delay. I am proud to be the original sponsor of this resolution. I am grateful to all who have become original cosponsors. It is not too late for persons to cosponsor the resolution, and I would beg that persons would do so.

So now, having finished my comments on the Pride Month resolution, I would like to step over to the next microphone.

VALUING ORDER AND LAW INSTEAD OF LAW AND ORDER

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise because now I must say it was most difficult to sit in this House and hear some of the comments made by my colleagues tonight. They seem to value statues above human life. All the vandalism and crimes that have been committed, I don't support that, and I don't think that the protesters who were out there peacefully protesting supported it either.

I don't think you ought to paint all protesters with one brush, just as I don't paint all peace with one brush. I never conclude that all officers are bad, but those who are bad ought to be punished.

I find it quite fascinating that my colleagues who came here and spoke so eloquently tonight, I haven't heard them on the floor in prior times talking about all of the atrocities being committed against people of color at the hands of the constabulary. I just question why is it that they don't come to the floor and stand up for people of color.

I stand up for all people. It doesn't matter your color, your sex, your sexual orientation. I have been on this floor consistently doing this, but I don't see that from the other side.

I see them here for what I call order and law, not law and order, and here is how that works: You have a President who goes before members of the police community, and he says to them: When you arrest a person, you don't have to be nice.

Now, he is talking about a person who is in the care, custody, and control of the police, and that person does not have to be treated so nice.

He sent a message. That message was, you maintain order, do whatever you have got to do, and I will provide the law to support you. That is order and law.

I support law and order. I have an uncle who was a deputy sheriff. He influenced my life. I am probably in Congress today because of words that he spoke to me, so I support policing. I understand the necessity to have persons who are going to assure us that we can be protected.

But what I don't support is a belief that peaceful protesters are all somehow a part of a mob. You can peacefully protest and go to jail. I know; I have been there. I was there with the Honorable John Lewis. We were peace-
is about. If people don't get uncomfortable, then your protest has accomplished very little.

Dr. King was in jail when he wrote the letter from the Birmingham jail. He was peacefully protesting, but he went to jail. It happens. That is a part of the protest movement.

When I went out to protest, knowing that I would likely go to jail, I had somebody to post my bail.

Peaceful protest does not mean that you are not disruptive. It means that you have a message that has to be heard. As Dr. King put it, protests can be the language of the unheard, peaceful protest especially.

So I am here to say to my colleagues, I regret that you cannot see the hurt that is being felt by people of color.

I don't understand why my tax dollars have to support a statue along some thoroughfare of Robert E Lee. You can have it. Take it to a museum. Tuck it away for whatever purposes you like. But you don't have to impose it upon me.

We don't allow—or, more appropriately, Germany does not have statues of Hitler in the public squares. And I refuse to stand by and allow statues of people who needed to keep my ancestors in chains, in slavery, which is a nice way of saying rape, murder, kidnapping, stripping babies from their parents, and sending the parents one way and the children another. It is too nice a word for what happened to my ancestors.

So, I am not going to celebrate them. I have never celebrated them, and it is time to remove them.

I am not going to go out and pull one over and push it off into some corner. But I don't see my colleagues helping with the means by which they can be removed, and you take them and put them wherever you would like to have them. I have no problem with your ownership of them, but don't expect me to celebrate them and have my tax dollars take care of them.

There was one in my congressional district, a Confederate soldier named Dowling. It has been removed, and I am proud to know that was removed.

So I rise now, as I close, to say just simply this: I love my country. I love my country. I love it because of many of the good things that have happened to me. But I also love it in spite of many of the things that were not appropriate that have occurred. And I will continue to love my country.

But I refuse to accept symbols of racism and hate. I will never honor them, and I would badly have my colleagues take them to some other place out of the public square.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

ADJOURNMENT

THE SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 4(b) of House Resolution 967, the House stands adjourned until 9 a.m. on Monday, June 29, 2020, for morning-hour debate, and 10 a.m. for legislative business.

Thereupon (at 6 o'clock and 38 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, June 29, 2020, at 9 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

4586. A letter from the OSD Federal Register Liaison Officer, Office of the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — City Employees' Retirement System of the City of Chicago; Final Rule (Docket No. 19-1898; RIN: 0596-AC26) received June 11, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Armed Services.

4587. A letter from the OSD Federal Register Liaison Officer, Office of the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — DoD Guidance Documents (Docket ID: DoD-2020-OS-0019; RIN: 0709-2A11) received June 11, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Armed Services.

4588. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's interim final rule — Eligibility of Students at Institutions of Higher Education for Funds Under the Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security (CARES) Act, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

4589. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Oxathiapiprolin; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2019-0228; FRL-10009-93] received June 11, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4590. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Indaziflam; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2020-0045; FRL-10008-92] received June 11, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4591. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Bacillus thuringiensis Cry14Ab-1 Protein in Soybean; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2019-0079; FRL-10008-72] received June 11, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4592. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval of Air Quality Implementation Plans; New Jersey; Gasoline Vapor Recovery Requirements [EPA-R02-OAR-2020-0602-Region 2] received June 11, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4593. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval of Air Quality Implementation Plans; California; Ventura County; 8-Hour Ozone Nonattainment Area Reporting Plans [EPA-HQ-OPP-2019-07-Region 9] received June 11, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4594. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promotion of State Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants; Virginia; Emission Standards for Municipal Solid Waste Incineration Units [EPA-R03-OAR-2019-0537; FRL-10004-07-Region 3] received June 11, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4595. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promotion of Air Quality Implementation Plans; State of Utah; Revisions to the Utah Division of Air Quality's Final Rule [EPA-HQ-OPP-2019-0688; FRL-10010-35-Region 8] received June 11, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4596. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promotion of Air Quality Implementation Plans; North Dakota; Revisions to the Utah Division of Air Quality's Final Rule [EPA-R08-OAR-2019-0689; FRL-10009-54-Region 3] received June 11, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4597. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promotion of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Maryland; Infrastructure Requirements for the 2018 Sulfur Dioxide National Ambient Air Quality Standard [EPA-R03-OAR-2018-0042; FRL-10009-54-Region 3] received June 11, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4598. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promotion of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Montana; Approvals and Promulgations; Mitsubishi; Columbia Falls, Kalispell and Libby PGM Naitonaintment Area Limited Maintenance Plan and Redesignation Request [EPA-R08-OAR-2019-0690; FRL-10010-18-Region 8] received June 11, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4599. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Quality State Implementation Plans; Approvals and Promulgations; Montanta; Columbia Falls, Kalispell and Libby PGM Naitonaintment Area Limited Maintenance Plan and Redesignation Request [EPA-R08-OAR-2019-0690; FRL-10009-54-Region 3] received June 11, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4600. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promotion of State Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants; Virginia; Emission Standards for Municipal Solid Waste Incineration Units [EPA-R03-OAR-2019-0537; FRL-10004-07-Region 3] received June 11, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.
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REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Ms. ADAMS (for herself, Ms. JOHN-

By Mr. BANKS (for himself, Mr. ROY,

By Mr. BROWN of Maryland (for him-

By Mr. BROWN of Maryland (for him-

By Ms. BROWN of Illinois, Mr. HUNTW-

By Mr. BROWN of Maryland (for him-

By Mr. BROWN of Maryland (for him-

By Ms. BROWNLEY of California:

By Mr. CHABOT:

By Mr. CONNOLLY:

By Mr. CONNOLLY:

By Ms. CONSTAFF (for herself, Mr.

By Ms. COURIER (for herself, Mr. RUS-
CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements, are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Ms. ADAMS: H.R. 7380.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution, specifically clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress).

By Mr. BROWN of Maryland: H.R. 7382.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Necessary and Proper Clause: “To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.”

By Ms. BROWNLEY of California: H.R. 7383.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution.

By Mr. CHABOT: H.R. 7384.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution of the United States, that Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution of the United States to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

By Mr. CONNOLLY: H.R. 7385.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. FINKENAUER: H.R. 7386.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. MURCARSEL-POWELL: H.R. 7387.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8 of the US Constitution.

By Mr. PETerson: H.R. 7388.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8.

By Ms. PRESSLEY: H.R. 7389.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1, and Clause 18.

By Miss RICE of New York: H.R. 7390.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

H.R. 7391.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution of the United States of America.

By Ms. SLOTKIN: H.R. 7392.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Necessary and Proper Clause: “To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.”

By Ms. SPANBERGER: H.R. 7393.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California: H.R. 7394.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1

By Mr. VAN DREW: H.R. 7395.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
U.S. Constitution, Article 1, Section 8, cl. 2 “To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes;”

By Mr. WALKER: H.R. 7396.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 1, Clause 1, Article 1, Section 8, Clause 14, and Article 1, Section 9, Clause 7.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 2: Mr. PALLONE, Mr. NEAL, Ms. WATERS, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. RYAN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. WELCH, Mr. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. NEAL, Ms. MALONEY of New York, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. B LUMENTHAL of Connecticut, Mrs. SOUTHWICK, Mr. JANAYA K. HARRIS, Ms. THOMPSON of Georgia, Mr. TONKO, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. GREEN, Mr. WATERS, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. WASHINGTON of California, Mrs. MILLER, Ms. GALLAGHER of Wisconsin, Mr. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. HIMES, Mrs. WATERSON COLEMAN of Virginia, Mr. JERREY of New York, Ms. KENYATTA of Georgia, Mr. RUSH, Mr. HUMPHRY of Idaho, Mr. JAVINS of Oregon, Mr. RITCHIE of Montana, Mr. VELA, Mr. WATSON COLEMAN of New York, Mr. BAKER of California, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. CASE of Arkansas, Mr. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. ROBERTS of Pennsylvania, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. FORSTER, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. ESCH, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. DEBENE, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. KIM, Ms. NOONCUT, Ms. CASON of Florida, Mr. ALLEd, Mr. McNdNery, Mr. KRISHNAMOOGHEE, Ms. MUDGE, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. VELA, Mr. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. HINES, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. GOTTMER, Mr. STANTON, Mr. CORREA, Ms. HAALAND, Mr. McCaEHn, Ms. DiGETTE, Mr. MEeks, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. VULKAS, and Mr. LAMB.

H.R. 414: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 592: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H.R. 692: Mr. CRESSNER.
H.R. 732: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. DURTH, Mr. NEUSE, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. KILMER, and Mr. LUJAN.

H.R. 1383: Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 1407: Mrs. Torres SMALL of New Mexico, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. HILL of Arkansas, Ms. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona, Mr. UPTON, Mr. GHEFFfTH, and Mr. FLEISCHMANN.

H.R. 1507: Mr. PASCRELL.
H.R. 1796: Ms. Omar.
H.R. 1834: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 2041: Mr. Foster.
H.R. 2074: Mrs. BRATTY.
H.R. 3096: Mr. RichHOUSE, Mr. COLE, Mr. ARmST-ROM of Mississippi, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 2108: Mr. MENG.
H.R. 2337: Mrs. HAYES.
H.R. 2610: Mr. HUDSON.
H.R. 2611: Mr. LUIJAN.
H.R. 2769: Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. TRAHAAN, and Mr. KATKO.
H.R. 3121: Mr. KATKO.
H.R. 3297: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 3354: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
H.R. 3390: Mr. Massie.
H.R. 3394: Mr. PALLONE, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. ESCH, and Ms. LOPFORD.
H.R. 3395: Mr. POCAH, Mr. DURTH, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. HAALAND, Mr. MOURG, and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 3637: Mr. TONKO.
H.R. 3835: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.
H.R. 4004: Mr. Veasey, Mr. Kennedy.
H.R. 4064: Mr. TAKANO.
H.R. 4179: Mr. GRIJALVA and Mr. MCMERRE.

H.R. 4335: Mr. Emmer.
H.R. 4679: Mr. Golden.
H.R. 4932: Mr. GABBARD, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. LEVIN of California, Mr. ALLEd, Mr. TONKO, and Mr. TRONE.
H.R. 5002: Mr. VAN DREW and Mr. PAPPAS.
H.R. 5056: Mr. Ted Lieu of California.
H.R. 5269: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 5297: Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.
H.R. 5312: Mr. MORELLE and Mr. LYNCH.
H.R. 5825: Mr. ROUDA.
H.R. 5481: Mrs. HARTZLER and Mr. ADERHOLT.

H.R. 5450: Mr. LOWEY.
H.R. 5698: Mr. Carse.
H.R. 5757: Mr. CLINE.
H.R. 5761: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 5786: Mrs. BEATTY and Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 6002: Mr. BANKS.
H.R. 6108: Mr. Casten of Illinois.
H.R. 6197: Mr. Jackson Lee.

H.R. 6417: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 6616: Mr. DeSALUDE.
H.R. 6649: Mr. Cox of California.
H.R. 6942: Ms. Schakowsky and Mr. KILDRE.
H.R. 6395: Mr. Khanna.
H.R. 6391: Mr. Levin of California.
H.R. 6381: Ms. DeLauro.
H.R. 6387: Mr. Ryan, Mr. David Scott of Georgia, Mr. Raskin, Mr. Larson of Connecticut, Mr. Cox of California, Ms. Frankel, Mr. Shuetsi, and Ms. Craig.
H.R. 6691: Mr. Mooney of West Virginia.
H.R. 6723: Mr. Horsford and Mr. Harder of California.
H.R. 6742: Mr. Crenshaw and Mr. Wittman.
H.R. 6744: Ms. Delauro.
H.R. 6637: Mr. Ryan, Mr. David Scott of Georgia, Mr. Raskin, Mr. Larson of Connecticut, and Mr. Ryan.
H.R. 7200: Mr. Norton, Mr. Perry, and Mr. Wright.
H.R. 7214: Mr. Cohen.
H.R. 7232: Ms. Brownley of California and Mr. Huffman.
H.R. 7268: Mr. Norman.
H.R. 7289: Ms. Brownley of California and Mr. Case, and Mr. Vela.
H.R. 7296: Mr. Bishop of Georgia.
H.R. 7301: Mr. Clay, Mr. Heck, Mr. David Scott of Georgia, Ms. Valdezquez, Mr. Green of Texas, Ms. Pressley, Mr. Garcia of Illinois, Mrs. Axne, and Mr. San Nicolas.
H.R. 7308: Mr. Rush, Mr. Cooper, Mr. Morelle, Ms. Lee of California, Mr. DeFazio, Mr. Beyer, Mr. Tonko, and Mr. Cohen.
H.R. 7318: Mr. Blumenauer.
H.R. 7322: Mr. Crenshaw.
H.R. 7327: Mr. DeFazio and Mr. Cooper.
H.R. 7329: Mr. Tiffany and Mr. Grothman.
H.R. 7340: Mr. Khanna.
H.R. 7341: Mr. Khanna.
H.R. 7371: Mr. Rush and Ms. Clark of Massachusetts.
H.R. 7372: Mr. Cook.
H.J. Res. 96: Ms. Garcia of Texas, Mr. Garcia of Illinois, Mr. Danny K. Davis of Illinois, Ms. Pressley, Mr. Heck, Mr. Cleaver, Ms. Lee of California, Mr. Price of North Carolina, Ms. Norton, Mr. Vargas, Mr. Gonzalez of Texas, Ms. Velázquez, Ms. Carolyn B. Maloney of New York, Mr. Kennedy, Mr. Cardenas, Ms. Jackson Lee, Mr. Green of Texas, Mr. Panetta, Mr. Perlmuter, Mr. Lynch, Mrs. Beatty, Ms. Schakowsky, Mr. Foster, Mr. Clay, Mr. Lawson of Florida, Ms. Dean, Mr. Serrano, Mr. Trone, Ms. Ocasio-Cortez, Mr. Espaillat, Ms. Bass, Mr. Rush, Mr. David Scott of Georgia, Ms. Delauro, Ms. Adams, Mr. Porter, Mr. Sherman, Mr. Casten of Illinois, Ms. Westton, Mr. Gottheimer, Ms. Kelly of Illinois, Mr. Raskin, Mr. McGovern, Mrs. Demings, Mr. DeFazio, Mrs. Watson Coleman, Ms. Fudge, Mr. Smith of Washington, Mr. Bustos, Mr. Brown of Maryland, Mr. Carson of Indiana, Mr. Blumenauer, Mr. Hastings, Mr. San Nicolas, Mrs. Axne, Ms. Clarke of New York, Mr. Ryan, Ms. Napolitano, Ms. Hayes, Ms. Jayapal, Mr. Langevin, Ms. Tlaib, Ms. Garber, Mr. Himes, Mr. Courtney, Mr. Tonko, Mr. Khanna, Ms. Brownley of California, Ms. Meng, Ms. Blunt Rochester, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Bruse, Mr. Phillips, Mr. Garamendi, Mr. Grijalva, Ms. Bonamici, Mr. Cicilline, Ms. Roybal-Allard, Ms. Sewell of Alabama, Mr. Thompson of Mississippi, and Mr. Richmond.
H. Con. Res. 29: Mr. Paschen.
H. Res. 794: Mr. Lipinski.
H. Res. 990: Ms. Adams, Mr. Espaillat, Ms. Roybal-Allard, and Mrs. Watson Coleman.
H. Res. 993: Ms. Castor of Florida.
H. Res. 999: Mr. Levin of Michigan.
H. Res. 1001: Mr. Heck.
H. Res. 1013: Mr. Biggs, Mr. Baird, and Mr. King of Iowa.
HONORING LUKE MARCHANT’S 40TH BIRTHDAY

HON. KENNY MARCHANT
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 26, 2020

Mr. MARCHANT. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor a very special constituent of the 24th Congressional District, my son, Luke Beckett Marchant. Tomorrow, Luke celebrates his 40th birthday with his wife, Katie, and their two young children, Walker Ross and Carter Bailey.

While working in Austin in an internship during college, he worked for Senator Ken Armbrister. After learning the ropes in the Texas Senate, he shifted gears to run and manage the race for Texas Agriculture Commissioner Todd Staples.

Luke graduated from Southern Nazarene University in Bethany, Oklahoma, in 2003 with a bachelor’s degree in Political Science and promptly came up to Washington, D.C., in hopes of finding himself a job in public service. I offered to put Luke up at the Pentagon Days Inn in Arlington, VA, for two weeks while he hit the pavement on Capitol Hill in hopes of landing a job as a recent college graduate.

After wearing out considerable shoe leather, Luke was hired to work in the mail room for Senator JOHN CORNYN and later learned every street in the nation’s capital while navigating the Senator around town as his driver. He quickly rose up through the ranks while never forgetting that he came to work each day to better serve the people of Texas to the best of his ability.

Luke’s passion for political life has taken him from Maine to Kentucky; Florida to our Lone Star State. He would go on to work for our colleagues Congressman PETE OLSON and Senator MARCO RUBIO. I’m fiercely proud to note that he also worked for Texas Attorney General and now Governor Greg Abbott.

Even though Luke has journeyed across our great country, it was deep in the heart of Texas, working on PETE OLSON’s first run for Congress, when Luke got luckiest. There he met his future wife, Katie, and it changed his life. I’m so proud of the man he has become and the family he and Katie have built. I look forward to spending more time with them and their children at our ranch.

Since December 2016, Luke has served as Vice President for Hill and Knowlton Strategies in Dallas, Texas. I would like to say that I taught him everything that he knows, but that hasn’t been true for a very long time. Nowadays he has been teaching his old man plenty.

I wish Luke a wonderful last day of his 30s today, and ask all of my colleagues to join this proud father in wishing him a very happy 40th birthday tomorrow.

HOMENELAINE G. LURIA
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 26, 2020

Mrs. LURIA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor and recognize the 75th anniversary of the first launch at NASA Wallops Flight Facility.

As the only Member of Congress to represent two NASA facilities, I am honored to share with Congress this historic achievement. The Wallops Flight Facility, established in 1945 by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, NASA’s predecessor, has supported government and commercial scientific discovery and exploration missions, contributing significantly to the Eastern Shore community, and expedited our nation’s technological advancements.

Wallops employs over 1,000 individuals and is home to NASA’s only owned rocket launch range for suborbital and orbital rockets. During its creation, Wallops Island was sought out by the scientific agency for multiple reasons, including its proximity to another NASA facility and a military base. Wallops was established initially for guided missile flight research, but since then has expanded to a diverse and multifaceted mission. On June 27, 1945, the original team launched its first test for the radar systems on their small rockets. While the first launch at Wallops consisted of very few resources and technology, this kickstarted an enduring and critical NASA facility. From that day, NASA Wallops continued to grow, and now the facility is worth over $1 billion.

Wallops has undertaken a multitude of missions, such as supporting aircraft research, launching rockets and scientific balloons, and enabling critical research aboard the International Space Station, which have improved our nation’s understanding of space and beyond. NASA Wallops has led our country and the world in providing flight and launch range services and more generally meeting the needs in the science, aerospace, defense, and commercial communities. I am honored to recognize the hard-working men and women at NASA Wallops and to commemorate this important day in history.

RECOGNIZING LINDA ROST OF BAKER

HON. GREG GIANFORTE
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 26, 2020

Mr. GIANFORTE. Madam Speaker, Montana has some of the best, brightest, most innovative educators in our country, and our students are better for it. I rise today to honor one of the best, Linda Rost of Baker who’s recognized for her dedication to students and for her outstanding accomplishments in education.

Linda loves rural living and that’s why Baker is her perfect fit. She enjoys the culture and the pride people have living in a small community. She says, when there’s crummy winter weather, everyone goes through it together, and the community grows stronger and closer.

Her extended family lives in nearby Willard. Linda feels a deep connection to the area. When a teacher is linked to her community that much, she can more easily relate to the kids and make a lasting difference in their lives.

While attending New Mexico State University, Linda started studying to be a scientist, but soon found the lab lonely and boring. She noticed she enjoyed tutoring and began taking education classes. That’s when she realized where her passions lie and what she truly wanted to do. Fast forward to today, she earned two master’s degrees in education from Montana State University, and is working on a Ph.D. in Curriculum and Instruction with a specialization in Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics at Texas Tech University.

Linda teaches biology, AP biology, chemistry, anatomy and physiology, and science research at Baker High School, the same high school her father went to. She says it’s really exciting to see her students pick a research project they’re passionate about, lead it to completion, and find themselves along the way. Many of Linda’s students have competed in national and international science competitions.

Two recent graduates of Baker High School conducted innovative, cutting-edge research. One student studied breast cancer signs and tested novel drugs used on brain cancer. He conducted weekly Skype sessions with scientists and got good results.

Another student wanted to make a biodegradable wrap for hay bales. She produced a bioplastic for the bales out of algae—stronger than the usual wrap—and after two weeks, it degraded slowly while maintaining its strength.

Linda calls herself a “guide,” but she is so much more. Linda serves as an inspiration for her students.

Linda is the 2020 Montana Teacher of the Year, and she was one of four finalists for 2020 National Teacher of the Year, which is run by the Council of Chief State School Officers.

Teaching is Linda’s passion, and Montana is better for it, Madam Speaker, for her commitment to education, her exceptional, engaging science instruction, and her lasting impact on students.
Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, it is my honor to recognize the Rotary Club of Waynesboro, Pennsylvania for its century of service. Chartered on April 22, 1920, the club has marked 100 years of dedication to the Waynesboro community.

During its many years of service, the Rotary Club of Waynesboro has been instrumental in a number of important community achievements, including the organization of a summer youth baseball organization later known as Waynesboro Little League, the initiation of a dental education program in Waynesboro Schools, and the introduction of a community-wide Easter Seals program, among many additional accomplishments. Its long record of service has left a profound legacy in Waynesboro and Franklin County.

On behalf of the 13th District of Pennsylvania, I thank the members of the Rotary Club of Waynesboro for their tireless commitment and hard work to continue the legacy of this outstanding organization. As the club celebrates its 100th anniversary, I look forward to its many years of service to come and wish these Pennsylvanians every continued success.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Madam Speaker, it is with a heavy heart and solemn remembrance that I rise today to pay tribute to an accomplished businessman, athlete, artist, and dear friend of longstanding—Mr. Andre Moses White. Sadly, Mr. White passed away on Tuesday, June 9, 2020, from complications with COVID–19. A memorial service honoring his life was held on Saturday, June 20, 2020, at 11:00 am at the Georgia International Convention Center in College Park, Georgia.

Andre Moses White (affectionately known as “Moses” to his family, friends, and colleagues) was born in Winter Park, Florida, to the union of the late Moses and Lucille White. He was born on October 7, 1944, and was the youngest of three sons.
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and individual empowerment; as a Board Member of Wayfield Foods, where he played Wayfield’s Santa Clause for nearly 30 years and brought joy to thousands of inner-city kids and their families during the holidays; and as a cherished member of the National Grocers Association, which is in the process of developing scholarships fund in his name to benefit young African-Americans seeking a career in food retail.

Maya Angelou once said, “A great soul serves everyone all the time. A great soul never dies.” Andre Moses White is undoubtedly great because of his distinguished service to his community, devotion to his craft, and the compassion he showed for his friends and loved ones.

Moses accomplished much in his life, but none of this would have been possible without the Grace of God; the love and support of his late wife, Joyce; his children, Andre, Andrea, Richard, and Raulinna; and a host of family, friends, and loved ones who will miss him deeply.

On a personal note, I will always cherish the friendship my wife and I shared with Moses and Joyce. They were both very special people and we enjoyed every opportunity we had to fellowship together. The kindness of their spirits truly revealed the timbre of their character.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join my wife, Vivian, and me, along with the more than 730,000 residents of Georgia’s Second Congressional District, in paying tribute to Mr. Andre Moses White and in extending our deepest sympathies to his family, friends, and loved ones during this difficult time of bereavement. Moreover, we pray that we will all be consoled and comforted by an abiding faith and the Holy Spirit in the days, weeks, and months ahead.

The Island Packet with Stephen Fastenau provided proactive coverage with a photo of PGA Tour Commissioner Jay Monahan talking with Heritage Classic Foundation President Steve Wilmot, Hilton Head Assistant Town Manager Josh Gruber, Town Manager Steve Riley, and Mayor John McCann at the Harbour Town Golf Links. The RBC Heritage is broadcast in 23 languages across 226 countries outside the United States. More than 1 billion households across the world could see the Harbour Town’s famous candy cane striped lighthouse.

The Tournament is traditionally kicked off with a procession from the Lighthouse at the Marina led by bagpipers from The Citadel of Charleston. The first stroke is by the prior year’s winner using an antique club from the Course of St. Andrews which had been provided by the First Secretary of Scotland (Prime Minister) Alex Salmond during a presentation ceremony at the U.S. Capitol steps coordinated by Congressman JOE WILSON (R-SC) who was gratefully wearing the Heritage Tartan plaid blazer.

A highlight of the Tournament is a Saturday flyover of a Boeing 787 Dreamliner or Dreamlifter over the famed eighteenth fairway. The world-class jetliner is manufactured at the Boeing facilities in Charleston which was toured last month by Boeing President David Calhoun who provided three cargo shipments of personal protective equipment to Governor Henry McMaster and Medical University of South Carolina President David Cole to combat the virus pandemic.

The Tournament is in recognition of the first golf course in the New World established in the Province of South Carolina by immigrants from Scotland. The Tournament is traditionally kicked off with a procession from the Lighthouse at the Marina led by bagpipers from The Citadel of Charleston. The first stroke is by the prior year’s winner using an antique club from the Course of St. Andrews which had been provided by the First Secretary of Scotland (Prime Minister) Alex Salmond during a presentation ceremony at the U.S. Capitol steps coordinated by Congressman JOE WILSON (R-SC) who was gratefully wearing the Heritage Tartan plaid blazer.

A highlight of the Tournament is a Saturday flyover of a Boeing 787 Dreamliner or Dreamlifter over the famed eighteenth fairway. The world-class jetliner is manufactured at the Boeing facilities in Charleston which was toured last month by Boeing President David Calhoun who provided three cargo shipments of personal protective equipment to Governor Henry McMaster and Medical University of South Carolina President David Cole to combat the virus pandemic.
and great-grandchildren. As a student, Jack dedicated his studies to agriculture, which is evident that it played a big role in his life for as long as he lived. He earned his B.S. in Agriculture from Auburn University and his master’s in animal science from the University of Tennessee. It was not clear before these degrees what areas of focus he would pursue, but it was obvious he was going to make a difference in agriculture and better the lives of many people along the way.

For the following thirty-one years Jack worked for the Auburn University Extension Service, where he engaged with 4-H students, Cattlemen, and Agronomy farmers in Montgomery, Elmore, and Limestone counties. After retiring, Jack went on to own a farm in Athens, Alabama and served as the Assistant Commissioner of Agriculture before assuming the role of Commissioner of Agriculture and Industries Thompson Bishop Sparks Diagnostic Lab on Auburn’s campus. This was quite the undertaking, but Jack got it done, and did so to do much more.

As a volunteer, Jack Thompson’s list of service roles is incredible. He was president of the Athens-Limestone Chamber of Commerce; Campaign Chairman of the United Way; president of the Limestone County Cattlemen’s Association, a lifetime Director of the State Cattlemen’s Association; a lifetime member of the Athens Industrial Development Association; and was a board member at the Salvation Army. Jack also worked with 4-H kids in coordinating with state, district, and local steer shows and managed livestock for what is now the Alabama National Fair.

Jack Thompson is now survived by his four children; David Thompson, Keith Thompson, Susan Woodham, and Janice Thompson. In addition, he is survived by his sister, Ann Thomas, and his eleven grandchildren and seven great-grandchildren.

It is with a heavy heart for the family of Mr. Jack Thompson and the community of Montgomery, Alabama that I recognize the life of Mr. Jack Thompson. His legacy will live on well into the future.

HONORING THE LIFE OF MR. CHRISTOPHER EDMOND ANGELO

HON. TED LIEU
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 26, 2020

Mr. TED LIEU of California, Madam Speaker,
I rise today to celebrate the life of Mr. Christopher Edmond Angelo, a beloved member of California’s 33rd Congressional District, who passed away at the age of 70 on May 19, 2020. With decades of legal advocacy on behalf of consumer and patient rights, Chris helped to further the protections of the most vulnerable in our community.

Born on December 19, 1949 in Los Angeles, California, Chris attended Hollywood High School, the University of California, Riverside, where he sat on the Board of Trustees for several years, and Loyola Law School. After graduating law school, Chris began his career as a defense attorney at Spray, Gould & Bowers and later moved on to representing plaintiffs at Gage, Mazury, Schwartz, Angelo & Kussman. In 1988, he and his partners formed Mazurky, Schwartz & Angelo and in 2003, he formed a partnership in Manhattan Beach with Joseph DiMonda.

Throughout his legal career, Chris’ legal work helped to expand the rights of patients to ensure the medical field prioritized patient care before profit and established duties on the part of commercial and industrial landowners to inspect for safety and toxic environmental hazards. This work also led to more oversight of insurance companies by expanding the ability of policyholders to discover insurer internal loss reserves and reinsurance records when suing for unfair claims practices. Additionally, Chris fought against jury nullification and spoliation of evidence, in order to help expand fairness and accountability both in and outside of the court room.

Chris was also a fierce advocate for parents of children with developmental disabilities. With his legal background, he taught both parents and institutions how to effectuate insurance coverage for their children and patients with disabilities. Through innumerable hours of counseling parents, and producing and donating a booklet called “For Our Children: A Lawyer’s Guide to Insurance Coverage and a Parent’s Call to Organize” (1998), Chris helped to educate communities on holding insurance companies accountable, while bolstering the rights of individuals and families with children with disabilities.

Chris is survived by his wife of 40 years, Patti; son Alexander; sister Juliet; and brother Mark; beloved brothers and sisters-in-laws; 13 nieces and 22 great nieces and nephews. May his compassion, leadership, and devotion to protecting the rights of the most vulnerable continue to live on in the fight for a more equitable and just world.

RECOGNIZING THE LIFE OF DR. JAMES HENRY NEELY

HON. TREAT KELLY
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 26, 2020

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Madam Speaker,
I rise today to celebrate the life of Dr. James Henry Neely, who passed away on Tuesday, June 23, at Baptist Memorial Hospital in Oxford, Mississippi.

Dr. Neely was born on August 8, 1932, in West Point, Mississippi. His many accomplishments began at Mary Holmes College High School. He was the editor of the school newspaper, secretary of the senior class, president of the athletic club and, member at large of the Student Council. He then took his successes to Kentucky State University, earning a degree in chemistry and a minor in math and French.

His passion for chemistry and academia lead Dr. Neely to Meharry Medical College in 1960, where he received his Doctor of Medicine degree. After graduation, he took his leadership skills and medical expertise to the United States Air Force. He earned the rank of Captain and served as a Flight Surgeon stationed in El Paso, Texas, and Belleville, Illinois.

Dr. Neely’s achievements didn’t stop there. After an honorable discharge from the military in 1964, he relocated to Tupelo, Mississippi, to set up his medical practice. He served his community in medical practice for 35 years. He was the first African American doctor to have full hospital privileges of admitting and treating patients at the North Mississippi Medical Center. This was only the beginning of his success within the medical field. He would go on to earn the Mississippi Medical and Surgical Award as Practitioner of the Year and the Meharry Medical College Distinguished Service Award for 25 years of service. Out of all of his accomplishments, however, Dr. Neely claimed his greatest achievement was his marriage to Elaine Kilgore for 66 years.

Outside of the medical profession, Dr. Neely held memberships in numerous organizations including the National Medical Association, The Black Business Association of Mississippi, the NAACP, and was a member of the West Point Trinity United Presbyterian Church.

Dr. Neely was not only a prominent figure in the medical field but in his community as well. He served as a member of the Board of Directors Community Development Foundation. He was involved in Big Brothers/Big Sisters, Boy Scouts of America, Tupelo UNCF, Good Samaritan Health Services and, St. Paul Outreach Boys Home.

To cherish his memory is his wife, Elaine; his son and my friend, mentor, colleague, and Assistant District Attorney in my office Brian Neely; his daughter, acclaimed poet and Goodwill Ambassador for the state of Mississippi Patricia Neely-Dorsey; his four grandchildren, and many other friends and extended family members.

Dr. Neely’s life was one of service, grace, and love for his family and community. He will be greatly missed by all whom he encountered in today’s world. We all look towards Dr. Neely as an example of how to make desired change by way of public service.

IN MEMORY OF BILL THOMPSON

HON. JOHN JOYCE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 26, 2020

Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania, Madam Speaker,
I rise today to honor the life and legacy of Bill Thompson of Hollidaysburg, Pennsylvania, who passed away on June 15, 2020, at the age of 81.

Mr. Thompson was a pharmacist by profession and a leader in the business community. In 1965, he founded Thompson Pharmacy in Juniata, PA. In time, Thompson Pharmacy expanded to multiple locations in central Pennsylvania. Additionally, Mr. Thompson served as treasurer and vice president of Value Drug, a cooperative of independent pharmacies in the Altoona area, for nearly 50 years.

In recognition of his service and dedication, Mr. Thompson was honored with a number of awards. In 2004, the School of Pharmacy at the University of Pittsburgh presented him their Distinguished Alumni Award. He was also the 2014 recipient of the Blair County Chamber of Commerce’s Lifetime Achievement Award.

Bill Thompson was an incredible advocate for central Pennsylvania, and his work made Blair County a better place. On behalf of the 13th District of Pennsylvania, I extend my condolences to Mr. Thompson’s family, friends, neighbors, and colleagues.
HON. JOE WILSON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 26, 2020

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, nearly a month ago, our nation watched in horror as a white Minneapolis, MN police officer murdered George Floyd. His murder, and those of Breonna Taylor, Ahmaud Arbery, Rayshard Brooks, and far too many others, serve as a sobering reminder of the original sin on which our nation has been built—the brutal legacy of slavery, segregation, oppression, and discrimination spanning more than 400 years.

In the aftermath of George Floyd’s murder, thousands of Americans peacefully assembled in every state and the District of Columbia to exercise their First Amendment rights to protest and petition their government for change. My hometown, which has a proud tradition of civic participation and free speech expression, test and petition their government for change.

On Tuesday, June 23, I held a listening session with Black Lives Matter activists, community organizers, and local officials to discuss systemic racism, police brutality, and what it will take to heal the deep wounds that still ail our nation. This session was powerful and moving, centering my commitment to the eradication of racism in every corner of the nation. Racism is present in nearly every institution, every system.

One individual, whose family has lived in Oregon for generations, shared her family’s experience growing up in segregated Eugene, OR. Her mother’s two sisters, only four and six years old, were hit by a fast-moving vehicle and when community members called for help, no ambulance came. They both died. Why? Because the victims were two black girls. They were seen as less than human, and our public safety response treated them like they were. Racism is present in our public safety and emergency response.

A member of the CAHOOTS Crisis Response team also joined our discussion. CAHOOTS is a model for what our future public safety response could look like, and heroes like her exemplify how an armed response may not always be the best or most appropriate response.

One activist spoke about her experience with racism in professional spaces. She told me about how her identity as a Black woman made her supervisors scrutinize her work more heavily and less willing to help when employees of color were dealing with personal struggles. Racism is present in our workplaces.

One community leader, joined by a separate activist, discussed disparities in mental health and how our healthcare system often fails Black Americans and people of color. They called for the creation of institutions that specialize in delivering mental health care to people of color because it’s clear: racism is present in our healthcare system and its consequences can be fatal.

Racism is present in nearly every sector of American life, and everywhere around our nation, including in the progressive communities of Eugene and Springfield, where I call home. It is abundantly clear we have reached a tipping point. Americans will no longer tolerate antiquated systems of oppression. They are demanding an urgent act, and I urge our leaders to respond.

We must reflect and reform our institutions. The Justice in Policing Act is a critical first step; but make no mistake, much more work needs to be done. We must look at increasing funding for alternative public safety programs.

We must fight racism in every corner of the nation. It is a cancer. Too long it has been ignored and allowed to grow and divide out of control. We must, and we will, take a stand here and now. Enough is enough.

TRIBUTE TO CLARENCE J. "BUD" BROWN, JR.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 26, 2020

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I am honored to commend to the House the admirable service of former Congressman Clarence J. “Bud” Brown, Jr., on the occasion of his 93rd birthday on June 18.

Born in Columbus in 1927, Bud spent much of his youth in Washington, D.C., where his father, the late former Congressman Clarence J. Brown, Sr., represented Ohio’s Seventh Congressional District from 1939 to 1965. Bud succeeded his father, serving in this House with distinction from 1965 to 1983. He was then selected by President Reagan to serve as the nation’s fifth Deputy Secretary of Commerce.

From 1992 to 1999, Bud served as President and Chief Executive Officer of the United States Capital Historical Society, which is dedicated to preserving the heritage and history of the Capitol. The Society honored him with its Freedom Award upon his retirement.

Bud and his wife, Joyce, are the proud parents of four children: Cate, Clancy, Roy, and Beth. Beth died at age seven after a three-year battle with leukemia. The foundation that Bud and Joyce established in her name has helped hundreds of high school graduates from Champaign County study medicine and related careers in college.

Madam Speaker, Bud Brown has been a personal friend and mentor for decades. We are grateful that good men like Bud commit their lives to public service and inspire others to follow in their footsteps.

SAVANNAH RIVER NATIONAL LABORATORY FELLOWS

HON. JOE WILSON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 26, 2020

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, congratulations to four Savannah River National Laboratory staff who have been named Fellows. This distinguishable title and achievement of Laboratory Fellow was awarded to Dr. Ralph James, Joe Cordaro, Dr. David Diprete, and Dr. Robert “Bob” Sindelar.

Dr. Ralph James, Associate Laboratory Director, Science and Technology, has over 35 years of experience in research and development in multiple fields, including nonproliferation, national security, environmental remediation, nuclear medicine, energy, and astrophysics. An avid inventor, Dr. James has 24 patents on radiation detection, spectroscopy and imaging, and has over 600 scientific publications, six book chapters, and 15 invited review articles. He was awarded numerous international honors for his work on nuclear detection and imaging and has received six R&D100 awards.

Joe Cordaro has worked at the Savannah River National Laboratory since 1989. He is recognized across the Department of Energy complex and internationally as an expert in nuclear instrumentation, process control, and...
high-speed data acquisition. Mr. Cordero is part of the SRNL team that developed an automated controlled-potential coulometer used in the measurement of plutonium that is used by the IAEA, Los Alamos National Laboratory, and Japanese Atomic Energy Agency. Mr. Cordero has 12 inventions with 4 patents. Dr. David Sindelar served as the technical lead for the radiochemistry team in the SRNL Analytical Development’s Nuclear Measurement Group since 1994. He has played a significant technical and leadership role at SRNL, serving and supporting DOE’s environmental management missions as well as other federal entities. He has developed customized radiochemical methods to characterize radionuclides to lower detection levels than previously possible in highly radioactive material, thereby facilitating the closure of numerous waste tanks at the site. In 2016, he was the winner of the Donald Orth Lifetime Achievement Award, the highest distinction given by SRNL.

Dr. Robert “Bob” Sindelar is recognized as an expert in the Life Management of nuclear systems, structures, and components including those used for fuel storage, nuclear materials separations facilities and high level waste storage. An accomplishment scientist with about 40 years of experience, Sindelar has been a technical driver for many programs and activities that have enabled the site to receive and provide extended storage for multiple types of used nuclear fuel. He is the Savannah River National Lab’s lead for nuclear materials technologies programs supporting the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission. Congratulations to all these Fellows on this tremendous achievement. I appreciate Dr. Vahid Majidi, the Director of the Savannah River National Lab, whose leadership has resulted in the lab’s national success and achievements. I would also like to commend Colin Demarest, a journalist at the Aiken Standard, for covering this story and highlighting the success of these prestigious Fellows.

HONORING THE LIFE OF THYRA STEVENSON

HON. RUSS FULCHER
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 26, 2020

Mr. FULCHER. Madam Speaker, prior to serving in Congress, I served in the Idaho Legislature with a beloved individual. This special person, who passed recently, was an air-craft commander, an instructor, a Captain, a teacher, a linguist, and a mother to five children and twelve grandchildren in her life of 75 years. Joyfully, Thyra Stevenson of Lewiston, Idaho, lived to the fullest in her life of adventure but sadly, she died suddenly last month. Thyra, the Boeing 727, the Boeing 737, and the Boeing 757. After her time as a pilot, Thyra went on to serve in the Idaho House of Representatives for three terms. While in the State Legislature, Thyra’s passion for education shined through, and she took a keen interest in ensuring the success of our local dairymen, farmers, and ranchers. In 2017, Thyra, in the self-described ultimate show of her life, purchased a 2019 F-350 Platinum. It is said that parking for such a large truck was limited around the Idaho State Capitol, but, today, our hearts are joined by family, friends, and colleagues in celebrating the “full-throttle” life she led. Thyra, a woman of her time, and a woman beyond her time will be sorely missed. I believe the embodiment of this message is a small tribute to the large life she lived. I pray for her family and those impacted by the sudden loss of loved ones during this difficult time. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is the permanent archive of the American people, and I am thankful to include the life of Thyra Stevenson of Lewiston, Idaho. May God bless our great country and wonderful people like Thyra that grace this world with their lives.

RECOGNIZING NATIONAL POLLINATOR WEEK

HON. MARCY KAPTUR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 26, 2020

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, I rise today in recognition of National Pollinator Week. Our pollinators are an invaluable asset to our food production, environment, and economy. Over 100 of our crops and $18 billion in crop production revenue rely on pollinators like the monarch butterfly, over 250 species of bumblebees, and hummingbirds. They help sustain life on Earth and we are obligated to protect them. As a country, we have taken necessary steps to rally around pollinators. In 2019, NIFA awarded $4 million in competitive grants for pollinator health related projects and the Appropriations Committee funded $400,000 for a designated pollinator research coordinator in the United States Department of Agriculture. It is reassuring to see united support from the USDA, Department of the Interior, and the Environmental Protection Agency, each of which has designated pollinator research coordinator in part to champion youth initiatives ranging from criminal justice reform to combating food waste.

Throughout his high school career, Teddy has consistently amplified his impact in politics. In the wake of the Stoneman Douglas High School shooting in Parkland, Florida, Teddy marched with a group of students on Los Angeles City Hall to speak out against gun violence. Before he could vote himself, Teddy helped to pre-register over 30 percent of the eligible student body at his school to vote. As part of the Western Justice Center’s “Creating Bias-Free Classrooms” initiative, Teddy acted in short plays and improv situations to help train teachers to combat racial prejudice in the classroom. It is no surprise that Teddy’s dedication to the art of filmmaking and determination to use his talents to serve others is being honored by the White House and the U.S. Department of Education by naming Teddy one of 20 United States Presidential Scholars in the Arts.

Teddy was born in Sacramento, California, on October 19, 2001, the son of two lifelong nonviolent and legal advocates, Lynn Alvarez and Steven Nissen. His talent in the arts was nurtured early in California’s public schools, first at Lanai Road Elementary School, then at Robert A. Millikan Affiliate Charter & Performing Arts Magnet Middle, and finally at the Los Angeles County High School for the Arts. Teddy’s filmmaking journey began in earnest in fifth grade, when Ms. Karen Bennett’s dedication and insight helped Teddy become one of the youngest filmmakers to compete in national film festivals across the country. Recently, Teddy has used his art to highlight social causes that are important to him, including creating media for the Los Angeles Ronald McDonald House, El Nido Family Centers, and Arts for Incarcerated Youth. Teddy plans to pursue his dream of making movies as a member of the 2024 class of the prestigious University of Southern California School of Cinematic Arts with a major in Film and Television Production. Looking into the future and following in his parent’s footsteps, Teddy hopes to start a nonprofit which pairs young activists with charitable organizations in order to create free informational and educational content. Apart from filmmaking, Teddy is an active member of his community through the California Anti-Bias Network. Throughout his four years of participation, Teddy has been a natural leader in this politically active community of over 3,500 teenagers throughout the state. His peers elected him California’s 72nd Youth Lieutenant Governor in January 2020, and he used this platform to champion youth initiatives ranging from criminal justice reform to combating food waste.

My district is the proud home of three cities designated as a “Monarch City USA,” including Oak Harbor, Port Clinton, and Sandusky, Ohio. These three cities have contributed to the protection of the monarch butterfly by planting milkweed and nectar plants, among other conservation efforts. This year the Trump Administration will decide whether the monarch butterfly should be added to the endangered species list as populations continue a harrowing multi-decade decline. I urge the Administration to use science and common sense when considering their decision.

In honor of National Pollinator Week, please join me in celebrating the beauty and utility of one of nature’s finest constructors, and renewing our promise to protect these keystone species: pollinators.

TRIBUTE TO TEDDY ALVAREZ-NISSEN—UNITED STATES PRESIDENTIAL SCHOLAR IN THE ARTS

HON. ADAM B. SCHIFF
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 26, 2020

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Theodore ‘Teddy’ Alvarez-Nissen, who has been named one of 20 United States Presidential Scholars in the Arts for 2020.

Teddy was born in Sacramento, California, on October 19, 2001, the son of two lifelong nonviolent and legal advocates, Lynn Alvarez and Steven Nissen. His talent in the arts was nurtured early in California’s public schools, first at Lanai Road Elementary School, then at Robert A. Millikan Affiliate Charter & Performing Arts Magnet Middle, and finally at the Los Angeles County High School for the Arts. Teddy’s filmmaking journey began in earnest in fifth grade, when Ms. Karen Bennett’s dedication and insight helped Teddy become one of the youngest filmmakers to compete in national film festivals across the country. Recently, Teddy has used his art to highlight social causes that are important to him, including creating media for the Los Angeles Ronald McDonald House, El Nido Family Centers, and Arts for Incarcerated Youth. Teddy plans to pursue his dream of making movies as a member of the 2024 class of the prestigious University of Southern California School of Cinematic Arts with a major in Film and Television Production. Looking into the future and following in his parent’s footsteps, Teddy hopes to start a nonprofit which pairs young activists with charitable organizations in order to create free informational and educational content.
CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — Extensions of Remarks

NEW SUDAN
HON. JOE WILSON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 26, 2020

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, congratulations to the Prime Minister of Sudan, Abdullah Hamdok, and President of the Sovereign Council, Lt. General Abdel Fatah al-Burhan, for their invaluable efforts to transition to a “New Sudan” characterized by a civilian-led democratic state, that promotes religious freedom and the rights of women and minorities.

There are immense challenges facing Sudan including political instability, economic fragility, and food security, all exacerbated in the face of a pandemic. The American people are supportive as evidenced by H.R. 6094, The Sudan Democratic Transition, Accountability, and Financial Transparency Act of 2020; the $356 million in financial support from USAID announced on June 25, 2020, and the 2020 bipartisan House Foreign Affairs Committee visit to Sudan.

The challenges and personal risks accepted by the Prime Minister and Sovereign Council President are recognized. The House of Representatives and the American people are committed to a prosperous and democratic Sudan.

Sudan is ably represented in Washington by Ambassador Noureddin Satti.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION
HON. JOHN R. CURTIS
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 26, 2020

Mr. CURTIS. Madam Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted nay on H.R. 51, the Washington, D.C. Admission Act. I missed this vote due to a scheduled surgery I needed to attend in Utah.

Our nation was founded on the belief that Americans should have equal opportunity to participate in government—and I believe that an engaged citizenry is vital to a successful nation. Because our Founders also believed that no individual state should have undue influence on the federal government, they created a location for the federal government over which Congress has ultimate authority: Washington, D.C. Statehood for D.C. would undoubtedly give the new state priority over existing states, including Utah.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION
HON. STEVE KING
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 26, 2020

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Speaker, I was unable to vote on June 25, 2020 due to not being in D.C. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows: “no” on rollcall No. 116; “no” on rollcall No. 117; “yes” on rollcall No. 118; and “no” on rollcall No. 119.

HONORING THE CAREER OF ALEX DELGADO
HON. JIM COSTA
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 26, 2020

Mr. COSTA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize my dear friend, Ms. Alex Delgado, on the occasion of her retirement from television news after 22 years at Fresno County’s news station KSEE24. Alex has been a staple in homes across the Central Valley and will be greatly missed.

Alex was born in Mexico City, Mexico and lived in Chicago and Texas, before relocating to the Central Valley. Her journalism career at KSEE 24 began in 1998. Alex has dedicated her career to ensuring the Central Valley’s residents are informed and their stories are told. In 2004, she launched a 4 o’clock news segment, as solo anchor and continued to contribute to late-night newscasts. Three years later, Alex started the Valley’s first live community lifestyle program, Central Valley Today. In 2019, Alex returned to the news desk as the anchor for KSEE24’s morning program, Sunrise.

Along with her award-winning journalism career, Alex has found time to give back to her community. Alex has helped host the Central Valley Veterans Day Parade for many years and served on the local board of the American Red Cross. Her many awards include being named Business Street’s Top 40 Under 40, a Top 100 Most Influential Women, and an EMMY Award for her work.

For 26 years, Alex has put her time and energy into bettering the community. She is a mother to two, cares for her family, and still has time to help those in need in the community.

Madam Speaker, it is with great respect that I ask my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives to join me in congratulating Alex Delgado on her career as an award-winning journalist. I ask that you join me in wishing Alex and her family continued success, health and happiness in this new chapter of her life.

HONORING THE LEGACY OF SHIRLEY MCKAGUE
HON. RUSS FULCHER
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 26, 2020

Mr. FULCHER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the honorable life and work of a beloved fellow Idaho native. A graduate of Idaho schools, a successful small business co-owner, and a leader in public service—also a long-time personal friend and legislative colleague of mine, Shirley McKague will be dearly missed. First, as a State Representative, then an Idaho State Senator, Shirley worked her way into the hearts of her colleagues in the Idaho Statehouse through her wit, charming personality, and talent. For her family, Shirley leaves behind her husband Paul of 50 years, and six children to carry on her wonderful legacy. Her legacy will highlight a life of success and positive influence. As a genuine conservative, Shirley was instrumental in the Idaho State Legislature and in the public service careers of countless fellow Idahoans who refer to her as their inspiration. In everything she did, Shirley was always more interested in the welfare of fellow Idahoans than that of her own. Shirley was a beacon in our local communities and known as someone who was thoughtful and soft-spoken, but always on target. God bless Shirley and her family. We will also miss her, and her passion for life.

CELEBRATING MOSS BROTHERS TIRES
HON. DAN BISHOP
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 26, 2020

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, today I rise to celebrate Moss Brothers Tires, a fourth-generation tire business in West Rockingham, North Carolina that has been in operation for more than 100 years.

Moss Brothers was founded as a general store by G.W. Moss in 1917. Through skillful management, G.W. Moss helped the business survive the Great Depression and even loaned money to members of the West Rockingham community who were in need.

Moss Brothers was converted to a tire store over 30 years ago and now serves an estimated 50–75 customers each day, including from neighboring counties and into South Carolina. Moss Brothers is currently owned by Will Moss, G.W.’s great-grandson, who continues the family tradition of hard work, dedication and commitment to community.

I salute Moss Brothers for their longstanding service to Richmond County. Here’s to another 100 years.

JUDGING FBI CONDUCT
HON. JOE WILSON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 26, 2020

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, today I rise to celebrate Moss Brothers Tires, a fourth-generation tire business in West Rockingham, North Carolina that has been in operation for more than 100 years.

Moss Brothers was founded as a general store by G.W. Moss in 1917. Through skillful management, G.W. Moss helped the business survive the Great Depression and even loaned money to members of the West Rockingham community who were in need.

Moss Brothers was converted to a tire store over 30 years ago and now serves an estimated 50–75 customers each day, including from neighboring counties and into South Carolina. Moss Brothers is currently owned by Will Moss, G.W.’s great-grandson, who continues the family tradition of hard work, dedication and commitment to community.
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Largely overlooked was the decision’s rebuke of the FBI and the Mueller team. The D.C. Circuit became the first federal court to acknowledge the misconduct that Attorney General William Barr is trying to bring to light. Most of the courts that oversaw Mr. Mueller’s prosecutions were asked to do no more than rubber-stamp a plea deal or sign off on a jury verdict. But Mr. Flynn, backed by tenacious lawyer Sidney Powell, fought the charges—forcing the Justice Department to review its actions, acknowledge its bad acts, and move to dismiss its case. Democrats and the press cast this outcome as evidence of Mr. Barr’s “politickization.” The circuit court begs to differ.

The Justice Department’s credibility was at stake here. Judge Sullivan bought into the same Democratic conspiracy theories, which is why he refused Justice’s motion to dismiss and appointed retired judge John Gleeson to act as shadow prosecutor. He argued the Justice Department wasn’t entitled to the usual “presumption of regularity.” And if the circuit judges thought there was anything to claims that Mr. Barr was playing political favorites, it could have allowed the process to continue.

Instead they bluntly noted that there was no “legitimate basis” to question the department’s behavior. They even slapped Mr. Gleeson for relying on “news stories, tweets and other facts outside the record.” By contrast, Judge Rao’s opinion notes: “The government’s motion includes an extensive discussion of newly discovered evidence casting Flynn’s guilt into doubt.” It points out that this includes “evidence of misconduct by the Federal Bureau of Investigation.” It finishes by noting that each government branch must be encouraged to “self correct when it errs.”

The court’s conclusion is obvious. All it had to do was look at the voluminous evidence the Justice Department supplied. Its briefs proved the FBI had improperly pursued Mr. Flynn, keeping open an investigation of newly discovered evidence casting Flynn’s guilt into doubt.” It points out that this includes “evidence of misconduct by the Federal Bureau of Investigation.” It finishes by noting that each government branch must be encouraged to “self correct when it errs.”

Mr. PALAZZO. Madam Speaker, due to travel requirements, I was not present to vote during the first vote series on June 25, 2020. Had I been present, I would have voted NAY on Roll Call No. 116 and NAY on Roll Call No. 117.

Mr. CROW. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of continued cooperation and peaceful negotiations between Ethiopia, Egypt, and Sudan regarding the construction and operation of the Grand Ethiopian Renaissance Dam (GERD). Furthermore, I urge the Trump Administration to respect our nation’s role as an impartial observer to these discussions going forward.

As you know, the GERD project broke ground in 2011. Next month, construction will be complete. When fully filled and operational, the dam will generate approximately 6,000 megawatts of electricity—making it the largest hydropower project in Africa. It will directly impact the flow of water, increase the supply of energy, and help ensure food security in Ethiopia, Egypt, and Sudan. In Ethiopia, it will help alleviate drought conditions that have impacted nearly one fifth of its population and inflicted untold damage on crops across the county. In Egypt, it will help improve water supply for the rapidly growing population. In Sudan, it will help reduce sediment and control flooding.

For the past four years, negotiations have followed the 2015 Declaration of Principles, agreed upon by the three countries involved in the negotiations. These principles outlined a commitment to peaceful resolution to conflicts as they arise; mutual trust and respect; information sharing; security; respect for one another’s sovereignty; and stewardship of the River Nile.

In recent months, tensions have escalated between Ethiopia and Egypt, putting the project in jeopardy. We must honor our nation’s role as an observer of these negotiations and avoid taking on an additional role as a facilitator or mediator. Moreover, we must not play favorites or take any other action that may risk damaging the integrity of this process or put a peaceful, mutually beneficial agreement out of reach.

As negotiations continue, I urge the United States Government and all other international parties to respect the 2015 Declaration of Principles, engage only with African Union diplomats, and support a peaceful resolution for all countries involved and for the region at large.
Friday, June 26, 2020

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action
The Senate was not in session and stands adjourned until 3 p.m., on Monday, June 29, 2020.

Committee Meetings
No committee meetings were held.

Joint Meetings
No joint committee meetings were held.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action
Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 17 public bills, H.R. 7380–7396; and 3 resolutions, H. Res. 1025–1027, were introduced.

Additional Cosponsors: Pages H2594–95

Report Filed: A report was filed today as follows:
H.R. 2, to authorize funds for Federal-aid highways, highway safety programs, and transit programs, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 116–437).

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein she appointed Representative Beyer to act as Speaker pro tempore for today.

Suspension: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measure:

Designating the National Pulse Memorial located at 1912 South Orange Avenue, Orlando, Florida, 32806: H.R. 3094, amended, to designate the National Pulse Memorial located at 1912 South Orange Avenue, Orlando, Florida, 32806.

Providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Education relating to “Borrower Defense Institutional Accountability”—Presidential Veto: The House voted to sustain the President’s veto of H.J. Res. 76, providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Education relating to “Borrower Defense Institutional Accountability”, by a yea-and-nay vote of 238 yeas to 173 nays, Roll No. 120 (two-thirds of those present not voting to override).

Subsequently, the veto message (H. Doc. 116–131) and the joint resolution were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.


Rejected the Keller motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Oversight and Reform with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with amendments, by a yea-and-nay vote of 182 yeas to 227 nays, Roll No. 121.

Pursuant to the Rule, 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 H. Rept. 116–436, shall be considered as adopted.

H. Res. 1017, the rule providing for consideration of the bills (H.R. 51), (H.R. 1425), (H.R. 5332), (H.R. 7120), (H.R. 7301), and the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 90) was agreed to yesterday, June 25th.

Establishing the Joint Congressional Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies for the inauguration of the President-elect and Vice President-elect of the United States on January 20, 2021: The
House agreed to take from the Speaker’s table and agree to S. Con. Res. 38, to establish the Joint Congressional Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies for the inauguration of the President-elect and Vice President-elect of the United States on January 20, 2021.

Recess: The House recessed at 2:45 p.m. and reconvened at 2:59 p.m.

Protecting Your Credit Score Act: The House considered 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. Further proceedings were postponed.

Pursuant to the Rule, 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 H. Rept. 116–436, shall be considered as adopted.

H. Res. 1017, the rule providing for consideration of the bills (H.R. 51), (H.R. 1425), (H.R. 5332), (H.R. 7120), (H.R. 7301), and the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 90) was agreed to yesterday, June 25th.

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”: The House considered 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”. Further proceedings were postponed.

H. Res. 1017, the rule providing for consideration of the bills (H.R. 51), (H.R. 1425), (H.R. 5332), (H.R. 7120), (H.R. 7301), and the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 90) was agreed to yesterday, June 25th.

Quorum Calls—Votes: Three yea-and-nay votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H2555, H2555–56, and H2556–57. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 9 a.m. and adjourned at 6:38 p.m.

Committee Meetings

ACCOUNTABILITY IN CRISIS: GAO’S RECOMMENDATIONS TO IMPROVE THE FEDERAL CORONAVIRUS RESPONSE

Committee on Oversight and Reform: Select Subcommittee on the Coronavirus Crisis held a hearing entitled “Accountability in Crisis: GAO’s Recommendations to Improve the Federal Coronavirus Response”. Testimony was heard from Gene L. Dodaro, Comptroller General of the United States, Government Accountability Office.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR MONDAY, JUNE 29, 2020

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

No meetings/hearings scheduled.

House

Committee on Natural Resources, Full Committee, hearing entitled “The U.S. Park Police Attack on Peaceful Protesters at Lafayette Square”, 12 p.m., 2167 Rayburn and Webex.

Committee on Rules, Full Committee, hearing on H.R. 2, the "INVEST in America Act" [Moving Forward Act], 1 p.m., Webex.
Next Meeting of the SENATE
3 p.m., Monday, June 29

Senate Chamber

Program for Monday: Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 4049, National Defense Authorization Act, post-cloture, and vote on the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill at 5:30 p.m.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
9 a.m., Monday, June 29

House Chamber
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