



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 166

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JULY 22, 2020

No. 129

House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CUELLAR).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
July 22, 2020.

I hereby appoint the Honorable HENRY CUELLAR to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2020, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with time equally allocated between the parties and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 9:50 a.m.

THE CULTURE WE CREATE IN OUR ARMED SERVICES MATTERS

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

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman SMITH and my colleagues on the House Armed Services Committee for their bipartisan work on this year's National Defense Authorization Act.

We advanced progressive ideals to support our military families; improve readiness; sharpen our technological edge; and foster American leadership,

our alliances, and a culture that is in line with the values of our Nation.

This bill is truly transformational when it comes to advancing diversity and inclusion, as well as fairness and justice, in our military.

We are at an inflection point when it comes to race in this country, demonstrated by peaceful protests across the country and at a time when a pandemic has widened disparities in healthcare, education, economic opportunity, and housing along racial lines.

Our armed services are not immune to these currents.

The military has historically prided itself as leading in opportunity and advancement for men and women of color, but we have fallen far short of our expectations. Today we are still grappling with a military that doesn't fully reflect our country's diversity. Forty-three percent of the Active-Duty servicemembers are people of color, yet only two of the 41 most senior generals and admirals in the military are Black, and only one woman.

As recent events have brought a reckoning in our society, we are still debating symbols of oppression. White supremacy, racism, and other toxic beliefs exist within our ranks, impacting how Black soldiers advance, their assignments in career fields, and how they are treated and assessed.

African Americans comprise just a single-digit percentage of fighter pilots and navigators, only 5 percent of Army Green Berets, 2 percent of Navy SEALs; and only 0.6 percent of the Air Force's power rescue jumpers are Black.

Structural racism still exists in our military formations. Fifty-three percent of minority servicemembers report they have seen examples of white nationalism or racism within the ranks. These issues didn't happen suddenly, but festered unchecked by a culture of indifference or intolerance.

This culture extends to gender disparities we still see in our Armed

Forces. We have made progress and, this year, witnessed historic barrier-breaking firsts:

Chief Master Sergeant JoAnne Bass was selected as the first woman to serve as the highest ranking non-commissioned officer in a service component;

Lieutenant Junior Grade Madeline Swegle became the Navy's first Black female tactical jet pilot;

The U.S. Army just welcomed its first female Green Beret.

However, there is more work to be done:

Women have never exceeded 27 percent of nominations made by Members of Congress to the prestigious service academies;

In 2009, more than 6,000 cases of sexual assault in the military were reported. The Pentagon estimates these reports amount to just 30 percent of assaults, primarily against women.

Women and men, whose trust in their fellow soldiers has been shaken, need our support and for this Congress to step up.

This year's NDAA takes important steps to create a more diverse and inclusive military. It builds on the work in 2008 of Majority Whip JIM CLYBURN, Representative HANK JOHNSON, and former Members of this Chamber Elijah Cummings and Kendrick Meek. As members of the Congressional Black Caucus, they recognized years ago that the military was not living up to the potential unlocked in 1948 when President Truman signed the executive order removing racial segregation in the Armed Forces.

Together, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. Cummings, and Mr. Meek led the effort to create the Military Leadership Diversity Commission, whose recommendations in 2011 are the basis for many of the diversity and inclusion provisions found in this year's NDAA, which are some of the most significant steps towards diversity and inclusion

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H3615

that Congress itself has taken since the desegregation of the Armed Forces in 1948.

It seeks to foster opportunities for women and minorities.

We bring new visibility to congressional nominations to our service academies to train a more diverse next generation of leaders.

We create a special investigator to review and investigate racial disparities in the military justice system and personnel practices.

We create a special prosecutor for sexual assault committed at our military academies.

We foster and train a greater number of minorities within the special forces and aviation communities.

We tap into the talent at our historically Black colleges and universities and other minority-serving institutions.

We hold the Secretary of Defense and service component leadership accountable for progress and give them the tools to make it happen.

This package updates workplace and climate surveys to include experiences with supremacist and extremist activity, anti-Semitism, and racism, allowing leadership to understand the full extent of these beliefs and better tailor responses and disciplinary action.

Finally, after decades of inaction, we reckon with one of the darkest periods of our history, the institution of slavery. This NDAA bans the display of the Confederate flag on Department of Defense property and directs the removal of the names from military installations of those men who betrayed their country—our country—and who fought a war to defend the institution of slavery.

The culture we create in our armed services matters. Diversity and inclusion in our armed services matters. It enhances unit cohesion and it improves military effectiveness. We have known this since 1950.

Our work is far from finished, but this year's NDAA represents an important step toward this pivotal moment.

HONORING MAJOR GENERAL BILL BLAND

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember and honor the life of Major General Bill Bland of Georgia's First Congressional District, who passed away peacefully at his home surrounded by family at 84 years old.

General Bland is the former Adjutant General for the State of Georgia and a beloved husband, father, and a good friend.

He enlisted in the Georgia Air National Guard in 1958 and received his pilot's wings in 1962 at Moody Air Force Base.

General Bland served faithfully in a variety of assignments which took him

all over the world. He was a command pilot with more than 8,000 hours, flying in nine different types of aircraft. He also served in the position of Adjutant General until his retirement in 1999, after more than 40 years of service in the U.S. Air Force and Air National Guard.

I had the honor and privilege of attending church with General Bland and his lovely wife, Harriet, at Wesley Monumental United Methodist Church. It was evident Jesus Christ was the Lord and savior of Bill's life, and he used all the gifts God gave him to serve others and bring glory to God. He was an active and faithful member of the church, where he served on the board of trustees for 17 years.

General Bland will surely be missed by his friends, family, our church community, and all who knew and loved him. His legacy of selfless devotion to our country and those in need will remain for countless years to come.

CELEBRATING THE FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT TRAINING CENTER'S 50TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center's, or FLETC's, 50th anniversary.

Since the Consolidated Law Enforcement Training Center was created in 1970 before becoming the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center, they have continued the mission of safeguarding our homeland and serving as America's enterprise resource for Federal law enforcement training.

In its first year, FLETC graduated 2,200 students. Last year, FLETC welcomed more than 67,000 students. They have grown to manage more than 850 training programs across the training sites, including one in Brunswick, Georgia.

For the past 50 years, FLETC has been a critical program to ensure our officers of tomorrow receive the proper training to protect the communities in which they serve.

FLETC has done a great job at adapting throughout their existence from hurricanes, government shutdowns, to a worldwide pandemic. Whatever they have faced, FLETC has done a remarkable job at getting invaluable Federal law enforcement personnel to the front lines.

Now, more than ever, is an important time to honor their five decades as the Nation's producer, resource, and steward of Federal law enforcement training.

Mr. Speaker, I thank all who work tirelessly at FLETC, especially those at Glynco in Georgia's First Congressional District.

REMEMBERING KYLE STEVEN HUGUNIN

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember and honor the life of Mr. Kyle Steven Hugunin.

Friends, family, and members of Kyle's community recently recognized the 1-year anniversary of his passing at the youthful age of 30. He was from Savannah, in Georgia's First Congressional District, and was an out-

standing, kind, and loving individual, who was a friend to all.

Kyle was employed by Industrial Conveyor Belt Services for 10 years and worked hard in all he did.

While reminiscing on Kyle's abundance of joy that he brought to all family, friends, and others, they recalled that "he had one of the best smiles ever." He represented what it looks like to truly live life to the fullest and not take any day for granted.

Kyle was a 2007 graduate of Benedictine Military School and loved the outdoors, hunting, fishing, golf, and baseball.

My thoughts and prayers go out to all who knew and loved him during this difficult time.

CONGRATULATING BRUNSWICK-GOLDEN ISLES CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Brunswick-Golden Isles Chamber of Commerce for the U.S. certification at the highest five-star level.

Accreditation with the U.S. Chamber of Commerce is the only program of its kind. It defines excellence in chamber planning and recognizes chambers for outstanding contributions toward positive change in their communities. There are currently only 204 chambers across the country that have earned the accreditation designation, and only 128 are five-star.

The Brunswick-Golden Isles Chamber of Commerce has been the voice of the business community and a leader among community programs.

I applaud all members of the chamber for their hard work throughout the years to excel above other chambers throughout the Nation and their efforts to lead by example.

In part due to the chamber's hard work and dedication, our community is an exceptional place to live, work, and visit. I look forward to seeing the positive future of the chamber and the communities they help serve and grow.

CRITICAL INITIATIVES INCLUDED IN FISCAL YEAR 2021 NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the House passed H.R. 6395, the William M. (Mac) Thornberry National Defense Authorization Act.

The passage of this year's NDAA in the House was a bipartisan achievement done under extremely difficult circumstances, and I would like to congratulate Chairman ADAM SMITH, and particularly Ranking Member MAC THORNBERRY, as this will be his final NDAA before his retirement at the end of this year.

I wanted to take a few moments to highlight some of the provisions in this legislation which I am grateful were included.

These include provisions which will strengthen manufacturing in my home

State, protect the employment rights of our Nation's servicemembers, help to improve maternal and mental healthcare for servicemembers and their families, and strengthen ties with one of our Nation's oldest allies.

The Southern New England Regional Commission, H.R. 5124, which this bill included, establishes a regional commission that will facilitate the investment of Federal funds in southern New England, including my home State of Rhode Island, to build upon our regional strengths, such as defense manufacturing, shipbuilding, and renewable energy. This initiative will generate critical economic growth in the region to reduce poverty, unemployment, and out-migration in counties that were hit hardest by the Great Recession and now by COVID-19.

Mr. Speaker, I acknowledge Congressmen JOE COURTNEY, JOE KENNEDY, STEPHEN LYNCH, JOHN LARSON, and BILL KEATING, who are cosponsors of this legislation, and I thank them for their support of this critical initiative which will benefit all of our districts.

This year's NDAA also includes the Justice for Servicemembers Act, H.R. 2750, which I authored, clarifying that the statutory rights of servicemembers and their families under the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act cannot be waived through forced arbitration unless it is agreed to after a dispute arises.

American servicemembers, veterans, and their families have sacrificed much in service of our country. They have fought to protect the fundamental idea that we are a nation of laws and institutions that guarantee the rights and prosperity of every American.

Since the Second World War, Congress has created many laws, including the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act, to provide essential protections and guarantee every veteran and Active-Duty servicemember, including the Reserves and National Guard, the right to be free from workplace discrimination on the basis of their military service and their right to their day in court to enforce these protections. But for too long, forced arbitration has eroded these fundamental protections by funneling servicemembers' claims into a private system set up by corporations without the same procedural safeguards of our justice system.

Buried deep within the fine print of everyday contracts, forced arbitration clauses block the brave men and women in uniform, as well as their family members, from having their day in court to hold corporations accountable for breaking the law. This bipartisan provision ends this shameful practice by clarifying that arbitration clauses are only enforceable if agreed to by servicemembers or their families after a dispute arises.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues, Congressman JARED GOLDEN, Congresswoman SUSAN DAVIS, and Congressman GUY RESCHENTHALER, for their strong bipartisan support for this provision to

protect our men and women in uniform.

□ 0915

Also included in this year's NDAA is a provision which will require the Department of Defense to provide a report to Congress on the maternal healthcare, in particular mental healthcare, that is available to our Nation's servicemembers, as well as the spouses of servicemembers.

According to the CDC, 1 in 8 women nationwide experience symptoms of postpartum depression, and in some States that percentage can be high as 1 in 5.

Yet, according to the What to Expect Project, data related to instances of postpartum depression and other mental health conditions associated with pregnancy and childbirth is not widely available.

This report required by the amendment will require the Department of Defense to outline the care that is currently available for servicemembers and their spouses who may experience symptoms of postpartum depression.

Finally, this year's NDAA will include a provision which will encourage greater investment and trade between the United States and Portugal.

Last year, I introduced the Advancing Mutual Interests and Growing Our Success, or the AMIGOS Act, H.R. 565, which makes Portuguese nationals eligible for E-1 and E-2 nonimmigrant visas if the Government of Portugal provides similar nonimmigrant status for U.S. nationals, legislation which passed the House without opposition in December of last year.

Access to these investor visas will allow Portuguese investors to support projects in the U.S., benefiting our economy as well as that of Portugal.

As one of the first countries to recognize the United States after the Revolutionary War, Portugal is one of our closest economic partners and strongest allies.

Today, the United States maintains that longstanding relationship as the fifth largest export market for Portugal, and its largest trading partner outside the European Union.

The AMIGOS Act will strengthen this trade partnership and strengthen ties with our longtime NATO ally, Portugal.

I would like to acknowledge Congressman BILL KEATING and Congressman DEVIN NUNES for their support of this provision, and the instrumental role they played in securing its inclusion in this year's NDAA during the House Armed Services Committee markup.

I would, once again, like to thank Chairman SMITH and Ranking Member THORBERRY for supporting these provisions, and for their work on this year's National Defense Authorization.

THE CONVERSATION ON STATUE REMOVAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from

North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, it is time, yet again, to correct the record.

For years, my colleagues across the aisle and the mainstream media have been spouting off unfounded claims that Republicans are complicit with the presence of statues in the Capitol that memorialize figures who had ties to the Confederacy.

Democrats seem to have forgotten that members of their own party on the State and Federal levels are the ones responsible for these statues in the first place.

Since 1870 statues have been present in the Capitol, and since then, Democrats retained a majority in the House 39 times. They had ample opportunities to remove controversial statues from the Capitol, yet, they did nothing. Why has it taken this long for them to even broach the issue?

We can all agree that racism, in any shape or form, must be denounced and rejected. But it is odd that my colleagues across the aisle want to skew the narrative, do everything they possibly can to rewrite history, and insert themselves into a conversation where they lean on conjecture more than they do on facts.

For years, I have advocated that both of North Carolina's statues of Charles Aycock and Zebulon Vance be removed based on their ties to the Confederacy.

I have suggested that two statues of people that all North Carolinians and Americans can be proud of be put in their place. I am proud that the first Republican majority in North Carolina's legislature in 140 years voted in 2015 to replace the Aycock statue with a statue of Reverend Billy Graham.

For years, the North Carolina Democrat Party has used former Governor Aycock's name, along with Governor Vance, for major fundraisers, and have held meetings in buildings named after him. Where was the initiative then?

North Carolina's former Democrat Governor, Bev Perdue, sidestepped questions about buildings named after former Governor Aycock in press conferences. Instead, she pivoted to his impact on public education in North Carolina. Again, I say, where was the initiative to remove the statues then?

Even in 2007, in a Democrat primary for Governor in North Carolina, it was said that addressing controversial statues was not the answer and that "the issue of equality is one that North Carolina must deal with on a more broader level."

If our colleagues across the aisle want to have a meaningful discussion on this issue with us, we welcome it.

The decision to replace these statues goes beyond bipartisan collaboration. It is about doing what is right, in an expeditious manner, as opposed to exploiting a situation to score cheap political points.

Mr. Speaker, describing the vote we will hold today as "political showmanship" would be an understatement.

Maybe it is to compensate for the fact that Democrats are responsible for the statutes having been placed in the Capitol and the times Democrats failed to act in the past. You be the judge.

**WE HAVE BEEN WARNED; NOW
WHAT DO WE DO?**

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

Mr. HIMES. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday night, Christopher David, a veteran of the United States Navy, was walking in Portland when he came upon an odd sight: Federal agents, in full tactical gear, heavily armed, looking for all the world like the operators that we drop into terrorist havens in Afghanistan, patrolling the streets of an American city; detaining Americans; hustling them, unexplained, into rented minivans.

Now, is Mr. David a masked ninja of anarchy? No.

Was he throwing rocks or carrying bottles of gasoline? No.

Mr. David was curious, and he stood there, clearly unarmed, clearly not a threat, curious.

And here is where it gets interesting, and any American who hasn't seen the video needs to look at it right now.

A Federal agent, gas mask, body armor, camouflage, bristling with weapons and tactical gear, approaches Mr. David, winds up, and beats Mr. David repeatedly with his truncheon.

Mr. David doesn't move. His hand has been broken by a Federal agent, but he doesn't move, not a muscle.

Well, the agent is confused by this and he hesitates. But backup arrives. Another Federal agent sprays Mr. David repeatedly in the face with pepper spray. Now this is heartening to the first agent, so he winds up and hits Mr. David again with his bat.

Now, I don't care how cynical you have become about our country. I don't care whether you have signed over your time, your talent, your treasure, your integrity to the support of Donald J. Trump. If you have a drop of American blood in your veins, your soul dies a little as you watch the heavily armed Federal agent beat a United States Navy veteran.

So what are combat-ready Federal agents doing in the streets of a city which does not want them there in a State which did not ask for them?

Are there bodies piling up in the streets of Portland?

Are there 150,000 dead—just to choose a number—Americans in Portland? No. There is not a single fatality. Of course not.

Like so many cities, Portland boiled over in rage at the murder of George Floyd at the hands of the Minneapolis Police Department. And, yeah, regretfully and illegally a minority of protestors have committed acts of vandalism; bottles and rocks have been thrown, windows broken, threats made. That is not okay, ever.

But protecting property in Portland or anywhere else is the job of the local police department, the State police and, in a worst-case scenario, the National Guard. Why?

First, while Federal agents are legally entitled to protect Federal property, they are not authorized to patrol municipal streets to enforce State and local law. That is an idea that goes back to our dissatisfaction with King George, and it is an idea that my Republican friends used to care about.

Second, operationally, agents of the Border Patrol and the Marshals Service are not trained to manage protests. They are trained to patrol borders and to chase fugitives. A heavily armed individual with no identification or insignia trundling people, without explanation, into an unmarked van is likely to be misunderstood in a way that could lead to violence, particularly in a heavily armed society.

Finally, there is the question of the President's intentions, which are pretty clear. We have seen how the President responds to real crisis; almost 150,000 Americans dead of COVID-19, denial, misinformation.

We have 5 percent of the world's population and 25 percent of the COVID-19 deaths on the planet. That is a disgrace. It is a lethal disgrace.

George Floyd, an unarmed Black American, dies at the hands of the police, like so many before him. That is a lethal crisis.

The President was asked about Black Americans dying at the hands of police and he says: "So are White people; so are White people. What a terrible question to ask."

And now the President threatens to send heavily armed Federal agents to New York, Chicago, Detroit, Baltimore. Do we have a problem? No, we do not.

Take it from an unclassified Office of Intelligence and Analysis report by the Department of Homeland Security: "The regularity of violence amidst lawful protests in Portland since 26 May contrasts with national trends, which reflect a steady decline in violence during the last 2 weeks"—"a steady decline in violence during the last 2 weeks."

Mr. Speaker, this is important because democracies die, but they don't die fast. They die because people come to believe that the media is the enemy of the people. They die because a President's supporters are more given over to that President than they are to the rule of law; and they die because citizens become used to the sight of Federal agents acting, not to protect them, but to attack them.

We have been warned. The question is: Now what do we do?

RECOGNIZING THE HEROIC SERVICE OF DETECTIVE JOSH SIMMONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from

North Carolina (Mr. BUDD) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BUDD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the excellent law enforcement personnel who serve North Carolina's 13th District. I would like to specifically mention a heroic act that happened on July 14 in Rowan County.

A detective named Josh Simmons saw a burning car as he drove down Highway 52. When he approached, he found an elderly woman unable to get out. He pulled her from the car just minutes before it went up in flames.

Detective Simmons said of his actions: "The way I was raised, you take care of people. I didn't know who was in the car. It didn't matter who they were. They just needed help."

Mr. Speaker, this is a great example for all of us. Our community is truly lucky to have such courageous folks serving and protecting us.

HEALTHY SKIES ACT

Mr. BUDD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to put forward a new proposal to help reopen our country with speed and with safety.

Between business, leisure, and tourism, air travel is a mode of transportation that must be trusted if our country can fully reopen. In fact, before the pandemic, commercial aviation drove 5 percent of our GDP and helped support more than 10 million American jobs.

Unfortunately, there are currently no concrete proposals to lessen the fear that has gripped air travelers and crippled the aviation industry. And that is why I am proposing a bipartisan bill called the Healthy Skies Act, along with Congressman RALPH NORMAN and JOHN LARSON.

This bipartisan legislation instructs the TSA Administrator to create a pilot program that would temporarily screen the temperature of all travelers going through TSA security before they reach the gate area.

Having the TSA temporarily screen passengers for elevated temperatures has a number of practical advantages. It ensures that each passenger experiences a consistent nationwide process to prevent infected individuals from boarding planes and spreading the virus. This will give travelers the peace of mind they need to confidently start flying again, while discouraging folks who might be sick from even attempting to come to the airport in the first place.

Reopening America should be the top priority of our government. Making sure air travelers are healthy enough to fly is a commonsense way to boost passenger confidence and jump-start economic activity. And that is how we can stop the spread of COVID-19 and continue a great American comeback.

CONGRATULATIONS TO THE CLASS OF 2020

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MALINOWSKI) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MALINOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, over the last 3 months, the people in my State of New Jersey have pulled together in extraordinary ways to fight the coronavirus. Our leaders made good decisions. But, more important, all of us understood that public health had to come first.

The sacrifices we made were worth making. Today, all our numbers are looking good. The rate of spread of the infection, testing positivity are way, way down. If all of America were New Jersey, we could stand here today and say that America is beating COVID-19. But that doesn't make the sacrifices any less hard to bear.

And among those who sacrificed were our young people who were looking forward to graduation; not just the formal ending of their high school education, but the celebration of it with family and friends, the dances, the big games, the rites of passage that all of us experienced when we were their age and that we want for our kids.

□ 0930

Many of our graduating seniors did end up having outdoor graduations, but they came late and with social distancing. And let's face it, a socially distanced graduation is kind of an oxymoron. But we have also seen our communities come together in creative ways to celebrate the accomplishments of our young people, and I want to recognize those efforts today.

In Hunterdon County in my district, the parents, teachers, and school administrators implemented an Adopt a Senior program, where volunteers adopted a graduating student to send a letter, a card, or a gift to let them know their communities are rooting for them.

In Berkeley Heights, the light poles downtown are decorated with seniors' pictures, announcing what college they will be attending in the fall.

In Bridgewater, an administrator visited the home of every senior in a bus with a banner celebrating the class of 2020, dropping off a graduation package and a personalized Bridgewater-Raritan High School lawn sign for each senior.

In Mount Olive, posters celebrating the graduating class were placed throughout town.

In Springfield, the school surprised students with a display of personalized banners on the fence outside of the high school, each one bearing the name and photo of a member of the graduating class.

In Westfield, a video slideshow played in the window panels of the historic Arcanum Hall, with montages of senior portraits, pictures from school events, and a countdown clock to graduation.

These efforts from our communities are wonderful to see and, I am sure, are tremendously appreciated by the recipients.

During my time in Congress, I have worked hard to reach out to young peo-

ple to encourage their interests and involvement in the conversations that are happening every day here in Congress. I have visited dozens of schools throughout the 75 towns of my district and have hosted two classes of my youth advisory council.

This year, about 170 kids in my youth council spent the entire year breaking up into congressional committees and proposing legislation. I intend to introduce some of their proposals in this body this year. Their questions are always thoughtful, and they are always eager to get involved and make a difference.

It is tough to see them graduate in a time of so much uncertainty and fear, but throughout the many crises our country has faced in recent months, I have seen our young people step up and lead time and time again. If the students in New Jersey's Seventh District are any indication of young people around the country, the future of America is in good hands.

Congratulations to all of our 2020 graduates. I can't wait to see everything they are going to accomplish in the years ahead.

CALLING FOR TEMPORARY PAYROLL TAX HOLIDAY

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

Mr. SPANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank those Members who have joined me in standing with millions of struggling Americans by calling for the adoption of the Keep Employees' Earnings Protected Act, also known as the KEEP Act, and to encourage my colleagues who haven't done so to do so and stand with us.

As this body debates another relief package, a keystone of such legislation should be a temporary payroll tax holiday. I introduced this bill to allow our workers to keep more of the money that they have already earned, thus infusing critical capital into our economy without involving Federal bureaucracy.

It is now more critical than ever to ensure that families have the funds, their funds, to reinvest back into our economy and to continue our economic comeback by buying locally and supporting each other. Employers, too, can use their tax savings to invest in their businesses and in their workforces.

No government program, no matter how generous, can replace a strong, functioning economy. President Trump has called on Congress to deliver this bill to his desk for signature, and the time to deliver is now. The American people are waiting and watching.

HOLDING CHINA ACCOUNTABLE

Mr. SPANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to lend my voice to House efforts to hold China accountable for their role in the spread of the coronavirus.

China lied; Americans died. It is really that simple.

China's socialist government not only misled the international community in what they knew and when they knew it, but they also colluded with the World Health Organization to cover for them. China's irresponsible behavior led to a worldwide COVID-19 pandemic, which has brought about death and economic mayhem across our planet. As the evidence mounts, China is now censoring those speaking out.

Congress must stand together, shoulder to shoulder, to ensure the Chinese Government is held responsible for the damage they have caused and to explore avenues to promptly bring manufacturing back to the U.S., including pharmaceuticals.

I also commend President Trump for pulling the United States out of the WHO until they, too, have been held accountable for their actions. Not a penny of taxpayer dollars should ever go toward international organizations that look the other way solely for political or economic interests, especially one that operates in the public health arena.

The time for answers is now.

HONORING SERGEANT ANDREW BOSKO

Mr. SPANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. Andrew Bosko, a Lakeland, Florida, World War II veteran who is 98 years young.

Andy was born in Ohio, raised in Pennsylvania, and is one of 13 children of immigrant parents from Austria and Czechoslovakia.

He entered the Army Air Corps in 1943, assigned to the Seventh Fighter Command in Hawaii. In 1945, the command was reassigned to Iwo Jima to provide emergency landing fields supporting bombing operations against Japan.

Meanwhile, Andy's wife and true love, Sophia, was supporting the war as a Rosie the Riveter. Yet, they still found time to write each other every single day.

Following the war, Andy worked as a machinist in New York and later participated in several other businesses.

Andy, you, together with your bride of 74 years, represent the greatest of our Greatest Generation.

They experienced economic and social turmoil and a world war, and then they helped rebuild our Nation into the greatest on Earth.

It is an honor to serve Andy, as he, for so many years, has served us.

REESTABLISH LAW AND ORDER

Mr. SPANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the House minority and Trump administration's efforts to reestablish law and order in our country and to stop mob rule.

For almost 2 months, communities throughout our country, particularly Democrat-led urban centers, have experienced levels of lawlessness and civil unrest unseen for decades. I am not referring to those who have exercised their First Amendment rights to peacefully assemble and protest. No. I am talking about those who vandalize, destroy, and knowingly break the law,

stirring havoc and instilling fear into families and business owners.

From San Francisco to Portland, from Minneapolis to New York City and everywhere in between, we have seen the consequences of protecting the mob over innocent civilians. This cannot be, and it cannot continue.

Law and order must be brought back to our neighborhoods, and we must hold cities and their leaders accountable for failing to adequately protect those whom they have sworn to serve.

All Americans, regardless of ZIP Codes, have a right to feel safe in their homes and on their roads. Mob rule will not be tolerated. We must reestablish law and order in America, and we must do it now.

REQUIRE FEDERAL CORONAVIRUS PREPAREDNESS

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

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, our Nation is in crisis. Yesterday, the United States added more than 1,000 names to the already unbearably long list of 140,000 people killed by COVID-19. There have been nearly 4 million confirmed cases in the United States, and the CDC believes the number is many times greater. There are hotspots around the country, most notably in Southern States.

Many States like California and my State of Illinois that have taken measures to reopen are now looking at rolling back these measures and reinstating greater restrictions to keep their citizens safe.

The pandemic has affected all of us, putting our loved ones at risk, keeping our kids from school, overwhelming our healthcare systems, and devastating our businesses while costing 40 million people their jobs and pushing State and local governments to the brink.

With so many people and communities suffering, we desperately need a national strategy to beat back this virus. Unfortunately, while families, students, community leaders, and citizens are all making great sacrifices, and local governments are being forced to cut vital services, leadership and support from the administration have repeatedly fallen short. The American people deserve better.

All the sacrifices made since March were and are meant to buy us time to bend the curve, knock down this virus, and, ultimately, stand up our economy. But the sacrifices are only valuable if we are using the time to prepare for what many experts believe will be a spike come the fall.

Sadly, around the country, testing capacity remains below where it needs to be. Hospitals in many States are over capacity in their ICUs, understaffed, and anxious about still looming shortages of personal protective equipment, or PPE.

Six months into this pandemic, it is simply unconscionable that there are

still shortages of PPE, the masks, gloves, and gowns we need to safely treat patients, protect workers and residents in our nursing homes, confidently open our schools, and get our economy on the road to recovery.

In Illinois, we have lost nearly 7,500 lives to this disease already. With concerns that the disease may get worse this fall, and with conditions already worsening as States struggle to reopen, I am calling on Congress and the administration to take urgent action to address our immediate needs while at the same time preparing for the challenges that lie ahead.

It has been nearly 10 weeks since the HEROES Act passed the House and was sent on to the Senate. States and local governments, hospitals and nursing homes, and schools and businesses need the aid provided by the HEROES Act. The Nation needs the supply chain czar included in the HEROES Act. We all need the testing capacity funded by the HEROES Act.

Yet, after 10 weeks, the Senate still has neither taken up our legislation nor offered a plan of their own. Instead, they are delaying the Federal response to an urgent national crisis.

Ending this pandemic should not be a partisan issue. We need to move forward together, Democrats and Republicans.

That is why I am asking my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support the COVID PREPARE Act. I introduced this commonsense, bipartisan legislation with my colleague, JOHN KATKO, to assure the American people that their Federal Government is prepared to address this ever-changing public health crisis.

This legislation would require Federal agencies to submit to Congress their plans for addressing COVID-19 in the fall, anticipating a potential increase in infections and even greater demands on our healthcare system and pressure on our economy.

The COVID PREPARE Act will provide bipartisan oversight and full transparency into both the planning and execution of our national response. We all certainly hope for the best, but we must responsibly prepare for the worst.

HONORING COLONEL CHARLES POWELL

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

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of my friend, Colonel Charles Powell, who passed away peacefully on July 2, 2020, in his home in San Angelo, Texas, at the age of 89.

Charles was a true American hero who devoted his life to serving others, and his passing is a loss that will understandably reverberate throughout the community. His genuine love for God and others, dedication to his family, and service to his country and

community set the gold standard of excellence that we should all strive for. Although he is leaving this Earth, his legacy will live on through countless lives he has impacted during his lifetime.

Charlie was born in Nashville, Arkansas, on May 7, 1931, where he grew up and met his future wife, JoAnne. The two graduated together from Nashville High School in 1949.

Charles went on to attend the United States Naval Academy in Annapolis, Maryland, and graduated, in 1954, with a bachelor's degree in general engineering. He was then commissioned into the United States Air Force and launched his 30-year career in military service.

After graduating from pilot training, Charles took to the skies, supporting transatlantic and transpacific deployments of tactical forces; refueling missions supporting reconnaissance activities in the Cuban Missile Crisis; and, finally, volunteering to serve in Vietnam as a rescue crew commander and airborne mission commander. He also participated in the planning and execution of the Son Tay POW camp raid.

Over the course of his career as a pilot, Colonel Powell logged over 67,000 flying hours, flew 168 combat missions, is credited with 14 combat saves, and was awarded a multitude of military honors.

In addition to flying missions, Colonel Powell served in a variety of leadership capacities in the Air Force, from flight instructor of the Air Command and Staff College, chief of staff of Air University, and, finally, the wing commander of the technical training wing at Goodfellow Air Force Base in San Angelo, Texas.

At the center of Charlie's world was JoAnne, and their love story is one for the ages. From meeting in grade school to graduating high school together and raising their daughter, Terri, as Charles' missions took him around the globe, their commitment to each other never wavered.

San Angelo was forever changed when these two spitfires flew into town in 1980. Charles was appointed as the wing commander at Goodfellow Air Force Base, which was slated for closure at the time. Charles and JoAnne immediately leapt into action, developing the relationship between Goodfellow and the community of San Angelo and completely transforming the mission of the base. After Charles' 4 years as wing commander, Goodfellow was removed from the closure list. Today, the connection between the base and San Angelo stands as the premier example of effective military-civilian partnership.

Thankfully, after Charlie retired from the service, the Powells never left San Angelo. Instead, they immediately set to work planting deep roots in the community and making San Angelo a better place to live. These two have been some of the most dedicated public servants our community has ever seen.

Through their innumerable service initiatives, they have been Goodfellow's most dedicated champions who served as the bridge between San Angelo and Goodfellow.

Through it all, Charles and JoAnne stood together, side by side and hand in hand. They transformed countless lives, not the least of which was my own. I had the pleasure of meeting the Powells when I ran for Congress in 2004, and in 2005, I hired JoAnne on as the first member of my staff. At that point, I could never have imagined the depth of the impact that Charlie and JoAnne would have on me, my family, and every member of my team over the years to come.

JoAnne is the most longstanding member of my staff, and she and Charlie have seen me through the ups and downs, all while tirelessly serving the constituents of the Concho Valley.

Within my office, JoAnne took on the responsibility of shepherding young men and women through the congressional nomination process for applying to the United States military academies, while Charles chaired the board responsible for vetting and recommending them to me for nomination.

□ 0945

Their teamwork resulted in many young men and women from my district receiving appointments to these prestigious institutions of higher learning, further extending the tradition of service to our country to future generations.

I cannot put into words the immense honor that it has been to have Charles and JoAnne as a part my family. My wife, Suzanne, and I feel tremendously lucky to have the opportunity to learn from them and to count them among our closest friends.

Colonel Powell will be greatly missed, and I take comfort knowing his legacy will continue through the people he loved and the community he was so proud to call home.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOHO).

PUBLIC APOLOGY TO THE HONORABLE
ALEXANDRIA OCASIO-CORTEZ

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, I stand before you this morning to address the strife I injected into the already-contentious Congress.

I have worked with many Members in this Chamber over the past four terms, Members on both sides of the aisle,—and each of you know that I am a man of my word. So let me take a moment to address this body.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to apologize for the abrupt manner of the conversation I had with my colleague from New York. It is true that we disagree on policies and visions for America, but that does not mean we should be disrespectful.

Having been married for 45 years, with two daughters, I am very cognizant of my language. The offensive name-calling words attributed to me by the press were never spoken to my

colleagues, and if they were construed that way, I apologize for their misunderstanding.

As my colleagues know, I am passionate about those affected by poverty. My wife, Carolyn, and I started out together at the age of 19 with nothing. We did odd jobs, and we were on food stamps. I know the face of poverty, and for a time, it was mine. That is why I know people in this country can still, with all its faults, rise up and succeed and not be encouraged to break the law.

I will commit to each of you that I will conduct myself from a place of passion and understanding that policy and political disagreement be vigorously debated with the knowledge that we approach the problems facing our Nation with the betterment of the country in mind and the people we serve.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot apologize for my passion or for loving my God, my family, and my country.

THE WAY WE TREAT ONE
ANOTHER MATTERS

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the words of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOHO). They were appropriate because the language we use matters. The way we treat one another matters.

Mr. YOHO needed no apology for his passion about poverty and for the downtrodden, but he ought to remember and acknowledge that the person to whom he spoke so inappropriately was one of the strongest fighters in this Congress for those with the least, those who are downtrodden, those who are forgotten.

Mr. Speaker, the apology was appropriate. I hope that Mr. YOHO feels that apology sincerely, and I hope all of us will take a lesson to think before we speak so harshly to one another.

This country is a divided country. There are some of us who believe that our Chief Executive uses harsh language and inappropriate language directed at some of our citizens. We ought not to replicate that conduct.

The apology was appropriate. I know that our colleague, ALEXANDRIA OCASIO-CORTEZ, appreciates that apology, but let us treat one another with the respect and dignity each of us deserves not only as a Member of this body, but as a human being.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 10 a.m. today.

Accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 49 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1000

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. DINGELL) at 10 a.m.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer:
Lord our God, thank You for giving us another day.

We ask Your blessing on all the Members of the people's House during these rare days of coming together in this Chamber. The coronavirus has changed so many forms and patterns of gathering, as family, community, and here in Congress.

Send out Your spirit that those who find themselves at odds with their colleagues might continue the productive work that must be done, but which does not draw contentious attention, and address as well the issues which are pressing upon our Nation. Lord, have mercy.

Continue to bless the men and women who attend to those who are sick—the number continuing to grow throughout our country. Keep our healthcare professionals safe and inspire those who labor to find treatments and cures for this dangerous virus.

May all that is done be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 4(a) of House Resolution 967, the Journal of the last day's proceedings is approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. TAKANO led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER
PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

SENATE SHOULD PASS THE
HEROES ACT

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Madam Speaker, it has been more than two months since the House passed the HEROES Act. In

that time, there have been more than 50,000 new coronavirus deaths, bringing the total to more than 140,000 Americans and more than 2.5 million more cases. Yet the Senate has done nothing.

This important legislation provides much-needed relief to States and cities experiencing lost revenue, to support our heroes on the front lines.

It ensures our first responders and essential workers are entitled to hazard pay and guarantees up to \$200 billion for those who have risked their lives working during the pandemic.

It expands testing, tracing, and treatment to all Americans.

It puts money back in the pockets of struggling Americans with a second round of stimulus payments up to \$6,000 per household.

It preserves health coverage by protecting the more than 5.4 million Americans who have lost their employer-provided health insurance.

It extends the weekly \$600 Federal unemployment benefit through January, providing a vital safety net for a record number of Americans who are unemployed. Right now, that expires in just 9 days.

It helps worried families afford a safe place to live, assisting renters and homeowners with rent, mortgage, and utility payments and other housing-related costs.

I urge the Senate to pass this bill immediately.

IN SUPPORT OF THE GREAT AMERICAN OUTDOORS ACT

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

Mr. GIANFORTE. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the Great American Outdoors Act.

My friend, Senator DAINES, deserves a lot of credit. He has successfully advanced this historic legislation, historic because of its long-term dedication to our public lands.

People from around the world come to tour our outstanding National Parks, including millions of visitors every year to Yellowstone and Glacier. Unfortunately, too many of our parks have fallen into disrepair. This bill begins to rebuild and repair our parks.

It is also a fitting complement to our successful efforts to permanently reauthorize the Land and Water Conservation Fund. It provides dedicated funding to increase public access to public lands across Montana.

I know how important LWCF is to Montana, and I will continue working to keep public lands in public hands and increase access.

I urge my colleagues to join me today in voting for the Great American Outdoors Act.

STUDENT LOAN DEBT CRISIS

(Ms. DEAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DEAN. Madam Speaker, our student loan debt crisis predates the pandemic. We encourage high school students to attend college, to claim their education, yet too many graduates are shackled with a mountain of debt that limits their future, impedes their financial freedom, and diminishes their purchasing power. The pandemic has only worsened this problem.

During this pandemic, we owe it to a generation of debt-laden young people, veterans, and transitioning adults to take bold action, to pass meaningful debt forgiveness. Freeing up the ability to claim an education without crushing debt will be a relief to so many Americans and our economy.

An educated public should enrich us all, not create unsustainable debt. So I call upon this body to pass bold and meaningful debt forgiveness for millions of bright young people so that their futures are determined not by the debt they incurred but by the knowledge they gained.

NATIONAL FRAGILE X AWARENESS DAY

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

Mr. THOMPSON. Madam Speaker, I rise today on National Fragile X Awareness Day to raise awareness of this genetic disorder.

Fragile X is caused by mutations in the gene known as FMR1. These mutations can result in behavioral, developmental, cognitive, and reproductive conditions, often leading to delayed development of speech and language. In the most severe cases, fragile X can cause potentially fatal neurodegenerative conditions.

Fragile X syndrome affects an estimated 100,000 Americans. But more than 1 million Americans have a variation of the fragile X mutation, meaning they either have or are at risk of developing one of the associated conditions.

This means each Member of this House, on average, represents 230 constituents living with fragile X syndrome, and countless more parents, grandparents, siblings, and caregivers love someone with fragile X.

Each person living with fragile X syndrome, and any other intellectual and developmental disability, makes our world a better place.

EXTENDING UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS

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

Mr. TAKANO. Madam Speaker, I rise today because supplemental Federal unemployment benefits expire next

week, and Republicans in the Senate refuse to extend these benefits for the American people.

Average daily expenses are weighing heavily on millions of families as our economy struggles and unemployment is at a record high, with over 17 million still unemployed.

Rent is due, bills are due, loan payments are due, but people are still out of work. Americans are fighting against financial hardships and the housing affordability crisis. Failure to extend unemployment benefits in the midst of this pandemic would be cruel and inhumane. It would cause financial ruin for millions who are already struggling.

Our communities need the additional \$600 weekly unemployment benefits. It could be the difference between getting evicted or making rent for another month.

I urge the Senate to pass the HEROES Act to extend Federal unemployment benefits. Millions of Americans are depending on it.

IN SUPPORT OF THE CITIZENS OF JAMMU AND KASHMIR

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

Mr. WATKINS. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of democracy around the world and, in particular, in Jammu and Kashmir.

The human rights violations there are already alarming. And now with COVID-19 plaguing the world, people there and everywhere must have access to the tools necessary to fight this disease.

As telecommunication blackouts, suppression of media reports, human rights abuses, and mass detentions continue in Jammu and Kashmir, COVID-19 concerns are amplified. There have already been disturbing reports that PPE and critical equipment are being blocked from entering the region.

Without adequate resources and internet access, hospitals and medical centers don't stand a chance. And lives being lost are lost to the world.

I urge the global community and actors in the region to work together to ensure that citizens of Jammu and Kashmir have access to the care, services, and resources needed to defeat this disease.

IN SUPPORT OF THE NO BAN ACT

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

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the NO BAN Act, which I was honored to coauthor. I urge my colleagues to swiftly pass this landmark legislation today.

More than 3 years ago, President Donald Trump's Muslim ban put into action the xenophobic and racist agenda that he promised during his campaign.

It immediately led to chaos at our airports, where I was honored to stand in solidarity with our incoming immigrants and those cruelly ripped apart from their families.

The Muslim ban became the cornerstone of President Trump's dangerous agenda. It has made America less respected around the world. And our country is not any safer.

This isn't the only time America has shamefully shut our doors based on race, ethnicity, or nationality. But we can make it the last time.

That is why we must pass the NO BAN Act and end the Muslim ban and make sure history does not repeat itself. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation today.

THE WORDS OF A BLACK POLICE OFFICER

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Madam Speaker, for those wondering what it is like to be a Black police officer amid the violent demonstrations that continue in cities across our country, consider what Portland Police Officer Jakhary Jackson said about the rioters in his own words.

"It's been very eye-opening. It says something when you're at a Black Lives Matter protest and you have more minorities on the police side than you have in a violent crowd, and you have White people screaming at Black officers."

Let me repeat Officer Jackson's words once more, because you will not hear any of this from our national media. Once again, here are the words of a Black police officer facing a violent mob of predominantly White anarchists.

"It's been very eye-opening. It says something when you're at a Black Lives Matter protest and you have more minorities on the police side than you have in a violent crowd, and you have White people screaming at Black officers."

FEDERAL OFFICERS IN PORTLAND

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, it was sad to hear my colleague with his recent comments. Let me tell you what it is like on the ground in Portland.

This is a serious problem in Oregon where people are attempting to peacefully demonstrate their opposition to a whole range of racist practices by law enforcement. There are, to be sure, occasionally a few people who are doing things that they shouldn't, and they should be arrested, tried, and convicted. But the vast majority of people are peaceful.

And it is no fault, frankly, of what has happened with the Trump administration, who have moved in with what can only be described as an occupying force, making the situation worse. They were unwanted, unwelcome, and unprepared. Nonetheless, they have moved in, been involved with episodes that people can watch on YouTube, where peaceful demonstrators were attacked.

One of my constituents, asking a simple question, was beaten with a baton, breaking his wrist, and pepper sprayed in the face. This is outrageous. This is a made-for-TV initiative by the Trump administration and should stop.

□ 1015

PROVIDING ASSISTANCE TO SMALL DEFENSE MANUFACTURERS

(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. Madam Speaker, I am grateful that the House Armed Services Committee included my amendment, the Small Manufacturer Cybersecurity Enhancement Act, in the National Defense Authorization Act, which passed yesterday by bipartisan vote.

This crucial amendment will provide much-needed assistance to small defense manufacturers with cyber compliance, and it will enhance the cybersecurity through our defense supply chain by expanding DOD cyber initiatives with the manufacturing extension partnership centers. The MEP national network is ideally situated to assist the Department to help strengthen our national defense.

This bipartisan legislation was supported unanimously by all members of the House Armed Services Committee. It is especially important to the communities I represent adjacent to the Army Cyber Command at Fort Gordon. The potential to create jobs is encouraged.

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

RECOGNIZING ESCALATION OF VIOLENCE ALONG ARMENIAN-AZERBAIJANI BORDER

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

Mr. COSTA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to call attention to the escalating violence that is occurring in the Armenian-Azerbaijani border.

Beginning July 12, the Azeri soldiers approached the Armenian border, a place that has been one of contention, and opened fired on Armenian civilians in the Tavush Province.

Since then, the conflict, sadly, has escalated. The Azeri armed forces have

been indiscriminate in attacking Armenian schools and factories, factories producing personal protective equipment that is essential during this pandemic.

Azerbaijan must be held accountable. In the midst of this global pandemic, where supplies and resources are already stretched, it is critical now more than ever that we work toward peace with Artsakh.

We must reevaluate the U.S. security assistance to Azerbaijan immediately—they are not being appropriate in their actions—as well as increase aid to Armenia to counter Azeri aggression.

In the appropriations bill yesterday, a \$20 million augmentation was made to the country of Armenia. I urge my colleagues to support that and urge immediate action condemning Azerbaijan's disgraceful actions.

RECOGNIZING RADIO STATION WHUB

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

Mr. ROSE of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, on July 20, 1940, Judge Luke Medley started a small radio station in Cookeville, Tennessee, my hometown. And for the last 80 years, WHUB Newstalk 101.7 and 1400, the Hub, has stood the test of time and been a haven for community events and local news.

WHUB's motto is: "Where community always comes first." They have always implemented that motto for the citizens of the Upper Cumberland in Tennessee, and they always will. WHUB has been the winner of numerous awards in the last 80 years from the State of Tennessee and the National Association of Broadcasters.

Congratulations to owner Jerry Zimmer, program director Brent Carl Fleshman, news director Shawn Jacobs, and general manager John Monk for their constant hard work to keep WHUB the number one news talk radio station in the Upper Cumberland.

Happy 80th anniversary to WHUB. God bless Tennessee, and God bless America.

LAUNCHING JUSTICE IN POLICING WEBSITE

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

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, it has been nearly 4 weeks since the House passed the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act. Leader MCCONNELL and the Republican-led Senate, however, refuse to call it up for consideration or a vote. Meanwhile, the problem of racial injustice is not going away on its own.

For millions of Americans, this issue is deeply personal, having experienced racial bias in our justice system firsthand. Most police officers, Madam Speaker, are trying hard to do their job

professionally and serve their communities well, and there are so many exemplary officers committed to addressing head-on the inherent bias and the problems in the culture of policing that lead some to commit acts of misconduct.

Still, millions of people live in fear simply because of the color of their skin and because of the history of police misconduct against African Americans in our country.

Madam Speaker, we must never accept this norm. Indeed, in his last public appearance, John Lewis visited Black Lives Matter Plaza in Washington and then encouraged Americans to stand up for social justice. He said this: "We must continue to be bold, brave, courageous, push and pull till we redeem the soul of America and move closer to a community at peace with itself."

His wise words continue to inspire Americans to be courageous in standing up, speaking out, and working to lift our country up to the highest of our ideals.

In order to make sure that all voices are being heard in Congress and in this national discourse, I launched a website to make it easier for Americans to share their own stories, learn about the legislation we passed, and share their thoughts on our bill. It is a platform for people to contribute to this work of redeeming the soul of America, as John Lewis urged us to do. That site is JusticeinPolicing.us.

Already, Madam Speaker, thousands of Americans from nearly every State have visited the site, and many have shared their own wrenching stories about why we need to pass this bill.

One woman in my district wrote about how, as the mother of 2 young Black men, she worries every day about them encountering the police. That should not be the case in America. That isn't good for families. It isn't good for the police. It isn't good for our communities. And as I said, it is not good for our country.

Another wrote about how her elderly parents were pulled over in Oklahoma because the officer couldn't believe that her African-American father was married to her White mother. Both were in their eighties. That was just 3 years ago.

One person from Iowa posted about being a lifelong Republican who is tired of her party's failure to tackle police misconduct and systemic racism in our country. That person is right. And it is not Republicans alone whom I am sure she is concerned with.

The Senate could act today on the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act. The Senate ought to act today. But it is sitting on Leader McCONNELL's desk or someplace else gathering dust while our site continues to gather stories of real lives impacted by these injustices.

Madam Speaker, I hope Americans will continue to speak out and give compelling and concrete examples of why action is necessary.

And I might say, we need to speak out on the extraordinarily good actions that are taken by our law enforcement officers as well. We need to be balanced. But we do not need to be balanced to the extent of ignoring the carnage that has occurred because of the color of skin. These stories need to be told.

In his very powerful New York Times column last month on the five crises facing America at this moment in our history, the extraordinarily insightful David Brooks wrote: "All Americans, but especially White Americans, are undergoing a rapid education on the burdens African Americans carry every day. This education," he said, "is continuing, but already, public opinion is shifting with astonishing speed." It is right that it does so.

The more we hear of the stories of personal experiences with systemic bias, the better equipped we will be as a Nation to confront this challenge together. As more people visit JusticeinPolicing.us to speak up and support this bill, I will be sharing their names and stories with this House and its Members, making sure that Members hear from their constituents on this issue.

We are the people's House. We are the people's voice. We are the protectors of democracy, yes, of our Constitution and our laws, but the soul and character of our country are in our hands as well.

As long as people of color continue to face dangerous and deadly systemic bias in our country, we will not stop pushing for the reforms that are so sorely needed.

FOSTERING UNDERGRADUATE TALENT BY UNLOCKING RESOURCES FOR EDUCATION ACT

Ms. JAYAPAL. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 891, I call up the bill (H.R. 2486) to reauthorize mandatory funding programs for historically Black colleges and universities and other minority-serving institutions, with the Senate amendment thereto, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the Senate amendment.

Senate amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; REFERENCES.

(a) *SHORT TITLE.*—This Act may be cited as the "Fostering Undergraduate Talent by Unlocking Resources for Education Act" or the "FUTURE Act".

(b) *REFERENCES.*—Except as otherwise expressly provided, whenever in this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.).

SEC. 2. CONTINUED SUPPORT FOR MINORITY-SERVING INSTITUTIONS.

Section 371(b)(1)(A) (20 U.S.C. 1067q(b)(1)(A)) is amended by striking "for each of the fiscal

years 2008 through 2019." and all that follows through the end of the subparagraph and inserting "for fiscal year 2020 and each fiscal year thereafter."

SEC. 3. SECURE DISCLOSURE OF TAX-RETURN INFORMATION TO CARRY OUT THE HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965.

(a) AMENDMENTS TO THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1986.—

(1) *IN GENERAL.*—Paragraph (13) of section 6103(l) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

"(13) *DISCLOSURE OF RETURN INFORMATION TO CARRY OUT THE HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965.*—

"(A) *INCOME-CONTINGENT OR INCOME-BASED REPAYMENT AND TOTAL AND PERMANENT DISABILITY DISCHARGE.*—The Secretary shall, upon written request from the Secretary of Education, disclose to officers, employees, and contractors of the Department of Education, as specifically authorized and designated by the Secretary of Education, only for the purpose of (and to the extent necessary in) establishing enrollment, renewing enrollment, administering, and conducting analyses and forecasts for estimating costs related to income-contingent or income-based repayment programs, and the discharge of loans based on a total and permanent disability (within the meaning of section 437(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965), under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965, the following return information (as defined in subsection (b)(2)) with respect to taxpayers identified by the Secretary of Education as participating in the loan programs under title IV of such Act, for taxable years specified by such Secretary:

"(i) Taxpayer identity information with respect to such taxpayer.

"(ii) The filing status of such taxpayer.

"(iii) The adjusted gross income of such taxpayer.

"(iv) Total number of exemptions claimed, or total number of individuals and dependents claimed, as applicable, on the return.

"(v) Number of children with respect to which tax credits under section 24 are claimed on the return.

"(B) *FEDERAL STUDENT FINANCIAL AID.*—The Secretary shall, upon written request from the Secretary of Education, disclose to officers, employees, and contractors of the Department of Education, as specifically authorized and designated by the Secretary of Education, only for the purpose of (and to the extent necessary in) determining eligibility for, and amount of, Federal student financial aid under programs authorized by parts A, C, and D of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (as in effect on the date of the enactment of the Fostering Undergraduate Talent by Unlocking Resources for Education Act) and conducting analyses and forecasts for estimating costs related to such programs, the following return information (as defined in subsection (b)(2)) with respect to taxpayers identified by the Secretary of Education as applicants for Federal student financial aid under such parts of title IV of such Act, for taxable years specified by such Secretary:

"(i) Taxpayer identity information with respect to such taxpayer.

"(ii) The filing status of such taxpayer.

"(iii) The adjusted gross income of such taxpayer.

"(iv) The amount of any net earnings from self-employment (as defined in section 1402), wages (as defined in section 3121(a) or 3401(a)), taxable income from a farming business (as defined in section 236A(e)(4)), and investment income for the period reported on the return.

"(v) The total income tax of such taxpayer.

"(vi) Total number of exemptions claimed, or total number of individuals and dependents claimed, as applicable, on the return.

"(vii) Number of children with respect to which tax credits under section 24 are claimed on the return.

"(viii) Amount of any credit claimed under section 25A for the taxable year.

“(ix) Amount of individual retirement account distributions not included in adjusted gross income for the taxable year.

“(x) Amount of individual retirement account contributions and payments to self-employed SEP, Keogh, and other qualified plans which were deducted from income for the taxable year.

“(xi) The amount of tax-exempt interest.

“(xii) Amounts from retirement pensions and annuities not included in adjusted gross income for the taxable year.

“(xiii) If applicable, the fact that any of the following schedules (or equivalent successor schedules) were filed with the return:

“(I) Schedule A.

“(II) Schedule B.

“(III) Schedule D.

“(IV) Schedule E.

“(V) Schedule F.

“(VI) Schedule H.

“(xiv) If applicable, the fact that Schedule C (or an equivalent successor schedule) was filed with the return showing a gain or loss greater than \$10,000.

“(xv) If applicable, the fact that there is no return filed for such taxpayer for the applicable year.

“(C) RESTRICTION ON USE OF DISCLOSED INFORMATION.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Return information disclosed under subparagraphs (A) and (B) may be used by officers, employees, and contractors of the Department of Education, as specifically authorized and designated by the Secretary of Education, only for the purposes and to the extent necessary described in such subparagraphs and for mitigating risks (as defined in clause (ii)) relating to the programs described in such subparagraphs.

“(ii) MITIGATING RISKS.—For purposes of this subparagraph, the term “mitigating risks” means, with respect to the programs described in subparagraphs (A) and (B),

“(I) oversight activities by the Office of Inspector General of the Department of Education as authorized by the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, and

“(II) reducing the net cost of improper payments to Federal financial aid recipients. Such term does not include the conduct of criminal investigations or prosecutions.

“(iii) REDISCLOSURE TO INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION, STATE HIGHER EDUCATION AGENCIES, AND DESIGNATED SCHOLARSHIP ORGANIZATIONS.—The Secretary of Education, and officers, employees, and contractors of the Department of Education, may disclose return information received under subparagraph (B), solely for the use in the application, award, and administration of student financial aid or aid awarded by such entities as the Secretary of Education may designate, to the following persons:

“(I) An institution of higher education with which the Secretary of Education has an agreement under subpart 1 of part A, part C, or part D of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965.

“(II) A State higher education agency.

“(III) A scholarship organization which is designated by the Secretary of Education as of the date of the enactment of the Fostering Undergraduate Talent by Unlocking Resources for Education Act as an organization eligible to receive the information provided under this clause.

The preceding sentence shall only apply to the extent that the taxpayer with respect to whom the return information relates provides consent for such disclosure to the Secretary of Education as part of the application for Federal student financial aid under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965.

“(D) REQUIREMENT OF NOTIFICATION OF REQUEST FOR TAX RETURN INFORMATION.—Subparagraphs (A) and (B) shall apply to any disclosure of return information with respect to a taxpayer only if the Secretary of Education has provided to such taxpayer the notification re-

quired by section 494 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 prior to such disclosure.”

(2) CONFIDENTIALITY OF RETURN INFORMATION.—Section 6103(a)(3) of such Code is amended by inserting “, (13)(A), (13)(B)” after “(12)”.

(3) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 6103(p)(4) of such Code is amended—

(A) by inserting “(A), (13)(B)” after “(13)” each place it occurs, and

(B) by inserting “, (13)(A), (13)(B)” after “(1)(10)” each place it occurs.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to disclosures made under section 6103(l)(13) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (as amended by this section) after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 4. NOTIFICATION OF REQUEST FOR TAX RETURN INFORMATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Part G of title IV (20 U.S.C. 1088 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 494. NOTIFICATION OF REQUEST FOR TAX RETURN INFORMATION.

“The Secretary shall advise students and borrowers who submit an application for Federal student financial aid under this title or for the discharge of a loan based on permanent and total disability, as described in section 437(a), or who request an income-contingent or income-based repayment plan on their loan (as well as parents and spouses who sign such an application or request or a Master Promissory Note on behalf of those students and borrowers) that the Secretary has the authority to request that the Internal Revenue Service disclose their tax return information (as well as that of parents and spouses who sign such an application or request or a Master Promissory Note on behalf of those students and borrowers) to officers, employees, and contractors of the Department of Education as authorized under section 6103(1)(13) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, to the extent necessary for the Secretary to carry out this title.”

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 484(q) (20 U.S.C. 1091(q)) is amended to read as follows:

“(q) reserved”.

SEC. 5. INCREASED FUNDING FOR FEDERAL PELL GRANTS.

Section 401(b)(7)(A)(iv) (20 U.S.C. 1070a(b)(7)(A)(iv)) is amended—

(1) in subclause (X), by striking “\$1,430,000,000” and inserting “\$1,455,000,000”; and

(2) in subclause (XI), by striking “\$1,145,000,000” and insert “\$1,170,000,000”.

SEC. 6. REPORTS ON IMPLEMENTATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than each specified date, the Secretary of Education and the Secretary of the Treasury shall issue joint reports to the Committees on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions and Finance of the Senate and the Committees on Education and Labor and Ways and Means of the House of Representatives regarding the amendments made by this Act. Each such report shall include, as applicable—

(1) an update on the status of implementation of the amendments made by this Act,

(2) an evaluation of the processing of applications for Federal student financial aid, and applications for income-based repayment and income contingent repayment, under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070 et seq.), in accordance with the amendments made by this Act, and

(3) implementation issues and suggestions for potential improvements.

(b) SPECIFIED DATE.—For purposes of subsection (a), the term “specified date” means—

(1) the date that is 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act,

(2) the date that is 120 days after the first day that the disclosure process established under section 6103(l)(13) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended by section 3(a) of this Act,

is operational and accessible to officers, employees, and contractors of the Department of Education (as specifically authorized and designated by the Secretary of Education), and

(3) the date that is 1 year after the report date described in paragraph (2).

MOTION TO CONCUR

Ms. JAYAPAL. Madam Speaker, I have a motion at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Ms. Jayapal moves that the House concur in the Senate amendment to H.R. 2486 with the amendments specified in section 4 of House Resolution 891.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 891, the question shall be divided among two House amendments.

AMENDMENT SPECIFIED IN SECTION 4(A) OF HOUSE RESOLUTION 891

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(a) of House Resolution 891, the portion of the divided question compromising the amendment specified in section 4(a) of House Resolution 891 shall be considered first.

The text of House amendment to Senate amendment specified in section 4(a) of House Resolution 891 is as follows:

In the matter proposed to be inserted by the amendment of the Senate, strike sections 1, 2, and 3 and insert the following:

TITLE I—NO BAN ACT

SEC. 101. SHORT TITLES.

This title may be cited as the “National Origin-Based Antidiscrimination for Non-immigrants Act” or the “NO BAN Act”.

SEC. 102. EXPANSION OF NONDISCRIMINATION PROVISION.

Section 202(a)(1)(A) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1152(a)(1)(A)) is amended—

(1) by inserting “or a nonimmigrant visa, admission or other entry into the United States, or the approval or revocation of any immigration benefit” after “immigrant visa”;

(2) by inserting “religion,” after “sex,”; and

(3) by inserting “, except if expressly required by statute, or if a statutorily authorized benefit takes into consideration such factors” before the period at the end.

SEC. 103. TRANSFER AND LIMITATIONS ON AUTHORITY TO SUSPEND OR RESTRICT THE ENTRY OF A CLASS OF ALIENS.

Section 212(f) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(f)) is amended to read as follows:

“(f) AUTHORITY TO SUSPEND OR RESTRICT THE ENTRY OF A CLASS OF ALIENS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), if the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Secretary of Homeland Security, determines, based on specific and credible facts, that the entry of any aliens or any class of aliens into the United States would undermine the security or public safety of the United States or the preservation of human rights, democratic processes or institutions, or international stability, the President may temporarily—

“(A) suspend the entry of such aliens or class of aliens as immigrants or non-immigrants; or

“(B) impose any restrictions on the entry of such aliens that the President deems appropriate.

“(2) LIMITATIONS.—In carrying out paragraph (1), the President, the Secretary of

State, and the Secretary of Homeland Security shall—

“(A) only issue a suspension or restriction when required to address specific acts implicating a compelling government interest in a factor identified in paragraph (1);

“(B) narrowly tailor the suspension or restriction, using the least restrictive means, to achieve such compelling government interest;

“(C) specify the duration of the suspension or restriction; and

“(D) consider waivers to any class-based restriction or suspension and apply a rebuttable presumption in favor of granting family-based and humanitarian waivers.

“(3) CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Prior to the President exercising the authority under paragraph (1), the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Homeland Security shall consult Congress and provide Congress with specific evidence supporting the need for the suspension or restriction and its proposed duration.

“(B) BRIEFING AND REPORT.—Not later than 48 hours after the President exercises the authority under paragraph (1), the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Homeland Security shall provide a briefing and submit a written report to Congress that describes—

“(i) the action taken pursuant to paragraph (1) and the specified objective of such action;

“(ii) the estimated number of individuals who will be impacted by such action;

“(iii) the constitutional and legislative authority under which such action took place; and

“(iv) the circumstances necessitating such action, including how such action complies with paragraph (2), as well as any intelligence informing such actions.

“(C) TERMINATION.—If the briefing and report described in subparagraph (B) are not provided to Congress during the 48 hours that begin when the President exercises the authority under paragraph (1), the suspension or restriction shall immediately terminate absent intervening congressional action.

“(D) CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term ‘Congress’, as used in this paragraph, refers to the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate, the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate, the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives.

“(4) PUBLICATION.—The Secretary of State and the Secretary of Homeland Security shall publicly announce and publish an unclassified version of the report described in paragraph (3)(B) in the Federal Register.

“(5) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, an individual or entity who is present in the United States and has been harmed by a violation of this subsection may file an action in an appropriate district court of the United States to seek declaratory or injunctive relief.

“(B) CLASS ACTION.—Nothing in this Act may be construed to preclude an action filed pursuant to subparagraph (A) from proceeding as a class action.

“(6) TREATMENT OF COMMERCIAL AIRLINES.—Whenever the Secretary of Homeland Security finds that a commercial airline has failed to comply with regulations of the Secretary of Homeland Security relating to requirements of airlines for the detection of

fraudulent documents used by passengers traveling to the United States (including the training of personnel in such detection), the Secretary of Homeland Security may suspend the entry of some or all aliens transported to the United States by such airline.

“(7) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section may be construed as authorizing the President, the Secretary of State, or the Secretary of Homeland Security to act in a manner inconsistent with the policy decisions expressed in the immigration laws.

“(8) CLARIFICATION.—For purposes of paragraph (1), the term ‘public safety of the United States’ includes efforts necessary to contain a communicable disease of public health significance (as defined in section 34.2(b) of title 42, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulation)).”.

SEC. 104. TERMINATION OF CERTAIN EXECUTIVE ACTIONS.

(a) TERMINATION.—Presidential Proclamations 9645, 9822, and 9983 and Executive Orders 13769, 13780, and 13815 shall be void beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) EFFECT.—All actions taken pursuant to any proclamation or executive order terminated under subsection (a) shall cease on the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 105. VISA APPLICANTS REPORT.

(a) INITIAL REPORTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State, in coordination with the Secretary of Homeland Security and the heads of other relevant Federal agencies, shall submit a report to the congressional committees referred to in section 212(f)(3)(D) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended by section 103 of this title, that describes the implementation of each of the presidential proclamations and executive orders referred to in section 104.

(2) PRESIDENTIAL PROCLAMATION 9645 AND 9983.—In addition to the content described in paragraph (1), the report submitted with respect to Presidential Proclamation 9645, issued on September 24, 2017, and Presidential Proclamation 9983, issued on January 31, 2020, shall include, for each country listed in such proclamation—

(A) the total number of individuals who applied for a visa during the time period the proclamation was in effect, disaggregated by country and visa category;

(B) the total number of visa applicants described in subparagraph (A) who were approved, disaggregated by country and visa category;

(C) the total number of visa applicants described in subparagraph (A) who were refused, disaggregated by country and visa category, and the reasons they were refused;

(D) the total number of visa applicants described in subparagraph (A) whose applications remain pending, disaggregated by country and visa category;

(E) the total number of visa applicants described in subparagraph (A) who were granted a waiver, disaggregated by country and visa category;

(F) the total number of visa applicants described in subparagraph (A) who were denied a waiver, disaggregated by country and visa category, and the reasons such waiver requests were denied;

(G) the total number of refugees admitted, disaggregated by country; and

(H) the complete reports that have been submitted to the President every 180 days in accordance with section 4 of Presidential Proclamation 9645 in its original form, and as amended by Presidential Proclamation 9983.

(b) ADDITIONAL REPORTS.—Not later than 30 days after the date on which the President

exercises the authority under section 212(f) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(f)), as amended by section 103 of this title, and every 30 days thereafter, the Secretary of State, in coordination with the Secretary of Homeland Security and heads of other relevant Federal agencies, shall submit a report to the congressional committees referred to in paragraph (3)(D) of such section 212(f) that identifies, with respect to countries affected by a suspension or restriction, the information described in subparagraphs (A) through (H) of subsection (a)(2) of this section and specific evidence supporting the need for the continued exercise of presidential authority under such section 212(f), including the information described in paragraph (3)(B) of such section 212(f). If the report described in this subsection is not provided to Congress in the time specified, the suspension or restriction shall immediately terminate absent intervening congressional action. A final report with such information shall be prepared and submitted to such congressional committees not later than 30 days after the suspension or restriction is lifted.

(c) FORM; AVAILABILITY.—The reports required under subsections (a) and (b) shall be made publicly available online in unclassified form.

TITLE II—AFFORDABLE PRESCRIPTIONS FOR PATIENTS ACT OF 2020

SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Affordable Prescriptions for Patients Act of 2020”.

SEC. 202. PRODUCT HOPPING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 41 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 26 (15 U.S.C. 57c–2) the following:

“**SEC. 27. PRODUCT HOPPING.**

“(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) ABBREVIATED NEW DRUG APPLICATION.—The term ‘abbreviated new drug application’ means an application under subsection (b)(2) or (j) of section 505 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 355).

“(2) BIOSIMILAR BIOLOGICAL PRODUCT.—The term ‘biosimilar biological product’ means a biological product licensed under section 351(k) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 262(k)).

“(3) BIOSIMILAR BIOLOGICAL PRODUCT LICENSE APPLICATION.—The term ‘biosimilar biological product license application’ means an application submitted under section 351(k) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 262(k)).

“(4) FOLLOW-ON PRODUCT.—The term ‘follow-on product’—

“(A) means a drug approved through an application or supplement to an application submitted under section 505(b) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 355(b)) or a biological product licensed through an application or supplement to an application submitted under section 351(a) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 262(a)) for a change, modification, or reformulation to the same manufacturer’s previously approved drug or biological product that treats the same medical condition; and

“(B) excludes such an application or supplement to an application for a change, modification, or reformulation of a drug or biological product that is requested by the Secretary or necessary to comply with law, including sections 505A and 505B of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 355a, 355c).

“(5) GENERIC DRUG.—The term ‘generic drug’ means a drug approved under an application submitted under subsection (b)(2) or (j) of section 505 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 355).

“(6) LISTED DRUG.—The term ‘listed drug’ means a drug listed under section 505(j)(7) of

the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 355(j)(7)).

“(7) MANUFACTURER.—The term ‘manufacturer’ means the holder, licensee, or assignee of—

“(A) an approved application for a drug under section 505(c) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 355(c)); or

“(B) a biological product license under section 351(a) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 262(a)).

“(8) REFERENCE PRODUCT.—The term ‘reference product’ has the meaning given the term in section 351(i) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 262(i)).

“(9) SECRETARY.—The term ‘Secretary’ means the Secretary of Health and Human Services.

“(10) ULTIMATE PARENT ENTITY.—The term ‘ultimate parent entity’ has the meaning given the term in section 801.1 of title 16, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor regulation.

“(b) PROHIBITION ON PRODUCT HOPPING.—

“(1) PRIMA FACIE.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), a manufacturer of a reference product or listed drug shall be considered to have engaged in an unfair method of competition in or affecting commerce in violation of section 5(a) if the Commission demonstrates by a preponderance of the evidence in a proceeding initiated by the Commission under subsection (c)(1)(A), or in a suit brought under subparagraph (B) or (C) of subsection (c)(1), that, during the period beginning on the date on which the manufacturer of the reference product or listed drug first receives notice that an applicant has submitted to the Commissioner of Food and Drugs an abbreviated new drug application or biosimilar biological product license application and ending on the date that is 180 days after the date on which that generic drug or biosimilar biological product is first marketed, the manufacturer engaged in either of the following actions:

“(A) The manufacturer engaged in a hard switch, which shall be established by demonstrating that the manufacturer engaged in either of the following actions:

“(i) Upon the request of the manufacturer of the listed drug or reference product, the Commissioner of Food and Drugs withdrew the approval of the application for the listed drug or reference product or placed the listed drug or reference product on the discontinued products list and the manufacturer marketed or sold a follow-on product.

“(ii) The manufacturer of the listed drug or reference product—

“(I)(aa) announced withdrawal of, discontinuance of the manufacture of, or intent to withdraw the application with respect to the drug or reference product in a manner that impedes competition from a generic drug or a biosimilar biological product, as established by objective circumstances; or

“(bb) destroyed the inventory of the listed drug or reference product in a manner that impedes competition from a generic drug or a biosimilar biological product, which may be established by objective circumstances; and

“(II) marketed or sold a follow-on product.

“(B) The manufacturer engaged in a soft switch, which shall be established by demonstrating that the manufacturer engaged in both of the following actions:

“(i) The manufacturer took actions with respect to the listed drug or reference product other than those described in subparagraph (A) that unfairly disadvantage the listed drug or reference product relative to the follow-on product described in clause (ii) in a manner that impedes competition from a generic drug or a biosimilar biological product that is highly similar to, and has no clinically meaningful difference with respect

to safety, purity, and potency from, the reference product, which may be established by objective circumstances.

“(ii) The manufacturer marketed or sold a follow-on product.

“(2) JUSTIFICATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (3), the actions described in paragraph (1) by a manufacturer of a listed drug or reference product shall not be considered to be an unfair method of competition in or affecting commerce if—

“(i) the manufacturer demonstrates to the Commission or a district court of the United States, as applicable, by a preponderance of the evidence in a proceeding initiated by the Commission under subsection (c)(1)(A), or in a suit brought under subparagraph (B) or (C) of subsection (c)(1), that—

“(I) the manufacturer would have taken the actions regardless of whether a generic drug that references the listed drug or biosimilar biological product that references the reference product had already entered the market; and

“(II)(aa) with respect to a hard switch under paragraph (1)(A), the manufacturer took the action for reasons relating to the safety risk to patients of the listed drug or reference product;

“(bb) with respect to an action described in item (aa) or (bb) of paragraph (1)(A)(ii)(I), there is a supply disruption that—

“(AA) is outside of the control of the manufacturer;

“(BB) prevents the production or distribution of the applicable listed drug or reference product; and

“(CC) cannot be remedied by reasonable efforts; or

“(cc) with respect to a soft switch under paragraph (1)(B), the manufacturer had legitimate pro-competitive reasons, apart from the financial effects of reduced competition, to take the action.

“(B) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in subparagraph (A) may be construed to limit the information that the Commission may otherwise obtain in any proceeding or action instituted with respect to a violation of this section.

“(3) RESPONSE.—With respect to a justification offered by a manufacturer under paragraph (2), the Commission may—

“(A) rebut any evidence presented by a manufacturer during that justification; or

“(B) establish by a preponderance of the evidence that, on balance, the pro-competitive benefits from the conduct described in subparagraph (A) or (B) of paragraph (1), as applicable, do not outweigh any anti-competitive effects of the conduct, even in consideration of the justification so offered.

“(c) ENFORCEMENT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—If the Commission has reason to believe that any manufacturer has violated, is violating, or is about to violate this section, the Commission may take any of the following actions:

“(A) Institute a proceeding—

“(i) that, except as provided in paragraph (2), complies with the requirements under section 5(b); and

“(ii) in which the Commission may impose on the manufacturer any penalty that the Commission may impose for a violation of section 5.

“(B) In the same manner and to the same extent as provided in section 13(b), bring suit in a district court of the United States to temporarily enjoin the action of the manufacturer.

“(C) Bring suit in a district court of the United States, in which the Commission may seek—

“(i) to permanently enjoin the action of the manufacturer;

“(ii) any of the remedies described in paragraph (3); and

“(iii) any other equitable remedy, including ancillary equitable relief.

“(2) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any provision of section 5, any manufacturer that is subject to a final order of the Commission that is issued in a proceeding instituted under paragraph (1)(A) may, not later than 30 days after the date on which the Commission issues the order, petition for review of the order in—

“(i) the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit; or

“(ii) the court of appeals of the United States for the circuit in which the ultimate parent entity of the manufacturer is incorporated.

“(B) TREATMENT OF FINDINGS.—In a review of an order issued by the Commission conducted by a court of appeals of the United States under subparagraph (A), the factual findings of the Commission shall be conclusive if those facts are supported by the evidence.

“(3) EQUITABLE REMEDIES.—

“(A) DISGORGEMENT.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—In a suit brought under paragraph (1)(C), the Commission may seek, and the court may order, disgorgement of any unjust enrichment that a person obtained as a result of the violation that gives rise to the suit.

“(ii) CALCULATION.—Any disgorgement that is ordered with respect to a person under clause (i) shall be offset by any amount of restitution ordered under subparagraph (B).

“(iii) LIMITATIONS PERIOD.—The Commission may seek disgorgement under this subparagraph not later than 5 years after the latest date on which the person from which the disgorgement is sought receives any unjust enrichment from the effects of the violation that gives rise to the suit in which the Commission seeks the disgorgement.

“(B) RESTITUTION.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—In a suit brought under paragraph (1)(C), the Commission may seek, and the court may order, restitution with respect to the violation that gives rise to the suit.

“(ii) LIMITATIONS PERIOD.—The Commission may seek restitution under this subparagraph not later than 5 years after the latest date on which the person from which the restitution is sought receives any unjust enrichment from the effects of the violation that gives rise to the suit in which the Commission seeks the restitution.

“(4) RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection may be construed as—

“(A) requiring the Commission to bring a suit seeking a temporary injunction under paragraph (1)(B) before bringing a suit seeking a permanent injunction under paragraph (1)(C); or

“(B) affecting any other authority of the Commission under this Act to seek relief or obtain a remedy with respect to a violation of this Act.”.

(b) APPLICABILITY.—Section 27 of the Federal Trade Commission Act, as added by subsection (a), shall apply with respect to any—

(1) conduct that occurs on or after the date of enactment of this Act; and

(2) action or proceeding that is commenced on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

(c) ANTITRUST LAWS.—Nothing in this section, or the amendments made by this section, shall modify, impair, limit, or supersede the applicability of the antitrust laws as defined in subsection (a) of the first section of the Clayton Act (15 U.S.C. 12(a)), and of section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 45) to the extent that it applies to unfair methods of competition.

(d) RULEMAKING.—The Federal Trade Commission may issue rules under section 553 of title 5, United States Code, to carry out section 27 of the Federal Trade Commission Act, as added by subsection (a), including by defining any terms used in such section 27 (other than terms that are defined in subsection (a) of such section 27).

(e) CONFIRMATION.—Upon the request of the Commission, the Secretary shall provide confirmation of—

(1) any request made by the Secretary to the manufacturer for an application or supplement to an application for a change, modification, or reformulation of a drug or biological product;

(2) any withdrawal by the manufacturer of an application for a drug or reference product; or

(3) any request made by a manufacturer to the Secretary for withdrawal of an approval of the application for a drug or reference product or a request for placement of a drug or reference product on the discontinued products list.

SEC. 203. TITLE 35 AMENDMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 271(e) of title 35, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)(C), in the flush text following clause (ii), by adding at the end the following: “With respect to a submission described in clause (ii), the act of infringement shall extend to any patent that claims the biological product, a method of using the biological product, or a method or product used to manufacture the biological product.”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(7)(A) Subject to subparagraphs (C), (D), and (E), if the sponsor of an approved application for a reference product, as defined in section 351(i) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 262(i)) (referred to in this paragraph as the ‘reference product sponsor’), brings an action for infringement under this section against an applicant for approval of a biological product under section 351(k) of such Act that references that reference product (referred to in this paragraph as the ‘subsection (k) applicant’), the reference product sponsor may assert in the action a total of not more than 20 patents of the type described in subparagraph (B), not more than 10 of which shall have issued after the date specified in section 351(l)(7)(A) of such Act.

“(B) The patents described in this subparagraph are patents that satisfy each of the following requirements:

“(i) Patents that claim the biological product that is the subject of an application under section 351(k) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 262(k)) (or a use of that product) or a method or product used in the manufacture of such biological product.

“(ii) Patents that are included on the list of patents described in section 351(l)(3)(A) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 262(l)(3)(A)), including as provided under section 351(l)(7) of such Act.

“(iii) Patents that—

“(I) have an actual filing date of more than 4 years after the date on which the reference product is approved; or

“(II) include a claim to a method in a manufacturing process that is not used by the reference product sponsor.

“(C) The court in which an action described in subparagraph (A) is brought may increase the number of patents limited under that subparagraph—

“(i) if the request to increase that number is made without undue delay; and

“(ii) (I) if the interest of justice so requires; or

“(II) for good cause shown, which—

“(aa) shall be established if the subsection (k) applicant fails to provide information re-

quired under section 351(l)(2)(A) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 262(l)(2)(A)) that would enable the reference product sponsor to form a reasonable belief with respect to whether a claim of infringement under this section could reasonably be asserted; and

“(bb) may be established—

“(AA) if there is a material change to the biological product (or process with respect to the biological product) of the subsection (k) applicant that is the subject of the application;

“(BB) if, with respect to a patent on the supplemental list described in section 351(l)(7)(A) of Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 262(l)(7)(A)), the patent would have issued before the date specified in such section 351(l)(7)(A) but for the failure of the Office to issue the patent or a delay in the issuance of the patent, as described in paragraph (1) of section 154(b) and subject to the limitations under paragraph (2) of such section 154(b); or

“(CC) for another reason that shows good cause, as determined appropriate by the court.

“(D) In determining whether good cause has been shown for the purposes of subparagraph (C)(ii)(II), a court may consider whether the reference product sponsor has provided a reasonable description of the identity and relevance of any information beyond the subsection (k) application that the court believes is necessary to enable the court to form a belief with respect to whether a claim of infringement under this section could reasonably be asserted.

“(E) The limitation imposed under subparagraph (A)—

“(i) shall apply only if the subsection (k) applicant completes all actions required under paragraphs (2)(A), (3)(B)(ii), (5), (6)(C)(i), (7), and (8)(A) of section 351(l) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 262(l)); and

“(ii) shall not apply with respect to any patent that claims, with respect to a biological product, a method for using that product in therapy, diagnosis, or prophylaxis, such as an indication or method of treatment or other condition of use.”

(b) APPLICABILITY.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to an application submitted under section 351(k) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 262(k)) on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This portion shall be debatable for 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

The gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Washington.

□ 1030

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. JAYAPAL. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on H.R. 2486.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise today to bring forward the No BAN Act amendment, and I thank Congresswoman CHU for her leadership on this bill.

In January 2017, President Trump issued the first Muslim ban, a xenophobic policy that has inflicted irreparable harm on Muslims here at home and around the world, a policy that says to Muslims that they are not to be trusted. This is hurtful, harmful to our global relationships, and deeply untrue.

When the ban was implemented, I rushed to the Seattle airport along with Chairman NADLER in New York City. We joined thousands of people in protest. Thanks to these efforts, we successfully secured the release in Seattle of two individuals. But the chaos and the pain that the ban cast upon American citizens, lawful residents, and international visitors can never truly be undone.

Today, new iterations of the Muslim ban and the most recent African ban have kept families separated; American businesses and research institutions can't recruit the best minds from abroad; and our Nation's doors are closed to people seeking safety from violence, war, and persecution.

The bans have hurt our relationships with other countries, harmed refugees, isolated us from our allies, and given extremists propaganda for recruitment. Most important, they do not make our country safer.

And let's be clear: A pandemic is not the time to push forward these xenophobic bans.

Citizens from Muslim-majority nations made up 4.5 percent of the U.S. physician workforce in 2019; and yet, between 2016 and 2018, the number of applicants to the Educational Commission for Foreign Medical Graduates from Muslim-majority countries decreased by 15 percent, a decrease that exacerbates existing gaps in the U.S. physician workforce which is so desperately needed in a time of COVID-19.

It is time to pass the No BAN Act to repeal President Trump's bans and stop any future President from implementing discriminatory bans that send the repugnant message that our foundational values of freedom of religion and liberty and justice for all do not apply.

Today is historic, as the No BAN Act is the first bill to pass the House that directly addresses Muslim civil rights. And we would not be here today without the courage of Muslims and allies across the country, especially the very important people at Muslim Advocates who work to repudiate the Muslim ban and move Congress to action.

This bill sends an important message to Muslims everywhere that America believes in liberty and welcomes people regardless of race or religion.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time, and I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) control the remainder of that time.

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

There was no objection.

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

I rise in opposition to this amendment to H.R. 2486. The majority is actually playing procedural games here by including a nongermane provision to satisfy certain requirements.

The two immigration bills that we are considering today are expensive, make no doubt about it. According to the CBO, the NO BAN Act will increase direct spending by \$290 million over the next 10 years and increase deficits by \$307 million over the same period. And a preliminary estimate from CBO notes that the Access to Counsel Act, which we will debate later today, will increase discretionary spending by at least \$1 billion over the next 5 years.

So the majority had to come up with a pay-for. They opted for prescription drug legislation, but chose to discard bipartisan committee past text to instead include a flawed prescription bill that will stifle investment and research, prevent new medications from coming to market, block truthful advertising, and disincentivize improvements in patient care.

This Congress has unanimously passed six bipartisan bills out of committee to address the costs of prescription drugs. But today, instead of using bipartisan-negotiated text, my colleagues across the aisle have made prescription drugs a partisan issue in an effort to pass partisan immigration bills.

Our President has consistently taken decisive action to help ensure the security of our immigration programs and, thus, the safety of our country. Every time he does so, my Democratic friends cry foul. They attempt to block the President's actions and threaten to take away the President's power.

The Department of Homeland Security has identified several types of information that it needs in order to make a reliable decision regarding the admissibility of a foreign country's nationals seeking entry to the United States. This includes things like:

Does the country report lost or stolen identity documents, including passports, to Interpol, and how often do they do so?

Does the country share information about their known or suspected terrorists or about their criminals with us?

Does the country issue modern electronic passports?

These are clearly important things to know when determining whether to let a foreign national enter our country.

Instead of expressing appreciation for what this President has been able to accomplish with regard to security, my colleagues have decided to consider this No BAN Act, which effectively eviscerates the ability of the administration to take quick and decisive action to protect our homeland when concerns arise, even action to prevent

entry of aliens based on a global health crisis like COVID-19.

Until the President signed the first travel executive order in January of 2017, very few had ever heard of the Immigration and Nationality Act section 212(f) authority. This provision provides the President broad latitude to impose restrictions on the entry of aliens or classes of aliens into the United States when such entry "would be detrimental to the interests of the United States." And this authority has been used successfully by Presidents Ronald Reagan, Barack Obama, and others.

Pursuant to the travel executive order, the President required the Secretary of DHS and Secretary of State, along with the Director of National Intelligence to determine what countries failed to meet international standards of information sharing or identity management or were at a risk of terrorism or public safety concern and to report their findings to him.

Based on that assessment and the recommendations of the Secretaries, the President placed travel restrictions on seven nations. Pursuant to the continued review of countries and an updated report in January, the President issued a proclamation imposing narrowly tailored travel restrictions on six additional countries: Burma, Eritrea, Kyrgyzstan, Nigeria, Sudan, and Tanzania.

It is important to understand that such restrictions are not permanent. When a country comes into compliance with the information sharing and other requirements, they can be removed from the list of restricted countries, and that has actually happened under this administration, for instance, Chad in 2018. And press reports note that the Government of Nigeria immediately began working to come into compliance.

The President's use of 212(f) authority has helped improve our security and the vetting of foreign nationals seeking entry into the United States. As the DHS Assistant Secretary for Threat Prevention and Security Policy testified last September: "One country reinstated a dormant program to help identify convicted criminals. Three countries have adopted more secure e-Passports. Two countries obtained access to Interpol databases for the first time. And eight countries began reporting lost and stolen passports to Interpol for the first time or they improved the regularity of that reporting."

These are not insignificant improvements to the world's security. The No BAN Act would take 212(f) authority from the elected President and give it to an unelected subordinate who is not accountable to voters.

Under this bill, only the Secretary of State can determine that the entry of aliens is a threat to the U.S. This is problematic in instances where other Cabinet officials should be involved, such as Health and Human Services or Treasury.

The bill's undefined and broad terms, "least restrictive means" and the "notion of harm," are ripe for litigation, especially considering the bill's expansive judicial review provision and explicit class action allowance.

The No BAN Act also contains onerous reporting requirements, consultation with Congress before the President can act, and Federal Register publication of information about the action taken and the circumstances necessitating the action. But does it make sense for the U.S. Government to broadcast the deficiencies they have identified since those would likely be exploited by bad actors seeking to do us harm?

Perhaps the most ridiculous of the bill's provisions is section 4, which not only terminates the travel executive orders in place but, incredibly, ceases all actions taken pursuant to any proclamation or executive order terminated by the bill. That means that information sharing on terrorists, criminals, and other security threats that has developed between the United States and other countries with travel restrictions would end.

This bill is a knee-jerk response by my Democratic colleagues because of the disapprobation of President Trump, and it would undermine the safety and security of Americans.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the No BAN Act, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, H.R. 2214, the National Origin-Based Antidiscrimination for Nonimmigrants Act, or the No BAN Act, is critical legislation that will stop executive overreach, defend Congress' role in establishing our Nation's immigration laws, and right one of the original sins of the Trump administration: the Muslim ban.

When the Trump administration issued its first version of the ban in January 2017, it was immediately apparent that it was unconstitutional, discriminatory, and morally reprehensible. Its chaotic rollout only magnified the cruelty underlying this policy.

When news first broke that people were being detained at the airports, I immediately rushed to JFK Airport that morning along with Congresswoman VELÁZQUEZ. Within hours, we were joined by hundreds of demonstrators demanding justice. What we found was chaos and heartbreak. Refugees, people with valid visas, and even legal permanent residents, people who had assisted American troops and saved their lives in Iraq were prevented from entering the country or even speaking with their attorneys.

We met people like Hameed Khalid Darweesh, an Iraqi who put his life on the line for 10 years to work with American and coalition forces as a translator. He underwent a years-long extensive vetting process to secure a

Special Immigrant Visa granted to people who assist our military in Iraq and Afghanistan. In return for his efforts, this hero was welcomed to the United States with a door slammed in his face and a grueling ordeal at the airport as he pleaded for his freedom.

I am pleased that Congresswoman VELÁZQUEZ and I were able to work with officials in New York and Washington to secure his release eventually, but we should never have had to do that. That is not the country we are proud to represent in Congress. We do not betray those who save American troops.

Although the President's initial Muslim ban was ultimately blocked by numerous courts, in 2018, after protracted litigation and several court injunctions, the Supreme Court unfortunately upheld the third version of the ban, Presidential Proclamation 9645.

The Court reached this decision based on its broad reading of section 212(f) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, which authorizes the President to "suspend the entry of all aliens or any class of aliens" when the President finds that such entry "would be detrimental to the interests of the United States."

I strongly disagree with the Court's broad interpretation of that provision. Section 212(f) was intended to give the President discretion to quickly address emergent issues involving public health, national security, public safety, or international stability. It was not intended to provide carte blanche authority to the President to ban large categories of individuals without justification or to rewrite immigration laws with which he disagrees.

That is why this legislation is so important. H.R. 2214 will repeal these shameful bans and stop executive overreach by amending 212(f) to prevent any President from using it in a manner that is unlawful or unconscionable.

The United States has always been and must continue to be a place that welcomes and embraces people of all religions and all nationalities. But as a result of the Muslim ban, our country's reputation as a beacon of hope, tolerance, and inclusion for those fleeing persecution, reuniting with their families, or simply seeking a better life has been forever tarnished.

I would like to thank my friend and colleague Representative CHU for introducing this legislation and for her leadership and commitment to this issue.

I also want to thank the NO BAN coalition, led by Muslim Advocates, and all of the many organizations whose support was vital to bringing this bill to the floor today. It is long overdue.

Madam Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support the NO BAN Act, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1045

Mr. BIGGS. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOODEN).

Mr. GOODEN. Madam Speaker, I thank Congressman BIGGS for yielding.

I rise today in opposition to the NO BAN Act, which would tie the hands of our executive branch, restricting our ability to act quickly and decisively to defend America from her enemies.

The President must have authority to act when our national security is at risk. When a situation demands we halt travel into our country, whether that be to protect us from a pandemic or other national security issue, the President must have the power to do so.

Democrats, on March 11 of this year, debated this very measure in the form of a bill, ironically, the same day that President Trump instituted his ban on European travel. Because they knew the optics would look bad, they pulled the bill down. If it was a bad bill then, it is a bad bill today.

Congress gave the President the authority we are discussing today when we passed, many decades ago, the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the years since, our courts have affirmed that authority on numerous occasions.

So why, then, do my Democratic colleagues want to take this critical authority away?

I would like to read an excerpt from a 1986 decision out of the D.C. Circuit, in which the court stated that the very authority we are debating today ensures that "the Executive would not be helpless in the face of such a threat" of an alien who posed a danger to the United States.

Furthermore, the court stated that "the President's sweeping proclamation power thus provides a safeguard against the danger posed" to our national security.

What far right extremist, ultra-conservative judge wrote those words? No other than Ruth Bader Ginsberg.

The safety and security of the American people should not be a partisan issue. It ought to be everyone's highest priority. We should not jeopardize the well-being of our citizens for the sake of political victories. If enacted, the NO BAN Act would put American lives and our country's national security at risk.

Madam Speaker, I will be opposing this dangerous policy, and I urge my colleagues to oppose it as well.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. JUDY CHU), the sponsor of the bill.

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Madam Speaker, I thank Chairman NADLER for his leadership in bringing the NO BAN Act for a vote on the floor today.

Three years ago, when President Trump first took office, within 1 week, he announced the first Muslim ban.

I will never forget that terrible day in January of 2017. I was on my way to a community event when I received a frantic call about 50 Muslims with green cards who were being detained at LAX for hours, with no end in sight.

At that moment, I decided to drop everything and help in any way I could. I rushed over to LAX to advocate for

these people. Once I arrived, I found out that, indeed, there were scores of people with a legal right to be here kept for hours without food and blocked from receiving legal advice from an attorney.

With this action, Trump was immediately creating chaos and separating families with no justification. It was outrageous. When I pressed Customs and Border Protection for answers, they resisted and blocked me. I even got them on the phone, only to have them hang up on me.

I had never been more disrespected as a Member of Congress, but disrespect and chaos is what this Muslim ban is all about. Since then, the administration has steadily worked to make it harder and harder for individuals to come to the United States, which has meant keeping families and loved ones apart.

Partners and spouses have been kept apart for years at a time. Children have missed parent's funerals. Parents have missed children's weddings, birthdays, and graduations. Families have been languishing, wondering when they will be reunited, all because of a policy born from prejudice. This is a cruel abuse of power that must be stopped.

The NO BAN Act repeals all versions of the Muslim ban, including the travel ban imposed in February of this year that includes many African countries. It limits the President's authority to ban people from entering the United States unless there is a clear justification. The President would have to consult with the Departments of Homeland Security and State before implementing a ban and would have to brief Congress within 48 hours.

Let me make clear that this bill would not have impacted our ability to fight the COVID-19 pandemic in any way, as it does not interfere with the ability of a President to restrict immigration due to public health concerns.

Madam Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to vote in favor of this historic legislation which sends a strong message to our communities that you cannot be discriminated against based on your religion or national origin.

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

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the Speaker of the House.

Ms. PELOSI. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I thank him for his leadership in bringing this legislation to the floor.

Madam Speaker, I pay special tribute to Congresswoman CHU, the chair of the caucus in the House that represents the Asian Pacific American community, and PRAMILA JAYAPAL, a member of the Judiciary Committee, instrumental in bringing this legislation as well, the NO BAN Act, and, again, the right to counsel legislation.

As I was thinking of this legislation today—I have a statement for the record, but I was thinking back to the

“rump” hearing that we had under the leadership of the Judiciary Committee at the time the NO BAN was announced. The distinguished chair, Ms. CHU, talked about how people reacted at the airports and the rest—among them, John Lewis—going to the airport.

But at this hearing, it was so remarkable, because people turned out. Diplomats showed up and spoke for their colleagues who were still in the diplomatic service, saying how wrong this was. They took professional risk as members of our diplomatic corps. There were around a thousand of them who signed a statement opposing this ban.

The military was there, our men and women in uniform. They were there saying: You are hurting us. We have made promises to interpreters and others who have helped us in Iraq and Afghanistan—they were Muslim—and now they can't come to the United States? It is wrong on its face, but we are not even keeping our word. Who will trust us? Who will trust us if we don't have respect for people?

Some military who were Muslim—actually Khizr Khan was there, a Gold Star father, he came and was very brief in his testimony. He had some good advice about what we could do about this.

But our men and women in uniform who are Muslim were hearing this, in Khizr Khan's case, a Gold Star family whose son had given his life for our country, a Muslim, and now we were saying there is going to be a Muslim ban.

What was interesting, though, was that a leader of the evangelical community was there. And this bill is sending a strong message. It is repealing all versions of the Muslim ban, the refugee ban, and the asylum ban, rescinding each cruel version of the President's discriminatory bans, including his executive order mandating extreme vetting for refugees and asylum seekers.

Well, the person who was there, and the record will show, representing the evangelicals, he said in his testimony that the United States Refugee Resettlement Program is the crowning glory of American humanitarianism, and here this President is rejecting that focus of who we are as a country and the model we should be.

In fact, all this administration has done is diminish the opportunities for those who would come here—some for fear of persecution, others because they had helped us, and others because of the Statue of Liberty, again, a beacon of hope to the world that is constantly undermined by this administration.

So, Madam Speaker, I salute the maker of this amendment, Chairwoman JUDY CHU. I salute PRAMILA JAYAPAL, who has been relentless, persistent on this matter, and I thank all of our colleagues who fought so hard.

Just to recall, we remember the day after the inauguration that women turned out in huge numbers not only in

Washington, but all over the country and all over the world. They knew the power of their presence.

So, when this came shortly thereafter, people understood the power of their presence, and people showed up at airports and wherever a manifestation of support for our Muslim community was needed. It was really quite a defining time for our country, because people knew their power and the power of their presence, being there, being there for everyone in our country.

So, Madam Speaker, I am very grateful to the makers of this motion, to the Judiciary Committee. And to Chairman NADLER, I thank him for giving us this opportunity to honor what the Statue of Liberty means to us and to the world.

Then just go look at Ronald Reagan's statements about the Statue of Liberty and the beacon of hope that it is to the world and contrast it to the attitude that we see coming out of this White House now.

I hope we have a good, bipartisan vote on this repeal of the Muslim ban and the access to counsel that goes with this legislation.

Madam Speaker, on the base of the Statue of Liberty, which is a beacon of freedom and hope for the world, are inscribed these words: “Give me your tired, your poor/ Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free/ Send these, the homeless, tempest-tossed to me.”

I rise to join my colleagues in support of the “NO BAN” Act to rescind the President's Muslim ban, which betrays everything the Statue of Liberty and our nation stand for.

I salute Congresswoman JUDY CHU, Chair of the Congressional Asian Pacific American Caucus, and the lead on this legislation—which is the first Muslim civil rights bill in our nation's history.

Thank you also to Congresswoman PRAMILA JAYAPAL for her leadership to ensure that those unjustly detained have access to legal counsel.

It is particularly senseless that the President continues to inflict his Muslim ban on the country as we face the COVID-19 pandemic.

These bans harm the economy and public health by depriving our nation of the researchers, scientists, physicians and other medical professionals desperately needed to crush the virus.

More than 100,000 medical professionals in our country are from just two of the countries included in the ban.

Overall, the ban has led to a 15 percent drop in new physicians from Muslim-majority countries coming to America.

These bans fuel anti-Muslim discrimination, which sadly, the White House is encouraging, when it misleads the public and says that the bans are needed to keep us safe—when in reality, the bans only weaken our response, by banning doctors and medical professionals from our shores.

At the same time, the bans erode our national security and devastate families: separating families and preventing thousands from attending loved ones' births, graduations, marriages and funerals. One study finds that these bans have prevented more than 9,000 family members of U.S. citizens from entering the country, including more than 5,500 children.

More than 400 national, state and local civil rights, faith-based, national security and community groups, from AFSCME and Amnesty International to United We Dream and Veterans for Peace, have spoken out to demand passage of the NO BAN Act to “end the harmful Muslim Ban and put in place vital protections against future discriminatory bans.”

“The NO BAN Act is a clear and unequivocal response to the Muslim Ban that would ensure no one can be banned from our country based on religious or nationality-based discrimination ever again.

“Regrettably, the Muslim Ban validates the worst stereotypes about Muslims; that they are inherently foreign and violent and pose such a threat to the United States they should be banned.

“The ban on Muslims comes after generations of politicians hostile to religious minorities have attempted to ban Jews, Catholics, and Latter-day Saints. Congress now has an opportunity to take action against the Muslim Ban and this troubling history by sending a strong message that our nation rejects religious bigotry.”

With this bill, Congress is sending that strong message. We are:

Repealing all versions of the Muslim ban, the refugee ban, and the asylum ban—rescinding each cruel version of the President's discriminatory bans, including his executive order mandating “extreme vetting” for refugees and asylum seeking;

Strengthening immigration law to explicitly prohibit discrimination based on religion—and ensuring that it applies to non-immigrant visas, entry into the U.S. and the approval of any immigrant benefit; and

Limiting executive authority to prevent any president from issuing future bans like the Muslim ban—imposing strict requirements before any future restrictions can be issued & enacting reporting requirements to Congress to create an oversight mechanism for the future.

The Democratic House will always stand up to defend our values. As Pope Francis said, “It's hypocrisy to call yourself a Christian and chase away a refugee or someone seeking help.”

I urge a strong bipartisan vote to put an end to this act of callousness and discrimination from the White House.

Madam Speaker, I urge a strong “yes” vote.

Mr. BIGGS. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the Speaker's invoking President Reagan, because in 1981, President Reagan used 212(f) authority to suspend entry of undocumented aliens from the high seas, so I appreciate her reminding us of the use of 212(f) by Reagan.

Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS).

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I thank Representative BIGGS for yielding.

Representative BIGGS just highlighted, frankly, the problem, Madam Speaker, that we see in this, and it has been reiterated over and over again.

This is not about a policy. This is about a person. It is about a person, the President, who the other side, and especially this committee that I have served as ranking member on and now

serve as a member of, has consistently gone after for, now, almost 19 months.

It has nothing to do with policies that at one point they did or did not believe in because, if this were true, we would have had a mass outcry in 2011 when President Obama used this authority to keep out folks because of human rights issues and other things.

So, again, the problem here is it is great to couch this in political terms; it is great to couch this in great, deep policy issues; but, for 18 months, this is all that we have heard.

I heard my chairman just a minute ago speak about how these policies that he disagrees with and doesn't like that are found under the law and that we are dealing with here today in this so-called NO BAN Act have tarnished us. Well, I will tell everybody what is tarnishing us in this country. It is acts like this and the constant back-and-forth.

There are times I have wondered—and I know my friend from Arizona has as well. We have talked about this a little bit. I have wondered why we have sort of kept the House locked down for the last 5 or 6 months, but if this is what we come back to do, maybe we should just stay away, because if this is what we are doing, it is, frankly, frustrating, because November 3 will be the chance to talk about this.

It is very policy and politically driven when we come to this floor on anything that really has to do with a political agenda, when there is a date on the calendar, as I talked about before, more than actually changing policy, because when you look at this, I will almost guarantee you that my friends currently in the majority, if they had a President of their party in the White House, they would come back on this very quickly and be very scared of messing with this power Presidentially.

This is a problem that we are seeing over and over and over and over again.

This NO BAN Act would strip the President of his ability to use the Immigration and Nationality Act to ban travel from certain countries that present national security concerns.

Ironically, as I said earlier, this is the very power that President Trump used in January to deal with the coronavirus in China. If this were in place, he may not have had the ability to actually work on what we know now as the pandemic early on to help stop the spread.

There are consequences to political legislation. This is one of them. We saved countless lives because of that, and now they want to strip the President of the authority to do that.

Now, others may say, well, we have got exceptions and we have got this. I am not taking anything from this committee on exceptions for this President. There have not been any. It is simply a partisan attack.

□ 1100

The Department of Homeland Security has identified several types of in-

formation that it needs in order to make a reliable decision regarding the admissibility of a foreign country's nationals to seek entry into the United States; things like: Does the country report lost or stolen identity documents, including passports, to Interpol, and how often they do so?

Does the country share information about their known or suspected terrorists or about their criminals with us?

And does the country issue modern electronic passports?

Why would we want to restrict the President, any President, from considering this information when determining whether to let a foreign national into our country?

Instead of appreciating what has been done here by this President with regard to our national security, like addressing the crisis on our border and China's increasingly hostile behavior, the Democrats have decided to move forward with this act, which we have talked about before in our committee and have pointed out many of the problems of this act. It eviscerates the ability of any administration to take nimble and decisive action to protect our homeland when cause for concern arises, like the threat of COVID-19.

What is even more ironic, and I touched on this when I first started, Madam Speaker, is that the very power that the majority wants to strip from this President was used successfully by President Barack Obama and also—as was pointed out by my friend from Arizona—by the Speaker of this House, currently, and Ronald Reagan.

When we understand this, this actually clarifies—it actually crystallizes it. So when you see every other President has used this in some form over the years, and it has only become a concern now because we do not like the current President, Donald Trump, and we have an election coming up very quickly, then we start seeing stuff like this.

In January 2017, President Trump signed an executive order to restrict travel from certain countries that were at a high risk of terrorism and were public safety concerns, based off recommendations from the Secretaries of DHS and State, along with the DNI.

It is important to understand these restrictions are not permanent. This is, again, another thing that permeates even some conversations I have heard already that we are making permanent changes. These are not permanent. They are there until the country gets it in order and are actually able to answer our security concerns, which is not going to be talked about today. We are not talking about security. We are trying to make it feel like it is something else against certain groups and ethnic groups. This is about security.

When you look at the law, and it says, when those public safety concerns are removed, they are removed from the restricted list, such as Chad was in 2018.

Let me be clear; there is no doubt the President's use of the 212(f) authority

has helped us improve our security and the vetting of foreign nationals seeking entry into the U.S. Some countries restricted by this order have taken positive steps to come into compliance with the information-sharing and public safety standards and have worked to participate in protecting international security.

Is that not what we would want? Or is what is being said by the majority today that we prefer lax standards for those coming here; we prefer less safety for our people of people coming here. Is that the standard being left here?

I don't think the majority wants to go there, but it is seemingly implied by what is being said. Because this is actually working with countries to come into modern-day compliance with known safety and international safety regulations.

This bill would take authority away from the President and give it to a subordinate. Again, strange move here; taking the Presidential authority. It goes back and shows the real intent of this bill is about this President, not about the law.

It would also outrageously terminate "all actions taken pursuant to any proclamation or executive order," effectively shutting down the information sharing on terrorism, criminals, and security threats that have come from these restrictions. This is dangerous, Madam Speaker, and it is a bad policy.

This bill is just another response, knee-jerk response, by the majority because they don't like the President and they don't like the decisions he makes on behalf of the country. Unfortunately, their never-ending desire to take him down comes at the expense of American security and safety if this bill were to become law.

Fortunately, we know it will not; another day of political posturing on the floor of the House, wreaking havoc on our borders, backlogging our customs process. And here is the interesting one that nobody has talked about that I have heard so far. I may have missed it, but I don't think I did.

Me and the gentleman from Arizona, we understand something. Everything coming here today has a price tag. This one does as well, \$1 billion.

But then this is really where it gets concerning, Madam Speaker, because I have tried my best over the years to work with the majority, and I see some of my friends over there that we have passed legislation with that have made an impact in this country.

But here is what really bothers me. How do they pay for it? How does the majority pay for this?

The majority, Democrats, have decided to include in this bill a prescription drug measure that could have been by bipartisan, and was bipartisan, if only they had abided by the agreed-upon text negotiated by Members in both parties.

Instead, we are considering an old, partisan version of a prescription drug

bill that will undermine critical innovation. We negotiated bipartisan changes to stop gaming while preserving the research that benefits patients, but the Democrats in the majority have abandoned that and, with this bill, they have abandoned any hope of showing the American people they truly want to legislate, instead of just constantly attacking this President.

But what is of deeper concern here, especially when it comes to prescription drug costs—because I don't want to hear my friends in the majority now talk about how they want to save money, and how they want to encourage innovation. When they put this into this bill, they have torn down bipartisan work that could actually save money. They have got to pay for it somehow.

I know their counsel; I know they are struggling right now. We have to pay for it somehow.

Well, then why not go back to the bipartisan process of working on prescription drugs, instead of throwing it into this NO BAN Act?

The majority's moral underpinning is severely damaged when you look at the fact that they are trying to play games with the prescription drug issue in our country on this bill; when we know, for a fact, that bipartisanship was the way forward on this, and I had worked with, and others had worked to bring a bipartisan solution. And now we throw it out the door because we are so bent on making a political statement on this floor that bipartisanship is gone. We might as well pack it up and wait for November 3. That hurts this body.

As the chairman of this committee in this House talked about just a moment ago about tarnishing the work in the world standing by what the President has done, are we really not going to have a conversation, Madam Speaker, about what is happening?

And I know—Madam Speaker, you do as well—concern about what happens here, concern about actually getting something done, concern about the very people that are lifted up by the majority and the minority, saying we are here for the American people. But when I see pay-fors like this, when I see the pay-for happening here, I know that this is not anything but another day on the campaign trail.

We are here today, making a political statement, and you know who is going to suffer? The very ones—I don't want to hear it from anybody in the majority today talking about how they want to help healthcare; how they want to bring prescription drug costs down; how they want to get at the very issues that we are dealing with. Because today you are going to go on record when you vote for this, by saying we don't care about the American people's fixing prescription drugs and getting healthy in this country. This today proves you have nothing to do.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congresswoman CHU for this important statement that is necessary for the American people: In God, We Trust. And the God we trust is a merciful God.

144,000 people dead from COVID-19. It is important when an administration, no matter who it is, fails the American people, the United States Congress must be the one that deals with that failure, and that is what the NO BAN Act stands for. It stands for expanding the INA's nondiscrimination provision to prohibit discrimination based on religion and extends the prohibition on discrimination beyond the issuance of immigrant visas to include the issuance of nonimmigrant visas, entry, admission to the United States, and the approval or revocation thereof.

I had an amendment that is added to this that makes it a surety that the administration report to Congress on the impacts of positive, negative, and unintended actions by the President. We must have oversight.

I stand in the name of Ali, a 17-year-old. When I landed from Washington, I went straight to the terminal immediately on that Friday. My tears were coming to my eyes as I saw little Ali denied entry into the United States.

That is why I am here. I support the NO BAN Act.

Madam Speaker, as an original cosponsor and senior member of the Committee on the Judiciary, I rise in strong and enthusiastic support of H.R. 2214, the "National Origin-Based AntiDiscrimination For Non-Immigrants Act, or No BAN Act, which stops executive overreach by preventing the president from abusing his authority to restrict the entry of non-citizens into the United States under section 212(f) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA).

This legislation also repeals several of the President's section 212(f)-based executive actions, including his original Muslim ban as well as the most recent expansion of the ban announced in January 2020.

Madam Speaker, I support this legislation because the NO BAN Act amends section 212(f) of the INA to place checks and balances on the President's authority to temporarily suspend or restrict the entry of aliens or classes of aliens into the United States, when it is determined that such individuals "would undermine the security or public safety of the United States or the preservation of human rights, democratic processes or institutions, or international stability."

Specifically, the bill requires the President to find and document that any suspension or restriction: (1) is based on specific and credible facts; (2) is narrowly tailored; (3) specifies a duration; and (4) includes waivers.

The NO BAN Act expands the INA's nondiscrimination provision to prohibit discrimination based on religion and extends the prohibition on discrimination beyond the issuance of immigrant visas to include the issuance of nonimmigrant visas, entry and admission into the United States, and the approval or revocation of any immigration benefit.

The NO BAN Act terminates several of President Trump's proclamations and executive orders invoking section 212(f) authority, including Presidential Proclamation 9645, also

known as the "Muslim Ban," and Presidential Proclamation 9983, barring the entry of immigrants from Burma (Myanmar), Eritrea, Kyrgyzstan, and Nigeria, and suspending participation in the Diversity Visa program for nationals of Sudan and Tanzania.

Madam Speaker, I am pleased that the NO BAN Act includes an important amendment I offered during the committee markup of the legislation, which requires the Administration to report to Congress on the impacts—positive, negative, and unintended—of any action taken by the President pursuant to executive orders he has or will issue pursuant to section 212(f) of the INA.

I strongly support the provision in the legislation that nullifies the President's latest executive order which adds the countries of Belarus, Myanmar, Eritrea, Kyrgyzstan, Nigeria, Sudan and Tanzania to the President's new and offensive Muslim Ban.

As a co-chair of the Congressional Nigerian Caucus, the United States cannot afford to hamper diplomatic relations with Nigeria due to its importance in the region.

Nigeria is the largest economy and most populous country in Africa with an estimated population of more than 190 million, which is expected to grow to 400 million by 2050 and become the third most populous country in the world after China and India.

The United States is the largest foreign investor in Nigeria, with U.S. foreign direct investment concentrated largely in the petroleum and mining and wholesale trade sectors.

At \$2.2 billion in 2017, Nigeria is the second largest U.S. export destination in Sub-Saharan Africa and the United States and Nigeria have a bilateral trade and investment framework agreement.

In 2017, the two-way trade in goods between the United States and Nigeria totaled over \$9 billion.

Due to many of the residents of these countries practicing Islam, the President's executive order has been appropriately nicknamed the "Muslim Ban", and only exemplifies the xenophobic and prejudiced mindset that is unacceptable in this country.

With countries such as Nigeria, Sudan, Tanzania, and Eritrea, being considered as additions to the travel ban list, I strongly oppose this discriminatory act.

Tanzania is also an important partner of the United States, and through numerous presidential initiatives, the United States has provided development and other assistance to Tanzania for capacity building to address health and education issues, encourage democratic governance promote broad-based economic growth, and advance regional and domestic security to sustain progress.

Although Sudan has had some internal issues during the last decade, the U.S. was a major donor in the March 1989 "Operation Lifeline Sudan," which delivered 100,000 metric tons of food into both government and rebel held areas of the Sudan, thus, averting widespread starvation.

The United States established diplomatic relations with Eritrea in 1993, following its independence and separation from Ethiopia.

The United States supported Eritrea's independence and through a concerted, mutual effort that began in late 2017 and continues today, there are vast improvements to the bilateral relationship.

U.S. interests in Eritrea include supporting efforts for greater integration of Eritrea with

the rest of the Horn of Africa, encouraging Eritrea to contribute to regional stability and partner on shared peace and security goals, urging progress toward a democratic political culture, addressing human rights issues and promoting economic reform and prosperity.

Although the law contains a waiver program that allows residents of these countries to enter the country if they meet certain standards, this program is arbitrary and unfairly creates a separation of families, provides less work opportunities and greatly reduces the opportunity to apply for visas in the future, unless it is repealed.

A comprehensive and coordinated strategy needs to be developed in coordination with the United States Congress to ensure that each country affected by this law may peacefully have its residents enter the United States and complete visa and asylum applications.

We live in a nation of laws but we also live in a nation that seeks to establish and maintain diplomatic ties to these important African nations and imposing a discriminatory and arbitrary ban would adversely affect foreign relations with a critical continent for decades to come.

Madam Speaker, in light of the crisis presented by current COVID-19 pandemic, the NO BAN Act contains a provision to ensure that the President can use section 212(f) to protect the United States from the spread of communicable diseases, including the 2019 coronavirus, by suspending the entry of a class of individuals if the President determines their entry would undermine the public safety of the United States.

However, to remove any perceived ambiguity and avoid the propensity of this president to abuse delegated authority, the legislation includes language to clarify that the term “public safety” “includes efforts necessary to contain a communicable disease of public health significance.”

Madam Speaker, the NO BAN Act is supported by a bipartisan coalition of the nation’s leading immigrants’ rights organizations, faith-based organizations, and civil rights organizations, including the following:

American Civil Liberties Union; Church World Service; U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops; Muslim Advocates Immigration Hub; Asian Americans Advancing Justice Association; Americans United for Separation of Church and State; Bend the Arc; Center for American Progress; The Public Affairs Alliance of Iranian Americans; Interfaith Immigration Coalition; Human Rights Campaign; Franciscan Action Network; HIAS; Jewish and Muslims and Allies Acting Together; Religious Action Center of Reform Judaism; National Council of Jewish Women; National Iranian American Organization Action; National Immigration Law Center; International Refugee Assistance Project; Friends Committee on National Legislation; Engage Action; and Airbnb.

I urge all Members to vote for H.R. 2214 and send a powerful message to the President and the American people that this House will not stand idly by as this Administration tries to abandon America’s well-earned and long-established reputation of being the most welcoming nation on earth.

Mr. BIGGS. Madam Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time is left?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Arizona has 11 minutes remaining. The gentleman from New York has 17½ minutes remaining.

Mr. BIGGS. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE), the minority whip.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Arizona for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this bill. And when you think about where we are as a country, we are in the middle of a global pandemic. And at the beginning of this, after China lied—and let’s be very clear—China lied, not only to the United States, but to the entire world about this disease that started in Wuhan.

And what they did, while they were lying, they corrupted the World Health Organization, that entity that typically we all would look to for guidance, and WHO literally was regurgitating the Chinese Communist Party’s talking points, saying it wasn’t spread from human-to-human contact, which was a lie. And we now have evidence to show that they manipulated and deceived the rest of the world.

While they were doing that, Madam Speaker, they were hoarding PPE. They were not only buying it up around the world, they make most of it in China. We need to change that, by the way.

We should be spending our time here on the House floor, not limiting the President’s ability to keep Americans safe, which, fortunately, President Trump was able to do. He did so effectively, properly; he stopped flights coming in from China when we knew the disease was coming from China, for goodness sake.

Why would you want to stop the President from being able to keep Americans safe?

What we should be spending our time on right now, Madam Speaker, is bringing more manufacturing back to America so we don’t need to rely on China, because they told even American companies like 3M that were making PPE, you can’t ship it back to the United States when our nurses and doctors need it.

So President Trump said, we are going to use the Defense Production Act. We are going to start making more of that here in America.

We need to put incentives to bring more of that back from China, so we are not relying on them.

But no, we are not spending our time on that today, Madam Speaker. We are spending our time with this bill that would limit and make it more difficult for the President of the United States, any President—just because some people don’t like this President, they are going to make it harder for any President to keep Americans safe, whether it is from terrorists abroad, or whether it is for health pandemics that might break out again in the future.

This is lunacy that we would be trying to make it harder for a President to keep Americans safe. Thank good-

ness President Trump used his executive powers to act like he did to stop the disease from spreading more into this country. He saved thousands of lives.

If China wouldn’t have lied to him, we would have had a few more weeks. There is data that shows scientifically that tens of thousands of lives would have been saved in America.

But at least the President was able to act when he had the proper information. I know people like Joe Biden said it was xenophobic, for goodness sake; criticized the President stopping people from coming in from the place where the disease started. And others criticized him for doing it as well. But it was the right thing to do. I am glad he took that action.

The last thing we need to be doing in the middle of this pandemic is making it harder for the President to keep Americans safe. I urge everybody to vote “no” on this bill.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES).

Mr. JEFFRIES. Madam Speaker, America is a Nation of immigrants; some voluntary, others involuntary. John Lewis would often remind us, however, that while we may have come over on different ships, we are all in the same boat now.

We are a gorgeous mosaic of people from throughout the world, different races, different regions, yes, different religions; that is what makes America a great country, not xenophobia.

Donald Trump’s hateful Muslim ban is unacceptable, unconscionable, and un-American. It is inconsistent with the principles of religious freedom and tolerance embedded in the First Amendment of the United States Constitution. That is why we are going to make it unlawful.

Vote “yes” on the NO BAN Act.

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

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

Mr. CICILLINE. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2214, legislation that will repeal the President’s shameful Muslim ban, and strengthen our immigration system by ensuring immigration decisions are not made on the basis of religious discrimination.

In the face of religious intolerance, Roger Williams established the great State of Rhode Island on the principles of religious liberty and separation of church and State. These are important principles that were ultimately incorporated into our founding documents.

In fact, President Washington, addressing the Hebrew congregation at Touro Synagogue, wrote in a famous letter in 1790, when they asked, Will we have religious freedom in this new country? He wrote those words: “For happily the Government of the United States gives to bigotry no sanction, to persecution no assistance.”

And what has been the result of this religious discrimination, this Muslim ban? It has resulted in mothers and fathers being separated from their American children. Foreign students are prevented from studying at our Nation's great universities; and doctors from countries under the ban aren't able to come here to provide care to patients in the United States, despite healthcare shortages across the Nation during a global health pandemic.

□ 1115

In addition to that, Madam Speaker, this legislation violates the founding principles of this country of religious freedom. I am very proud that this legislation is being brought to the floor so that we can reaffirm that important principle not only in the founding documents of our country but in the present immigration laws and their application.

In addition to that, there has been a lot of discussion about how we are paying for this. I am very proud that this legislation includes provisions of the Affordable Prescriptions for Patients Through Promoting Competition Act, which will save taxpayers over half a billion dollars in the form of lower prescription drug prices. All across the country, prescription costs are skyrocketing. People are going bankrupt and even dying because they can't afford prescription medication.

H.R. 2214 addresses product hopping, an anticompetitive tactic used by Big Pharma to protect and extend their monopolies over certain prescription drugs, leading to dramatically higher prices. This legislation expressly prohibits hopping under the FTC Act, and the bill is subject to the same equitable remedies, including restitution and disgorgement of profits. So, all this talk about folding into the pay-for would actually produce lower prescription drug prices for Americans, and somehow that is a bad idea? Give me a break.

This bill reasserts the prohibition against religious discrimination, one of the most important founding principles of this country, and it pays for it by delivering lower prescription drug prices for the American people.

Madam Speaker, I thank Chairman NADLER, Congresswoman CHU, and Congresswoman JAYAPAL for their great work, and I urge my colleagues to pass this bill.

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

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN).

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, let us not forget who we are. Our Framers rebelled against centuries of religious oppression, Inquisition, Holy Crusades, witchcraft trials, and state religion. They conceived America as a haven of refuge for people fleeing from religious and political persecution from all over the world. It would become an "asylum

for humanity," said Tom Paine—not an insane asylum, mind you, but an asylum for freedom.

The President's Muslim ban desecrates this vision with the kind of religious discrimination that our Nation was created to oppose.

The NO BAN Act now strikes down the President's infamous Muslim ban proclamation and restores the principle of no religious discrimination to the immigration process. It will be a proud day for this Congress when we invalidate the President's infamous and ugly attempt to scapegoat people based on their religion.

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

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. CORREA).

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

Madam Speaker, in January of 2017, when President Trump issued his first Muslim ban executive order, I immediately rushed to LAX to help those individuals who were being held at LAX. These were individuals who had been cleared by our State Department to enter the United States. Let me repeat: These were individuals who had been cleared by our State Department to enter the United States, and then they were blocked by the President's random order.

I immediately introduced my first bill, the DIRE Act, to provide due process guaranteed by our Constitution for Dreamers, immigrants, and refugees, due process that has been systematically denied by a President.

Our Nation is built by immigrants who dare to dream better, immigrants who came to this country with nothing but their dreams of a better life.

Madam Speaker, I urge passage of this bill.

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

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Colorado (Mr. NEGUSE).

Mr. NEGUSE. Madam Speaker, today, I rise in support of the NO BAN Act, a powerful bill that preserves the promise of America and rejects this administration's xenophobic and anti-Muslim immigration policies.

The President's reckless bans on majority Muslim and African countries do not align with our American values or the unique promise that this country has offered immigrants and refugees for centuries. It will not make us safer, and it is yet another example of this administration's haphazard and cruel immigration policies.

I am proud that I was able to successfully offer an amendment during the Judiciary Committee's markup, with the chairman's support, that added this President's latest ban to the underlying bill. It is not only the right thing to do for our country but also a matter very personal to me.

As many in this Chamber know, my parents came to America nearly 40 years ago as refugees from Eritrea, one of the very countries that this President has targeted in his latest ban. My parents' ability to start a new life in this country offered me and my family freedom, opportunity, and the privilege to truly experience the American Dream. There are countless success stories like my family's waiting to be told, stories that won't be written if this body does not pass this NO BAN Act today.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleague to support it.

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

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. ROSE).

Mr. ROSE of New York. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the NO BAN Act to finally repeal the racist and discriminatory Muslim bans that have stained our Nation for the past 3 years.

The Muslim ban undermines everything that this great country stands for, the greatest country in the history of the world.

It has torn apart my constituents' families and trapped their loved ones in war zones and refugee camps. It has made Muslim Americans feel like second class citizens in their very own country. They are Americans just as much as I.

This ban has done nothing to make us safe. Senator John McCain, in fact, once called the ban a self-inflicted wound in the fight against terrorism.

The administration's own officials admit this does absolutely nothing to protect our country. The State Department says that just one-tenth of 1 percent of the people blocked from this country under the Muslim ban was deemed a security risk. Those stats do not lie. DHS cannot point to a single threat that our existing immigration policies and systems would not have handled.

If we are going to fight for this country to fulfill its promise, this ban must be overturned.

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

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. OMAR).

Ms. OMAR. Madam Speaker, it gives me great pride to rise today in support of the NO BAN Act.

Our friends on the other side of the aisle might try to obscure the reality here by pointing to the Muslim countries that are not on the ban. The White House has tried to wrap their hateful policy up in a false story about national security, but we know the truth.

I have spoken countless times, both before and since I have entered this office, about the hateful brutality of the Muslim ban.

Today, I want to celebrate the work that brought us to this point. I want to

celebrate the countless Americans who went to the airport the day the first ban was announced. I want to celebrate the thousands of State Department employees who signed the dissent memo and those who resigned in protest. I want to celebrate Congresswoman CHU and Senator COONS for their tireless work on overturning this ban.

Today's vote is a culmination of all of their work, starting at the grassroots level. We have been in the struggle together, and we will continue to be in it until this ban is in the dustbin of history.

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

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL).

Mrs. DINGELL. Benjamin Franklin once famously said that those who would give up liberty for security deserve neither.

My home, Dearborn, Michigan, is home to the largest population of Arab Americans in this country. They are constantly targeted very irrationally. Yet, Michigan, unfortunately, also lays claim to the Michigan Militia, which was responsible for one of the worst acts of terrorism in this country.

Muslims, Arab Americans, are my neighbors. They are my friends. They are doctors, teachers, and pharmacists. They are part of this country.

Policies like the Muslim travel ban have no place in the United States of America. It disrespects freedom of religion, and it is unconstitutional.

National security experts have been clear that the Muslim ban has made our country less safe. In fact, strong national security policies include protecting the fundamental pillars of our democracy: freedom of religion, freedom of speech, compassion, and justice. We must stand together as Americans against unjust policies like this.

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

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. LEE of California). Both sides have 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MALINOWSKI).

Mr. MALINOWSKI. Madam Speaker, when President Trump first announced the Muslim ban, we were told it was temporary, 90 days, according to the executive order, or until we "figure out what the hell is going on," in the President's own words.

It has been 3½ years. Hundreds of thousands of Americans, including many of my own constituents, are still cut off from their loved ones, missing births, missing weddings, and missing funerals.

We are still not admitting refugees to this country for the first time since we turned back Jews fleeing Hitler before World War II. And by now, we know exactly what is going on.

It has nothing to do with national security, and it never did. There has never been a deadly terrorist attack carried out in America by someone from any of these countries. One of them is Iran, after all, a country whose people have themselves been targeted for extinction by ISIS.

How many times do we hear from the administration that we stand by the people of Iran even as we ban them from visiting our country?

These good people were sacrificed for a cheap campaign promise. They were hurt, and our country's ideals were betrayed, because someone decided it would be easier to seek scapegoats than solutions to our country's problems. It is wrong, and it should stop.

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

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Speaker, I thank Chairman NADLER for yielding and for his tremendous leadership. Also, I want to thank Congresswomen Chu and Jayapal for their tremendous and steady leadership and strong support of H.R. 2214, the NO BAN Act.

This important legislation would end the Muslim ban and prohibit discrimination and migration on the basis of religion and national origin.

Let me be clear. This is a landmark piece of civil rights legislation not only for Muslims but for our country's values. Our Nation was founded by, shaped by, and continues to be influenced by our immigrant communities who contribute so much to this country. Equating Muslims with terrorists is against our values as a nation. It is despicable.

Make no mistake, the NO BAN Act would help ensure that this kind of discrimination ceases, prevents future such discrimination, and promotes our core values of religious freedom.

Madam Speaker, we cannot allow President Trump's White nationalist agenda to continue. We must ensure that our country is open to everyone, not just those whom Trump deems acceptable. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this bill.

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

□ 1130

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

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. ESPAILLAT).

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Madam Speaker, when we heard of the Muslim ban being implemented, many New Yorkers, including our chairman, Congressman NADLER, rushed to JFK Airport to help families. What I witnessed there in many cases was, in fact, Muslim mem-

bers of our Armed Forces were trying to be reunited with their mother, with their spouse, and they were being denied.

As I entered the space, I was surrounded by Customs and Border Patrol officers, and we fought to make sure that these folks could unite. And so we witnessed the pain of a spouse without a husband, a son without a mother, a father without a child.

Madam Speaker, this is not American. This is not American at all. But what was witnessed there and across the country was the best of our Nation, the spirit of our Nation, the fact that we would not be split along racial, ethnic, or religious lines.

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

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. TLAIB).

Ms. TLAIB. Madam Speaker, I rise today to declare loudly and clearly to every Muslim and every African person in Michigan's 13th District, in America, and around the world that the United States House of Representatives is taking action to end this administration's racist ban.

Madam Speaker, I rise to send a message to marginalized communities everywhere that, in repealing the Muslim and African ban, we are also preventing discriminatory bans from ever happening again.

Madam Speaker, I rise as a mother of two wonderful Muslim-American boys, Adam and Yousif, to say that Muslims and Muslim Americans are our family members, our friends, and our neighbors—and, yes, they are Members of Congress.

Madam Speaker, it appears that this White House might not like that fact very much because this racist ban is a Federal endorsement of anti-Muslim rhetoric and discrimination in our country, but today we are coming together to finally put a stop to this.

End the Muslim and African ban.

End all discriminatory bans forever.

Mr. BIGGS. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ).

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of the NO BAN Act.

I remember when the Muslim ban was first implemented in January 2017, I went to JFK Airport with Chairman NADLER to demand the release of travelers being detained there. One of them was an Iraqi translator who had risked his life working for the U.S. Army in Iraq. His reward was being caught up in this hateful Trump administration policy.

At the airport that day, I saw two Americas: Inside the airport was an America characterized by prejudice, weakness, and fear; but outside, where

thousands gathered to oppose this hateful policy, I saw the America I know, an America of strength and compassion.

Madam Speaker, today, as we vote on this bill, we are being asked to choose between these two visions. We can choose a weak, bigoted America that says there is no place for our Muslim brothers and sisters or for Black people, or we can choose an America that lives up to its highest ideals, that welcomes those from around the world seeking a better life.

Mr. BIGGS. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER).

Mr. BEYER. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of JUDY CHU's NO BAN Act.

In the words of John Lewis: "When you see something that is not right, not fair, not just, you have to speak up; you have to do something."

The NO BAN Act is doing something. It is stating in clear, powerful legislation that America will never again let racism or religious intolerance be a barrier to lawful immigration. We will not allow ignorance or xenophobia to dictate America's immigration policies.

Our strength has always—always—been our diversity.

A functional Muslim ban or a ban of entire countries simply because they comprise a race or a religion that some President does not like is not just evil, it is stupid. Watch which American communities recover most quickly from the pandemic—those with the most diverse populations.

Madam Speaker, I stand here today, as I stood at the airport at the onset of the ban, to ensure our immigration system cannot be hijacked by hatred.

Mr. BIGGS. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI).

Ms. MATSUI. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the NO BAN Act.

Today is about our commitment to the most sacred of American ideals: to celebrate our diversity. But this administration has embarked on a crusade to demonize immigrants and our Muslim-American community.

Americans and their families have been targeted because of their religious beliefs, their race, and their ethnicity. Because of this bigotry, families and loved ones have been separated, unable to celebrate milestones or face hardships together.

Madam Speaker, I stand here today because one of the greatest and most beautiful things about our country is the diversity of people, views, and perspectives. We cannot allow an administration to upend our immigration system and upend our ideals. We must always stand up and speak out.

Madam Speaker, I remember my grandparents' and parents' stories about World War II, when they were ostracized and ultimately removed to internment camps. Let's not forget this past xenophobic history.

Madam Speaker, I am proud to support this bill, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. BIGGS. Madam Speaker, I am prepared to close, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, you have heard a lot of incendiary language regarding the travel restrictions. The most incendiary language is always calling it "incendiary," "a white nationalist agenda," "racist," "hateful," et cetera.

Was it xenophobic, was it racist, was it hateful when the Obama administration implemented travel bans to the same seven nations?

Was it?

No. Nor is it here either.

Madam Speaker, that kind of language is meant to incite public ridicule and distract from the real issue here.

As the Supreme Court noted, the text in this bill says nothing about religion. And as they went on to say: "The policy covers just 8 percent of the world's Muslim population and is limited to countries that were previously designated by Congress or prior administrations"—read, Obama administration—"as posing national security risks."

That is not a Muslim ban. This is a legitimate travel restriction implemented for the safety of this Nation.

Additionally, I heard from multiple friends across the aisle a straw man argument, a true straw man argument here, that this ban was religious in nature. But if that were the case, they would have stopped it after inserting religion with other proscriptions. But instead, they built up a huge bureaucratic apparatus to limit the authority of the President of the United States. So it is a straw man argument.

Madam Speaker, the chairman mentioned that the Supreme Court ruling, in his opinion, was without justification, and so I am going to read what the Supreme Court said: "The President lawfully exercised that discretion based on his findings—following a worldwide, multiagency review—that entry of the covered aliens would be detrimental to the national interest."

The sole prerequisite, they said, is for the President to find that the entry of the covered aliens "would be detrimental to the interests of the United States."

But the President fulfilled that requirement by first ordering DHS and other agencies to conduct a comprehensive evaluation of every single country's compliance with the information and risk assessment baseline.

That is what this policy was built upon. It is consistent with the Obama administration and the previous administrations.

But for whatever reason, and I think we all can surmise what that may be,

when this President conducts an even more thorough evaluation of these nations and their processes and then issues a proclamation setting forth those extensive findings describing deficiencies in those practices—and, by the way, I am going here based on the Supreme Court decision again—in the practices of select foreign governments, several of which are state sponsors of terrorism, it is somehow xenophobic, a white nationalist agenda, racist, and hateful. But when the previous administration did it and actually came back to Congress and added three more nations, it wasn't.

The only ad hominem attack I would ever make here is that it surely seems potentially hypocritical to me. No visas would be revoked pursuant to P.P. 9645 or 9983. Individuals subject to those Presidential proclamations who possess a valid visa or valid travel document were permitted to travel and continue to be admitted to travel in this country.

To call it a Muslim ban is meant to incite—and I will say, we do terrible on this side of the aisle. My friends across the aisle, when you find that peg to hang your hat on, heck of a great job, because everybody uses it. It is very effective, but it is highly misleading.

What this bill does is it emasculates the very notion of executive power in the President. It really does. The idea, because you want to emasculate the power of President Trump.

But what it does is it gives more power to the bureaucratic state, more power to the bureaucratic state. So the timeline is also going to prevent the President from acting quickly on this.

These are the issues that we have just been distracted from, because it certainly appears—and I will say, my friend from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), when she talked about symbolism in her speech, she is right. This is symbolic. This bill is symbolic. It is symbolic, if you will, of a hatred of this President. Because when the previous President's administration did this, not a peep. This administration does the same thing, and it is outrageous.

Madam Speaker, the implementation was not great. They have admitted the implementation was not great, but that is an implementation problem, not a policy problem. And you want to change the entire policy and the entire structure not because the policy was bad—if it were, we would have heard about it the last 40 years—but, instead, because the original implementation was bad.

The Supreme Court has upheld what this administration did because what they did was conduct a thorough vetting of their own policy regarding these nations and those nations' policies in implementing safety mechanisms, and so they fulfilled that. Here we are today, saying: You know what? Because it is President Donald Trump, this is bad.

Madam Speaker, they are going to pass this bill. There is no doubt they

are going to pass this amendment. But never forget the inherent inconsistency with the act that you are going to do on this bill with what you have done in the previous administrations.

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

□ 1145

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

Madam Speaker, I find it extremely disingenuous to deny the nature of the Muslim ban. You know why? Because the President told us so. He told us he was going to institute a Muslim ban, and then he did it. And every country he put on the list was Muslim. Every country he has added to the list was Muslim.

Only Muslims and Muslim countries pose threats to the United States of any nature; no one else in the world does? How stupid does he think we are?

This is a Muslim ban. It has been. It is an abuse of his office. It is an abuse of the law. It must be repealed. The honor of the United States must be redeemed. And that is why this dishonorable, hateful policy must be repealed. And that is why we must vote for this bill, to redeem the honor of the United States from the disgusting religious bigotry supported by the President and instituted by the President in this ban.

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

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

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2214 the "National Origin-Based Antidiscrimination for Non immigrants Act," or NO BAN Act. I wish this bill was not necessary, but unfortunately, it is now more imperative than ever.

As a result of the President's relentless attempts to rewrite our immigration laws, we must take immediate steps to rein in his repeated abuse of executive authority.

As a candidate for president, Donald Trump promised to ban all Muslims from entering the United States, suggesting—without any evidence—that it would somehow make our country safer. Immediately upon entering office, he tried to make good on that promise.

Ultimately, it took the President 10 months, 3 attempts, and the inclusion of a sham waiver process to craft a ban that stood up to Supreme Court scrutiny.

In a decision rightly criticized by Justices Breyer and Sotomayor—and many of us in this chamber—the majority concluded that despite statements calling for a "total and complete shutdown of Muslims entering the United States," the President's ban was somehow not inspired by blatant religious animus. Seeking to distance itself from these remarks, the Administration later claimed that the ban was necessary to keep our country safe from terrorist threats. And yet, a bipartisan coalition of more than 50 former national security officials found that rather than making our country safer, the ban actually undermines U.S. national security.

H.R. 2214 not only invalidates the various iterations of the Muslim Ban, it also amends

the authority the President relied on in invoking the ban—section 212(f) of the Immigration and Nationality Act. But rather than gutting it, as some of my Republican colleagues have claimed, H.R. 2214 maintains its basic structure, and incorporates checks and balances to ensure that it can no longer be so flagrantly abused.

H.R. 2214 will thus ensure that section 212(f) can only be used in a manner consistent with its intended purpose and historical norms, and that no President—Democratic or Republican—will be able to utilize it to usurp congressional authority.

I would like to thank my friend and colleague, Representative CHU for her leadership and steadfast commitment to this issue. Her efforts led to the introduction of this legislation and I urge all of my colleagues to support the NO BAN Act.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the No BAN Act.

This bill is being framed as a "religious freedom" initiative. I have fought for religious freedom throughout my career. I know what religious freedom means. This bill is not about religious freedom. It is about scoring cheap political points against President Trump.

The President is granted broad authority to take quick action to limit the entry of foreign nationals into the United States. This is needed for a variety of reasons, including national security and public health. Whether it is addressing shortcomings in a certain country's vetting and information sharing or limiting the potential influx of coronavirus cases, we entrust the Executive Branch to keep America safe.

President Trump's actions have been mislabeled as a "Muslim Ban." But that is not the case. There is no religious test anywhere in the President's travel restrictions. North Korea, an essentially religious-less society, is one of the countries included. Myanmar, another country affected, is more than 80 percent Buddhist. Indonesia, which was not included in the covered travel restrictions, has the largest percentage of the world's Muslim population at over 12 percent.

Rather than try to paint with a broad brush, we should look at the causes of these travel restrictions. Eritrea—Does not comply with the established identity-management and information-sharing criteria. Kyrgyzstan—Does not comply with the established identity-management and information-sharing criteria. Nigeria—Does not comply with the established identity-management and information-sharing criteria. And so on.

This isn't about religious freedom. It is only about convincing people it is.

In addition to the deficiencies of the underlying policy, the Majority has made a mistake in including the Senate version of pharmaceutical legislation as its pay-for.

Last year, the House Judiciary Committee worked on a bipartisan basis to advance two important bills. One to reduce the burdens of patent litigation when a company seeks to bring a complicated biosimilar drug to market. And another to create a new antitrust authority to prevent companies from playing games that could artificially suppress generic competition.

Chairmen JERROLD NADLER and DAVID CICILLINE were great partners to me and then-Hanking Member DOUG COLLINS in that effort. It was refreshing during a time of increasingly partisan hostility to work together in a thought-

ful manner to address drug pricing in the country.

Unfortunately, rather than take up that bill, the Majority has simply ignored our weeks of careful negotiation and has chosen instead to blindly attach the Senate language.

The shortcomings of this version of the legislation were already addressed in committee. The text included in the No BAN Act gives the FTC the authority to find a company liable even if all they do is introduce an improved version of a product and then make truthful and non-misleading statements about the new product. This will undoubtedly stifle innovation. Why would any company invest the necessary research dollars to introduce a new product, if they can be held liable for truthful marketing of that product? In Committee, we fixed that.

The bill we're voting on today is also out of step with current antitrust law. It would completely change the remedy and enforcement authority under traditional antitrust law, and for no obvious reason, apply those changes exclusively to just one industry. In Committee, we fixed that.

I find it troubling that the Majority is choosing to abandon the good faith negotiations and bipartisan work. The gentlemen from New York and Rhode Island worked with the Minority to come up with a good product that addresses drug pricing through regular order. The committee process works. We should be voting on the legislation that passed the Judiciary Committee by a voice vote. Not this version.

I oppose this legislation and urge my colleagues to do the same.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 891, the previous question is ordered on this portion of the divided question.

The question is: Will the House concur in the Senate amendment with the House amendment specified in section 4(a) of House Resolution 891?

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

Mr. NADLER. 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, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

AMENDMENT SPECIFIED IN SECTION 4(b) OF
HOUSE RESOLUTION 891

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 891, the portion of the divided question comprising the amendment specified in section 4(b) of House Resolution 891 shall now be considered.

The text of House amendment to Senate amendment specified in section 4(b) of House Resolution 891 is as follows:

In the matter proposed to be inserted by the amendment of the Senate, strike sections 4, 5, and 6 and insert the following:

**TITLE III—ACCESS TO COUNSEL ACT OF
2020**

SEC. 301. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the "Access to Counsel Act of 2020".

SEC. 302. ACCESS TO COUNSEL AND OTHER ASSISTANCE AT PORTS OF ENTRY AND DEFERRED INSPECTION.

(a) ACCESS TO COUNSEL AND OTHER ASSISTANCE DURING INSPECTION.—Section 235 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1225) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(e) ACCESS TO COUNSEL AND OTHER ASSISTANCE DURING INSPECTION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall ensure that a covered individual has a meaningful opportunity to consult with counsel and an interested party during the inspection process.

“(2) SCOPE OF ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall—

“(A) provide the covered individual a meaningful opportunity to consult with counsel and an interested party not later than one hour after the secondary inspection process commences and as necessary throughout the inspection process, including, as applicable, during deferred inspection;

“(B) allow counsel and an interested party to advocate on behalf of the covered individual, including by providing to the examining immigration officer information, documentation, and other evidence in support of the covered individual; and

“(C) to the greatest extent practicable, accommodate a request by the covered individual for counsel or an interested party to appear in-person at the secondary or deferred inspection site.

“(3) SPECIAL RULE FOR LAWFUL PERMANENT RESIDENTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Homeland Security may not accept Form I-407 Record of Abandonment of Lawful Permanent Resident Status (or a successor form) from a lawful permanent resident subject to secondary or deferred inspection without providing such lawful permanent resident a reasonable opportunity to seek advice from counsel prior to the submission of the form.

“(B) EXCEPTION.—The Secretary of Homeland Security may accept Form I-407 Record of Abandonment of Lawful Permanent Resident Status (or a successor form) from a lawful permanent resident subject to secondary or deferred inspection if such lawful permanent resident knowingly, intelligently, and voluntarily waives, in writing, the opportunity to seek advice from counsel.

“(4) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(A) COUNSEL.—The term ‘counsel’ means—

“(i) an attorney who is a member in good standing of the bar of any State, the District of Columbia, or a territory or a possession of the United States and is not under an order suspending, enjoining, restraining, disbarring, or otherwise restricting the attorney in the practice of law; or

“(ii) an individual accredited by the Attorney General, acting as a representative of an organization recognized by the Executive Office for Immigration Review, to represent a covered individual in immigration matters.

“(B) COVERED INDIVIDUAL.—The term ‘covered individual’ means an individual subject to secondary or deferred inspection who is—

“(i) a national of the United States;

“(ii) an immigrant, lawfully admitted for permanent residence, who is returning from a temporary visit abroad;

“(iii) an alien seeking admission as an immigrant in possession of a valid unexpired immigrant visa;

“(iv) an alien seeking admission as a non-immigrant in possession of a valid unexpired non-immigrant visa;

“(v) a refugee;

“(vi) a returning asylee; or

“(vii) an alien who has been approved for parole under section 212(d)(5)(A), including

an alien who is returning to the United States in possession of a valid advance parole document.

“(C) INTERESTED PARTY.—The term ‘interested party’ means—

“(i) a relative of the covered individual;

“(ii) in the case of a covered individual to whom an immigrant or non-immigrant visa has been issued, the petitioner or sponsor thereof (including an agent of such petitioner or sponsor); or

“(iii) a person, organization, or entity in the United States with a bona fide connection to the covered individual.”

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) SAVINGS PROVISION.—Nothing in this title, or in any amendment made by this title, may be construed to limit a right to counsel or any right to appointed counsel under—

(1) section 240(b)(4)(A) (8 U.S.C. 1229a(b)(4)(A)),

(2) section 292 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1362), or

(3) any other provision of law, including any final court order securing such rights,

as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This portion shall be debatable for 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS) each control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 5581, the Access to Counsel Act of 2020.

Last September, the Judiciary Committee and the House Foreign Affairs Committee held a hearing to explore the Muslim ban, including the chaos that unfolded at airports across the country when it was first announced.

I can personally attest to that chaos, based on my experience at JFK Airport immediately after the ban was implemented. Refugees, individuals with valid visas, and even lawful permanent residents of the United States were detained for hours and prevented from speaking with attorneys. Some even had their phones taken away and were unable to call their family members.

Although the issue grabbed the headlines then, it is unfortunately a problem that occurs daily. Due to the complexity of the U.S. immigration law and the fact-intensive nature of questions regarding admissibility, it is not uncommon for some people to spend hours undergoing inspection by U.S. Customs and Border Patrol.

During this time, individuals are often prevented from communicating with those on the outside. And if the individual is lucky enough to have a lawyer, CBP will often refuse to speak with them, even if they can provide critical information or correct a legal error.

Moreover, serious consequences can result from being refused admission. For example, an individual who is given an expedited removal order is barred from returning to the United States for 5 years.

H.R. 5581 will ensure that no one who presents themselves at a port of entry with valid travel documents is completely cut off from the world during inspection. H.R. 5581 allows such individuals, including U.S. citizens, to communicate with counsel and other parties if they are subjected to secondary inspection that lasts longer than one hour.

To be clear, this bill does not provide a right to counsel, nor does it impose any obligation on the Federal Government to pay for or otherwise provide counsel to individuals during CBP inspection proceedings. I wish it did, but it doesn't. This is confirmed by the fact that the Congressional Budget Office found that H.R. 5581 would have no effect on direct spending or revenues.

I would like to extend a special thanks to my colleague, Representative JAYAPAL, for her leadership on this issue and for championing this bill. I encourage my colleagues to support it, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to this amendment to H.R. 2486.

The Access to Counsel Act of 2020 is a way for the majority to test how far they can go toward their ultimate goal of taxpayer-funded counsel at every stage of the immigration process. I think we just heard that, that that is a stated goal.

Many immigration interest groups have made no mystery of the fact that they believe foreign nationals have a right to come to the United States and should all receive taxpayer-funded counsel at every stage of the process.

My colleagues across the aisle understand that it is currently a bridge too far to repeal outright the Immigration and Nationality Act provision that prohibits taxpayer-funded counsel during removal proceedings. But this amendment is a step forward in their march in that direction.

The bill mandates that the DHS Secretary shall ensure that an individual who has been selected by Customs and Border Protection for secondary screening at a port of entry has a meaningful opportunity to consult with counsel and an interested party during such screening.

It is important to understand exactly what secondary screening is, why it is used, and the ramifications that this bill would have on the port of entry operations.

My colleagues across the aisle provided the Judiciary Committee no opportunity to hear from DHS experts about any of these issues. There was no hearing on this legislation or even generally on the subject matter at hand.

CBP is extremely concerned about the impact the requirements of this

bill would have on processing at ports of entry. Many of us have been to airports and seen the long lines of passengers from abroad waiting to be processed. We have been to land ports of entry and seen lines of passenger vehicles and cargo trucks that literally wait for hours for the opportunity to enter the U.S. The Access to Counsel Act would exponentially increase those processing and wait times.

Secondary inspection is used at ports of entry to give CBP officials time for additional screening that may take longer than the normal case. It can include more in-depth questioning, additional database searches, and physical searches when an individual is suspected of carrying contraband.

Secondary inspection is done in an area near the primary inspection booths. It serves to remove those whose admissibility may be in question from the primary inspection line so as to not slow the line down.

The vast majority of the over 400 million people admitted the United States annually do not get referred to secondary inspection, but about 17 million do.

Most ports of entry buildings and other infrastructure are not equipped to allow multiple counsel consultations at the same time. That means longer wait times and backlogs for entry. Allowing 17 million people to consult with counsel or some other interested party will bring legitimate trade and travel to a grinding halt.

Of course, slowing down of trade and travel processing isn't the only concern with H.R. 5581. Under current regulations adopted in 1980, applicants for admission are not entitled to representation in primary or secondary inspections, unless the applicant has become the focus of a criminal investigation and has been taken into custody.

But this bill gives all applicants for admission to the U.S., including non-immigrants and lawful permanent residents, a new statutory right to counsel. This idea is based on the belief that everyone has a right to enter the U.S., and it is a first step toward what many of our Democrat colleagues ultimately want, taxpayer-funded counsel for foreign nationals.

In addition, there are serious concerns with what constitutes interested parties under the bill. The term is defined to include practically anyone, including any relative of the covered individual, the petitioner or sponsor of a visa, or anyone with a bona fide connection to the covered individual.

This could result in a scenario where a covered individual is referred for secondary inspection because he is believed to be smuggling drugs or some other contraband and then places a call to tip off his accomplices.

The Access to Counsel Act is a bad idea that would unduly hinder legitimate trade and travel. I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to

the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL).

Ms. JAYAPAL. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary for his tremendous work and leadership on bringing these important issues to the floor.

I am very proud that the House is considering my bill today, the Access to Counsel Act, H.R. 5581. It is a commonsense measure that would ensure that U.S. citizens, green card holders, and other people with legal status are able to consult with an attorney when Customs and Border Protection detains them for over an hour.

I introduced this bill, Madam Speaker, as my first bill when I got to Congress, and it was in the wake of the Muslim ban. It was in the wake of that chaos that was unleashed at airports across the country as people from seven Muslim-majority countries found themselves detained for hours, in some cases pressured to sign papers giving up their legal status, and in many cases deported.

More often than not, these people did not even have the opportunity to see an attorney or even call anyone. They did not even have the opportunity to use the restrooms or to get water and food.

Since then, however, Madam Speaker—it isn't just that moment—there have been numerous cases of students detained for long periods at airports and sent back, despite holding valid visas secured after undergoing rigorous vetting by the State Department. One student was detained and deported in spite of a court order saying that he should be allowed to stay until a court could review his case.

And earlier this year, we saw no less than 200 people of Iranian American descent detained at the northern border in Blaine, Washington, for up to 12 hours with no access to counsel. These lengthy detentions occurred while CBP repeatedly denied that Iranian Americans were being targeted for different treatment.

Many of the people impacted were U.S. citizens, as well as elderly people and children. Some had even undergone extra vetting to participate in a program designed for trusted travelers at the northern border.

A month later, CBP Acting Commissioner Mark Morgan said that border officials "got a little overzealous in their actions," but the damage, Madam Speaker, had already been done. There were children of U.S. citizens—they themselves U.S. citizens—who watched their parents be detained and treated in a way that no American citizen should go through. No person should go through that type of indignity and disrespect.

If my bill were enacted into law, it would ensure that any time CBP detains people with lawful status, then those individuals would simply have the right to call a lawyer and receive assistance. It does not stop CBP from doing its job; it does not create a right

to counsel for everyone. This is just a simple phone call to their attorney.

So I would like to thank those who bravely came forward to share their stories, to make clear the Access to Counsel Act is desperately needed, and I urge my colleagues to vote "yes."

Mr. BIGGS. Madam Speaker, just to point out, this bill does not say anywhere this contact will be limited to a simple phone call. Nowhere does it say that.

Madam Speaker, I will reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume again to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL).

Ms. JAYAPAL. Madam Speaker, I just wanted to quote directly from section 2 of my bill: "The Secretary of Homeland Security shall provide the covered individual a meaningful opportunity to consult with counsel and an interested party not later than one hour after the secondary inspection process commences and as necessary throughout the inspection process, including, as applicable, during deferred inspection."

So again, this could be a phone call. "Meaningful access" is a broad term and it takes into account my colleague from the other side's concerns.

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

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I am prepared to close.

□ 1200

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

Madam Speaker, I am interested in the interpretation of the term "meaningful opportunity." I tried a lot of cases in my career. I did both prosecution and criminal defense extensively. I can tell you what a meaningful opportunity would be as counsel. It would be sitting there with my client face-to-face, getting all the information possible.

If the intention was to include, specifically, a simple phone call, that is what should have been put in here. That is what should have been put in this bill, but it wasn't. So, when I read it, I think of places I have been to all along the border, having grown up in southern Arizona, and I have taken and led many congressional delegations over the last 3½ years.

I think of the Antelope Wells Port of Entry. I think about that being about a 4-hour drive for the Customs and Border Protection officers that manned that or worked there, that staffed that. I think, well, what is the communications like there? It is not good. It is not good. It is extremely remote. The nearest town on the Mexican side of the border is 60 miles away. The nearest town on the New Mexico side of that border is Lordsburg, which is about a good 1.5- to 2-hour drive away itself.

If you really wanted to get to narrow this, this bill should have been narrowed, but it wasn't narrowed.

I think of Naco, that little port of entry in southern Arizona. I think of Douglas. I am telling you, the problem that this bill has is it doesn't—if that is the goal. There are other problems, but if that is the goal, this language has not been specific enough.

I also have talked with those who have had the secondary inspection. If we are referring to the implementation of the travel restriction—and I think the world, including the administration, admitted that it was rolled out poorly—that is a different animal than what happens on a normal basis.

I think of the San Luis Port of Entry or the Nogales Port of Entry, but, particularly, San Luis. It gets so much traffic through there. I can't imagine what will happen when you try to bog down everything by allowing everyone who moves to a secondary inspection have counsel or some other interested party, who we don't really know who that is. That is not defined very well, either.

I think of all the commercial truck traffic that comes through Nogales. We don't inspect but a small fraction of vehicles coming through there. It is very difficult to move traffic. The infrastructure itself is not conducive to this.

I will just say, the one thing I was reminded of as I was reviewing this bill for this debate today—and it really kind of came out in the debate when someone was talking about this notion of where we are now, which is if you become a focus of a criminal investigation, you do get counsel. You get that opportunity for counsel.

I started thinking that, yes, exactly, this is what we are doing. We are saying now, in a civil administrative function, we are going to give you a right to counsel. Are we going to expand that to every area where there are civil administrative regulatory violations or potential violations? The answer is that would be absolutely, totally bizarre. It would be unworkable, just as this will be unworkable.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY).

Mr. KENNEDY. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman for moving this legislation forward and to our colleague, Ms. JAYAPAL, for extraordinary work on this legislation.

Madam Speaker, you can learn an awful lot about a country by its approach to justice. You learn about its values, about the people it protects first, about the arc of its history, about the injustice it tolerates and the inequities it reinforces.

When you aim that spotlight on our Nation, what it reveals is not pretty. It is not something to be proud of. Because for millions of people who call this Nation home, justice is not a guarantee. It is something withheld. It is something far too many will never experience.

Very few battle that injustice more frequently than immigrants who arrive on our shores and at our border because they believe in the promise of our Nation. If we believe in that same promise as fiercely as they do, we shouldn't be scared to provide them with justice, with, at the very least, access to legal counsel.

Madam Speaker, we need to pass this bill to, at the very least, take a small step forward in living up to those ideals, and we need to do it today.

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

Madam Speaker, I will just say this, I appreciate the sponsor of this indicating that, in their interpretation, a simple phone call would suffice. I don't think that is the way CBP is interpreting this. I think they are interpreting this that they are going to have to build out infrastructure so there can be private facilities for counsel to meet with these folks.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I have no other speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I just want to go back to this and indicate there are a multiplicity of issues with this bill, but some things that I want to reiterate.

I think the bill is a step forward to providing state-funded counsel for folks who are here getting a secondary inspection, which in the vast majority of cases is almost perfunctory and incidental and is very quick, in the normal case.

Again, I think it is bad facts—or, actually, good facts to make the argument. It is not going to make good policy. You are, again, arguing implementation of the travel restriction, which wasn't great.

But the norm—the norm—if you get down to the border and spend time, as I have many times, you are going to see these secondary inspections are short, perfunctory. There is no need of counsel. They almost always turn out well for the person that is delayed, except for when they are a danger. Then, it becomes a problem, and they get an opportunity for counsel because now you have a criminal focus on them. That is the key here.

So, expanding this to civil cases, which is exactly what you are doing here, and putting us in line to walk down to where we ultimately are going to pay for that, that is not great policy. That is bad policy, and I am urging my folks to oppose this.

Madam Speaker, I yield the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I find it bizarre to suggest that you shouldn't vote for a bill because some other bill may do something that you don't like. This bill does not provide—I personally think maybe it would be a good idea,

but that is not this bill. This bill does not provide for funded counsel in any way. It doesn't do that. Maybe I should introduce a bill to do that. That is not this bill, so let's forget about that.

This bill simply says that if an individual is held—an individual who may be an America citizen, who may be a green card holder, who if improperly, by mistake, is sent out of the country and may be forbidden from applying to come back in for 5 years, with all kinds of problems, who may be a cancer researcher who is supposed to work at Rockefeller Institute or Johns Hopkins or wherever and would be denied his or her talents because of a mistake.

All this bill says is that if someone is held in secondary inspection for at least an hour, they must be given an opportunity to call counsel, to call other people, to call their brother-in-law, to call whoever, and to communicate. That is all the bill says.

I fail to understand why it is at all controversial. It will prevent the kind of tragic mistakes that have been made in the past. It will prevent the kind of confusion that we saw, that I personally saw at the airport when people were held for hours and hours and weren't permitted to talk to counsel standing outside the door, when I physically had to prevent the door from closing and dared them to arrest a Member of Congress in order to allow an immigrant with valid papers to speak to an attorney who was standing on the other side of the door.

That is what this bill is. It is simple. It is humane. It is commonsensical and ought to be adopted. I urge everyone to vote for this bill.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, as an original cosponsor and senior member of the Committee on the Judiciary, I rise in strong and enthusiastic support of H.R. 5581, the "Access to Counsel Act of 2020," which ensures that certain individuals who are subjected to prolonged inspection by U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) at ports of entry have a meaningful opportunity to communicate with counsel and other interested parties.

This important legislation amends section 235 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA) to require the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) to ensure that certain individuals can communicate with counsel and other interested parties if they are subjected to prolonged inspection by CBP.

The protections afforded by the Access to Counsel Act of 2020 would apply to individuals who possess valid travel documents, but who are pulled out of the "primary" inspection line and referred to "secondary" inspection for extended processing.

If such individuals are held in secondary inspection for at least one hour, they must be permitted to communicate with counsel and other interested parties.

Counsel and interested parties would be able to provide information and documentation to the inspecting officer to facilitate the inspection process and offer support and assistance to the individual subject to inspection.

Madam Speaker, the stakes can be high for a person wrongfully refused admission and the consequences of being denied admission to the United States can be significant.

For example, a U.S. research institution may lose the opportunity to employ a next generation cancer researcher if that researcher is denied admission despite possessing a valid nonimmigrant visa.

Individuals who are refused admission may be unable to reunite with their families, receive critical medical care unavailable in their home country, or pursue higher education at a U.S. college or university.

Although some individuals may be permitted to withdraw their application for admission and return home without long term consequences, others may be ordered removed without a hearing or further review under “expedited removal.”

An individual who receives an expedited removal order is barred from returning to the United States for five years.

Communication protocols are inconsistent across ports of entry and CBP provides no public guidance on an individual’s ability to communicate with counsel and other individuals during the inspection process.

According to an American Immigration Council report, CBP policies and practices on access to counsel vary from one office to another.”

While some ports of entry completely bar counsel in primary or secondary inspection,” others provide specific procedures for interacting with counsel or provide the inspecting officer with broad discretion to decide whether and with whom to communicate.

Madam Speaker, the Access to Counsel Act of 2020 ensures that no one is cut off from the world due to the Administration’s hasty and mismanaged rollout of the Muslim ban and the widespread chaos that it engendered at airports across the nation.

Affected individuals were detained at airports for hours, and many were sent back to their home countries without the ability to contact their families or receive the assistance of counsel.

Reports of similar treatment surfaced in January 2020, as tensions between Iran and the United States escalated and up to 200 individuals of Iranian descent were detained and questioned in secondary inspection at the Peace Arch Border Crossing in Blaine, Washington.

These individuals—many of whom were U.S. citizens or permanent residents, including seniors and children—were held for several hours, with some reportedly held for up to 12 hours.

Madam Speaker, although complications in the inspection process can arise in response to sweeping changes in immigration policy or shifting world events, the greatest impact on individuals comes from the consistent lack of access to counsel and other assistance at ports of entry on a day-to-day basis.

All individuals—including U.S. citizens—who seek to lawfully enter the United States are subject to inspection by CBP officers at ports of entry.

Without access to counsel and other parties, many individuals are refused admission or issued an expedited removal order instead of being provided the chance to vindicate their rights and lawfully enter the country.

The Access to Counsel Act will ensure individuals who are seeking to lawfully enter the

United States are treated fairly and with dignity.

The bill permits counsel and interested parties to appear in person at the port of entry, but also gives DHS and CBP enough discretion to determine—based on operational and other practical limitations—how the consultation takes place.

The bill provides extra protection for lawful permanent residents (LPRs) by prohibiting DHS from accepting a Record of Abandonment of Lawful Permanent Resident Status from an LPR without first providing the LPR a reasonable opportunity to consult with counsel.

Madam Speaker, the Access to Counsel Act of 2020 is supported by an impressive coalition of highly respected organizations, including: Amnesty International; American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU); America’s Voice; American Immigration Lawyers Association (AILA); Coalition for Humane Immigrant Rights; Immigration Hub; and National Iranian American Council (NIAC).

I urge all Members to join me in voting to pass H.R. 5581, the Access to Counsel Act of 2020.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5581, the “Access to Counsel Act of 2020”, a bill that will ensure that individuals who lawfully present themselves at our ports of entry are treated fairly and allowed to communicate with counsel and other parties if they are subjected to prolonged inspection.

The Immigration and Nationality Act provides individuals in removal proceedings the right to representation at no expense to the government. Although federal regulations extend this right to immigration-related “examinations,” applicants for admission—specifically those in primary or secondary inspection—are excluded unless they become the focus of a criminal investigation.

However, our immigration laws are complex, and so are some questions regarding an individual’s admissibility.

Access to outside assistance is important to ensure that CBP has a complete understanding of the facts and the law before deciding admissibility. That is because grave consequences can result from being refused admission—consequences that extend well beyond simply turning around and getting back on a plane.

Individuals who are refused admission may be unable to reunite with their families or receive critical medical care unavailable in their home country. They may be turned away from a U.S. employer who desperately needs their skills. Or they may be denied the opportunity to pursue higher education at a U.S. college or university.

If that weren’t enough, they could also be subject to a 5-year bar to returning to the United States if they are issued an expedited removal order.

That is why this legislation is so critical.

By allowing individuals who lawfully present themselves for inspection at a port of entry to communicate with counsel or other interested parties with information relevant to their request for admission, CBP will be better equipped to correctly resolve legal uncertainties and individuals will be treated more equitably.

I would like to thank my friend and colleague, Representative JAYAPAL for her leadership and commitment to this issue. Her efforts

led to the introduction of this legislation, and I urge all my colleagues to support the Access to Counsel Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 891, the previous question is ordered on this portion of the divided question.

The question is: Will the House concur in the Senate amendment with the House amendment specified in section 4(b) of House Resolution 891?

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

Mr. NADLER. 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, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Byrd, on of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 3989. An act to amend the United States Semiquincentennial Commission Act of 2016 to modify certain membership and other requirements of the United States Semiquincentennial Commission, and for other purposes.

□ 1215

TAXPAYER FIRST ACT OF 2019

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1053, I move to take from the Speaker’s table the bill (H.R. 1957) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modernize and improve the Internal Revenue Service, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendments thereto, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SCHNEIDER). The Clerk will designate the Senate amendments.

Senate amendments:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Great American Outdoors Act”.

SEC. 2. NATIONAL PARKS AND PUBLIC LAND LEGACY RESTORATION FUND.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle II of title 54, United States Code, is amended by inserting after chapter 2003 the following:

“CHAPTER 2004—NATIONAL PARKS AND PUBLIC LAND LEGACY RESTORATION FUND

“Sec.

“200401. Definitions.

“200402. National Parks and Public Land Legacy Restoration Fund.

“§200401. Definitions

“In this chapter:

“(1) ASSET.—The term ‘asset’ means any real property, including any physical structure or grouping of structures, landscape, trail, or other tangible property, that—

“(A) has a specific service or function; and

“(B) is tracked and managed as a distinct, identifiable entity by the applicable covered agency.

“(2) COVERED AGENCY.—The term ‘covered agency’ means—

“(A) the Service;

“(B) the United States Fish and Wildlife Service;

“(C) the Forest Service;

“(D) the Bureau of Land Management; and

“(E) the Bureau of Indian Education.

“(3) FUND.—The term ‘Fund’ means the National Parks and Public Land Legacy Restoration Fund established by section 200402(a).

“(4) PROJECT.—The term ‘project’ means any activity to reduce or eliminate deferred maintenance of an asset, which may include resolving directly related infrastructure deficiencies of the asset that would not by itself be classified as deferred maintenance.

“§200402. National Parks and Public Land Legacy Restoration Fund

“(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the Treasury of the United States a fund to be known as the ‘National Parks and Public Land Legacy Restoration Fund’.

“(b) DEPOSITS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), for each of fiscal years 2021 through 2025, there shall be deposited in the Fund an amount equal to 50 percent of all energy development revenues due and payable to the United States from oil, gas, coal, or alternative or renewable energy development on Federal land and water credited, covered, or deposited as miscellaneous receipts under Federal law in the preceding fiscal year.

“(2) MAXIMUM AMOUNT.—The amount deposited in the Fund under paragraph (1) shall not exceed \$1,900,000,000 for any fiscal year.

“(3) EFFECT ON OTHER REVENUES.—Nothing in this section affects the disposition of revenues that—

“(A) are due to the United States, special funds, trust funds, or States from mineral and energy development on Federal land and water; or

“(B) have been otherwise appropriated—

“(i) under Federal law, including—

“(I) the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act of 2006 (43 U.S.C. 1331 note; Public Law 109-432); and

“(II) the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 181 et seq.); or

“(ii) from—

“(I) the Land and Water Conservation Fund established under chapter 2003; or

“(II) the Historic Preservation Fund established under chapter 3031.

“(c) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—Amounts deposited in the Fund shall be available to the Secretary and the Secretary of Agriculture, as provided in subsection (e), without further appropriation or fiscal year limitation.

“(d) INVESTMENT OF AMOUNTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may request the Secretary of the Treasury to invest any portion of the Fund that is not, as determined by the Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Agriculture, required to meet the current needs of the Fund.

“(2) REQUIREMENT.—An investment requested under paragraph (1) shall be made by the Secretary of the Treasury in a public debt security—

“(A) with a maturity suitable to the needs of the Fund, as determined by the Secretary; and

“(B) bearing interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration current market yields on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States of comparable maturity.

“(3) CREDITS TO FUND.—The income on investments of the Fund under this subsection shall be credited to, and form a part of, the Fund.

“(e) USE OF FUNDS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Amounts deposited in the Fund for each fiscal year shall be used for pri-

ority deferred maintenance projects in the System, in the National Wildlife Refuge System, on public land administered by the Bureau of Land Management, for the Bureau of Indian Education schools, and in the National Forest System, as follows:

“(A) 70 percent of the amounts deposited in the Fund for each fiscal year shall be allocated to the Service.

“(B) 15 percent of the amounts deposited in the Fund for each fiscal year shall be allocated to the Forest Service.

“(C) 5 percent of the amounts deposited in the Fund for each fiscal year shall be allocated to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service.

“(D) 5 percent of the amounts deposited in the Fund for each fiscal year shall be allocated to the Bureau of Land Management.

“(E) 5 percent of the amounts deposited in the Fund for each fiscal year shall be allocated to the Bureau of Indian Education.

“(2) LIMITATIONS.—

“(A) NON-TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS.—Over the term of the Fund, within each covered agency, not less than 65 percent of amounts from the Fund shall be allocated for non-transportation projects.

“(B) TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS.—The amounts remaining in the Fund after the allocations required under subparagraph (A) may be allocated for transportation projects of the covered agencies, including paved and unpaved roads, bridges, tunnels, and paved parking areas.

“(C) PLAN.—Any priority deferred maintenance project funded under this section shall be consistent with an applicable transportation, deferred maintenance, or capital improvement plan developed by the applicable covered agency.

“(f) PROHIBITED USE OF FUNDS.—No amounts in the Fund shall be used—

“(1) for land acquisition;

“(2) to supplant discretionary funding made available for annually recurring facility operations, maintenance, and construction needs; or

“(3) for bonuses for employees of the Federal Government that are carrying out this section.

“(g) SUBMISSION OF PRIORITY LIST OF PROJECTS TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary and the Secretary of Agriculture shall submit to the Committees on Energy and Natural Resources and Appropriations of the Senate and the Committees on Natural Resources and Appropriations of the House of Representatives a list of projects to be funded for fiscal year 2021 that—

“(1) are identified by the Secretary and the Secretary of Agriculture as priority deferred maintenance projects; and

“(2) as of the date of the submission of the list, are ready to be implemented.

“(h) SUBMISSION OF ANNUAL LIST OF PROJECTS TO CONGRESS.—Until the date on which all of the amounts in the Fund are expended, the President shall annually submit to Congress, together with the annual budget of the United States, a list of projects to be funded from the Fund that includes a detailed description of each project, including the estimated expenditures from the Fund for the project for the applicable fiscal year.

“(i) ALTERNATE ALLOCATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Appropriations Acts may provide for alternate allocation of amounts made available under this section, consistent with the allocations to covered agencies under subsection (e)(1).

“(2) ALLOCATION BY PRESIDENT.—

“(A) NO ALTERNATE ALLOCATIONS.—If Congress has not enacted legislation establishing alternate allocations by the date on which the Act making full-year appropriations for the Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies for the applicable fiscal year is enacted into law, amounts made available under subsection (c) shall be allocated by the President.

“(B) INSUFFICIENT ALTERNATE ALLOCATION.—If Congress enacts legislation establishing alternate allocations for amounts made available under subsection (c) that are less than the full amount appropriated under that subsection, the difference between the amount appropriated and the alternate allocation shall be allocated by the President.

“(j) PUBLIC DONATIONS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary and the Secretary of Agriculture may accept public cash or in-kind donations that advance efforts—

“(A) to reduce the deferred maintenance backlog; and

“(B) to encourage relevant public-private partnerships.

“(2) CREDITS TO FUND.—Any cash donations accepted under paragraph (1) shall be—

“(A) credited to, and form a part of, the Fund; and

“(B) allocated to the covered agency for which the donation was made.

“(3) OTHER ALLOCATIONS.—Any donations allocated to a covered agency under paragraph (2)(B) shall be allocated to the applicable covered agency independently of the allocations under subsection (e)(1).

“(k) REQUIRED CONSIDERATION FOR ACCESSIBILITY.—In expending amounts from the Fund, the Secretary and the Secretary of Agriculture shall incorporate measures to improve the accessibility of assets and accommodate visitors and employees with disabilities in accordance with applicable law.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of chapters for subtitle II of title 54, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to chapter 2003 the following:

“2004. National Parks and Public Land Legacy Restoration Fund200401”.

(c) GAO STUDY.—Not later than 5 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall—

(1) conduct a study on the implementation of this section and the amendments made by this section, including whether this section and the amendments made by this section have effectively reduced the priority deferred maintenance backlog of the covered agencies (as that term is defined in section 200401 of title 54, United States Code); and

(2) submit to Congress a report that describes the results of the study under paragraph (1).

SEC. 3. PERMANENT FULL FUNDING OF THE LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 200303 of title 54, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“§200303. Availability of funds

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Any amounts deposited in the Fund under section 200302 for fiscal year 2020 and each fiscal year thereafter shall be made available for expenditure for fiscal year 2021 and each fiscal year thereafter, without further appropriation or fiscal year limitation, to carry out the purposes of the Fund (including accounts and programs made available from the Fund pursuant to the Further Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2020 (Public Law 116-94; 133 Stat. 2534)).

“(b) ADDITIONAL AMOUNTS.—Amounts made available under subsection (a) shall be in addition to amounts made available to the Fund under section 105 of the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act of 2006 (43 U.S.C. 1331 note; Public Law 109-432) or otherwise appropriated from the Fund.

“(c) ALLOCATION AUTHORITY.—

“(1) SUBMISSION OF COST ESTIMATES.—The President shall submit to Congress detailed account, program, and project allocations of the full amount made available under subsection (a)—

“(A) for fiscal year 2021, not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of the Great American Outdoors Act; and

“(B) for each fiscal year thereafter, as part of the annual budget submission of the President.

“(2) ALTERNATE ALLOCATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Appropriations Acts may provide for alternate allocation of amounts made available under subsection (a), including allocations by account, program, and project.

“(B) ALLOCATION BY PRESIDENT.—

“(i) NO ALTERNATE ALLOCATIONS.—If Congress has not enacted legislation establishing alternate allocations by the date on which the Act making full-year appropriations for the Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies for the applicable fiscal year is enacted into law, amounts made available under subsection (a) shall be allocated by the President.

“(ii) INSUFFICIENT ALTERNATE ALLOCATION.—If Congress enacts legislation establishing alternate allocations for amounts made available under subsection (a) that are less than the full amount appropriated under that subsection, the difference between the amount appropriated and the alternate allocation shall be allocated by the President.

“(3) RECREATIONAL PUBLIC ACCESS.—Amounts expended from the Fund under this section shall be consistent with the requirements for recreational public access for hunting, fishing, recreational shooting, or other outdoor recreational purposes under section 200306(c).

“(4) ANNUAL REPORT.—The President shall submit to Congress an annual report that describes the final allocation by account, program, and project of amounts made available under subsection (a), including a description of the status of obligations and expenditures.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 200302(c) of title 54, United States Code, is amended by striking paragraph (3).

(2) Section 200306(a)(2)(B) of title 54, United States Code, is amended by striking clause (iii).

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 2003 of title 54, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to section 200303 and inserting the following:

“200303. Availability of funds.”.

MOTION TO CONCUR

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Grijalva moves that the House concur in the Senate amendments to H.R. 1957.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of July 21, 2020, the motion shall be debatable for 80 minutes, with 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources and 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the majority leader and minority leader or their respective designees.

The gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) each will control 30 minutes. The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on H.R. 1957.

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

There was no objection.

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

In February of 2019, I flew to Arizona from Washington to speak about my bill to permanently protect the Grand Canyon from uranium mining. We wanted to publicly release the legislation on the rim of the canyon to show firsthand the lands that we were attempting to protect.

Unfortunately, the weather had other ideas. That night, before the event, it snowed more than it had in decades. But by some small miracle, the roads were clear, and we found an easy pathway into the park. We made it in time and even found some rangers to help us set up in the snow.

Tribal leaders representing people who have called that land their home for a millennia joined us at the event. Standing there with them on the edge of the amazing canyon millions of years in the making and glistening in the snow, it was hard not to be moved.

Looking out over the Grand Canyon, you are reminded why we as a Nation have dedicated ourselves to protecting the unique and enduring landscapes around us. Nowhere else on Earth is there a sight quite like the Grand Canyon, or, for that matter, like Yosemite Valley or Yellowstone National Park. These places are gems of our National Park system, and they show who we are as a people.

We are judged on what we choose to pass on, and today we have an opportunity to reaffirm our commitment to preserving these lands for the future and for future generations.

In a few short minutes we will vote on the Great American Outdoors Act, a bill to significantly increase conservation spending in the United States. For too long we have allowed our National Parks to fall into disrepair. We have underfunded maintenance while park visitation has skyrocketed. At the same time, we have failed to meet the full promise of the Land and Water Conservation Fund. We have been diverting half of this conservation funding stream to other uses for which this money was never intended.

Today, we take the opportunity to remedy both those failures. The Great American Outdoors Act provides \$1.9 billion per year to maintain our National Parks and public lands, ensuring that special places like the Grand Canyon are accessible to all Americans as they were to me on that February morning.

The law will also make an enduring commitment to protecting green and flourishing open spaces by providing \$900 million annually to the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

This funding will mean more parks for inner city families. It will allow us to protect forests, wetlands, and marshes from the destruction of climate change. It will help protect lands around the National Parks from inappropriate development and will expand recreational access and opportunity for all Americans. Combined, these two major programs amount to one of the biggest wins for conservation in decades.

We all know that not everyone here agrees about the value of these pro-

grams. In fact, we disagree almost daily on how best to protect the landscapes of our Nation.

But I hope today we can move past those political differences and to honestly consider the value of conservation and the importance of stable, predictable funding.

We have a generational opportunity to ensure America's crown jewels are protected. We have a unique chance to ensure that every tool is available to help us respond to the climate crisis, so that we can protect those landscapes that best protect clean water, clean air, and healthy green spaces.

This bill is a major win for the American people, decades in the making. I might add. I have pursued it for years. Some of my colleagues have pursued it for years. This didn't happen overnight.

Now, during a time of national disillusionment, it is perhaps more necessary than ever to demonstrate that we can still bridge the divide.

When it comes to passing along this Nation to our children and to theirs, we can still work together to find common ground.

This bill goes beyond politics. It is about ensuring that we pass along a legacy of public lands stewardship and conservation to future generations, so they, too, can marvel at the Grand Canyon covered in snow.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support this important measure.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let's get a couple of things very clear.

First of all, this is not about the Land and Water Conservation Fund. We reauthorized permanently the Land and Water Conservation Fund in the last Congress, and in doing that, in a House Republican bill, I might add, we took the State-side projects—these are the kinds of things like easements and picnic grounds and roads and parks that your constituents are all telling you that they like, those are called the State-side projects—and we actually increased the funding for those programs.

We also put in that act a limitation on the amount of money that could be used to buy more land. This bill is about that concept, the limitation of land acquisition. The special interest groups have been putting pressure on you and are giving you misinformation about this particular thing. They simply want to circumvent the limits that were pushed in that bill that was there earlier.

This is two bills merged together. The first one was the old H.R. 1225, the backlog maintenance bill that Mr. GRIJALVA referred to in his speech. We

wanted to see if we could actually help parks and other public lands who are having a maintenance backlog that is near \$20 billion today.

Many people, 330 people, cosponsored that bill. Obviously, it was popular. But for 1½ years, Democratic leadership failed and refused to move that bill. One of their arguments was, this is key, there is no offset for a bill that scored \$7 billion. They refused to move it because there was no offset.

That bill would fund parks' maintenance backlogs by taking excess revenue from those that come from all the energy development, but primarily oil and gas, off-coast as well as on land, and after we pay our obligations, the first \$1 billion of the excess would be used to maintain our parks. That is still a decent bill.

You have added that, or the Democrats in the Senate have added that, to a second bill that is mandatory \$900 million of spending. That mandatory spending will be from now until eternity, but the goal of that is simply to increase the buying power to buy more lands, not to create the State-side projects which we increased.

We are spending trillions of dollars on coronavirus emergency spending. We still have to pay for that. If you really think that mandatory increasing of our debt is the right policy, I think there is a problem there because the CBO did say that this new concoction—bill scores at \$17 billion. And I want you to notice there is no offset for that in this bill.

Both House Republicans and House Democrats have rules that they will not bring a bill to the floor that is not offset. The Blue Dog Democrats unanimously wrote a letter to their leadership saying, Do not bring a bill to the floor that is not offset.

This violates the rules of both the Democrats and the Republicans clearly and adds \$17 billion to the debt, and the reason this is here is, well, because.

Both LWCF, as well as what we want to do with park maintenance, is paid for by royalties from those gas and oil explorations. The excess was to go to parks. We already have obligations with those royalties. GOMESA is an obligation. Historic preservation is an obligation. State reimbursement is an obligation. Those are priorities.

Now, we are also saying in this bill, the \$1 billion of money to buy more land is now also a priority above and beyond what is happening for the parks and what will get there for the parks, which may not in normal times be a concern, but in this era, CRS has already certified that we are 84 percent lower in the amount of activity and the amount of royalties coming in from our energy development than we were a year ago. That is 2 million barrels of oil a day less than we were producing and getting royalties from them last year.

So if buying more land is the priority, the maintenance of our backlog could be totally left out.

Now, this is not for want of what we are trying to do. There were amendments to try and fix this, but they were not allowed to be brought to this floor. There are amendments in the Senate to fix these problems, but they were not allowed to be brought to the floor. There will be many on both sides of the aisle, some on our side, who will support and defend this bill.

I will remind you we are having a heat wave here in Washington, D.C. For the first time in four years we are coming close to 100 degrees, but the heat index is well into three digits. There are a lot of people suffering from heat stroke.

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CUNNINGHAM), a sponsor of the legislation, companion legislation to the Senate bill.

□ 1230

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of my bill, the Great American Outdoors Act, and to express my gratitude for so many of my friends and colleagues, including the 252 cosponsors from both sides of the aisle who are working with me to secure the greatest achievement for conservation in a generation.

Mr. Speaker, my bipartisan legislation gives Congress a chance to deliver a massive win not only for our irreplaceable parks and public lands, but also for this institution as a whole by showing the American people that we can work together and keep our promises.

The Great American Outdoors Act will honor our Nation's commitment to conservation in two important ways.

First, it fully and permanently funds the Land and Water Conservation Fund, our most important conservation program. LWCF preserves the best of America, ensuring hunting, fishing, boating, hiking, and other recreational access for all of our constituents.

It is the backbone of our \$778 billion economy, which accounts for over 5 million jobs across this country. It protects working forests and the jobs that they support in the woods and the mills. And here is the best part: It does it all without spending a dime of taxpayer money.

Despite this, we have consistently fallen short in utilizing the full amount of funds in LWCF. Over the past 55 years, we have only spent half the money that we have deposited in the fund, thereby creating an unsustainable backlog in the Lowcountry and across this Nation. This legislation will fix that, ensuring at long last that these funds are spent how they were intended.

Second, it will relieve the growing multibillion-dollar maintenance backlog in our national forests, parks, and other Federal public lands. From crumbling roads and eroding trails to aging water systems and deteriorating his-

toric sites and visitor centers, the widespread disrepair of our national treasures is only getting worse. The Great American Outdoors Act will address this as well by making essential investments to reverse the damage, while creating over 100,000 jobs in the process.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is grounded in two basic principles: that Congress should invest funding set aside for conservation towards the public good, and that we should pay the maintenance bills we have already accrued. It is time that we honor our promises.

In South Carolina, the LWCF has protected the hallowed ground of Fort Sumter, the living outdoor classroom of Congaree National Park, the Pitt Street Bridge in Mount Pleasant, the Folly Beach Boardwalk, and literally hundreds of other local and State parks.

In my district, LWCF protected the ACE Basin, which is the largest undeveloped estuary on the Atlantic Coast, providing a home for the area's incredible wildlife, a source of recreation for sportsmen and -women, and a natural safeguard for our coastal communities from devastating weather events.

Just this past week, I heard from our veterans about the important role that public lands play in the healing process for many men and women transitioning back to civilian life. They told me how access to nature and the outdoors has helped them find a sense of calm and peace.

The power of these places to heal and unite us reaches all the way back here to Washington, where my bill is supported by the Speaker, by the minority leader, and by a large bipartisan majority. Seventy-three Senators have already voted for this bill, and President Trump has specifically asked for us to send it to his desk.

In this current climate of division and discord, the Great American Outdoors Act is exemplary of the fact that Republicans and Democrats can still come together to pursue commonsense solutions, do right by our public lands, and keep our word.

Mr. Speaker, I invite all my colleagues to join me in supporting our communities, families, public lands, and economy by voting to pass the Great American Outdoors Act.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON) to explain why mandatory spending is good.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend from Utah for yielding. I know that was painful.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in favor of the Great American Outdoors Act. It makes sense to me that, if we are going to have public lands and preserve public lands for Americans, we should also take care of it. That is why the LWCF funding and deferred maintenance part of this bill are very important and a perfect combination.

With that in mind, I wrote the LAND Act in 2017, which funded these two

programs without using a dime of taxpayer money.

Fast-forward to 2020 and the President specifically asked Congress to send him a bill that funded both these programs and that he would sign it.

Thanks to Senator GARDNER, Senator DAINES, Senator HEINRICH, and Senator MANCHIN, the Great American Outdoors Act built upon the LAND Act and passed the Senate with 73 votes, which brings us to this historic day.

The Great American Outdoors Act creates 100,000 jobs, preserves public lands for future generations, and cares for our current national parks and trails. All this is funded by energy revenue and the existing \$20 billion fund—again, not taxpayer dollars.

The bill does not expand the Federal footprint because 99 percent of the LWCF purchases are within existing public lands.

The bill does not force anyone to sell their property since it is willing seller and willing buyer.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of this bill not for me and not for you, but for future generations so that they can enjoy our great outdoors.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. Cox), a member of the Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. COX of California. Mr. Speaker, today is a great day for public lands, for land conservation, for outdoor recreation, and for every American who values these gifts that Mother Nature has provided for our country.

Last year, we made a promise to the American people to protect their public lands, our national treasures, by permanently reauthorizing the Land and Water Conservation Fund as part of the John Dingell Conservation, Management, and Recreation Act. Today, we are poised to make good on that promise by passing the Great American Outdoors Act, which will permanently and fully fund the LWCF. I am proud to be an original cosponsor of that bill.

These funds have not just protected our Nation's most well-known national parks, but, over the years, LWCF dollars have also created parks, ball fields, and other outdoor recreational spaces in every corner of our country from Alaska to Florida, from Maine to Hawaii.

This also includes many communities in my district, such as Mendota, Huron, Selma, Sanger, Parlier, Lemoore, Corcoran, Allensworth, Shafter, Buttonwillow, McFarland, and Arvin, just to name a few.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the bipartisan team of my colleagues and activists who have worked hard to make this legislation a reality.

There is an old East Asian proverb that says: One generation plants the trees for another generation to enjoy the shade. Today, we are replanting those trees.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote in support of this bill.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STIVERS).

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Great American Outdoors Act.

My district has 120 projects that benefit from the Land and Water Conservation Fund, from community parks to the Wayne National Forest, to the Hopewell Culture National Historical Park.

Public lands, forests, and parks give folks the opportunity to connect with the outdoors and with each other, especially in this time of the coronavirus.

I also represent a bunch of small businesses, like Rocky Boots in Nelsonville that employs 2,800 people and depends on a thriving outdoor recreation economy.

In my district last year, \$1.37 billion was spent on outdoor recreation. And at a time when there is such a backlog in maintenance, this maintenance support will create 100,000 jobs.

During a time when we have 11.1 percent unemployment, Congress should be taking every opportunity it can to create jobs.

Mr. Speaker, this bill isn't just about conservation, it is about jobs and the economy, and I urge my colleagues to vote "yes."

It is a Senate bill that passed the Senate 73-25. It is not perfect, but it is a good bill, and it is a bill we should support.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI).

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Great American Outdoors Act.

Protecting wilderness reflects the best values of Oregon: environmental protection, stewardship of our land, and community partnership.

The Land and Water Conservation Fund represents a bipartisan commitment to safeguarding natural areas and providing recreation opportunities in the prized outdoor areas that make places in northwest Oregon, like Ecola State Park and the Tualatin National Wildlife Refuge, so special. Unfortunately, the program has faced significant instability in recent years, limiting the long-term planning needed for meaningful conservation efforts.

Last month, I joined my colleagues on the Select Committee on the Climate Crisis in releasing a bold, comprehensive, science-based climate action plan. Our plan for solving the climate crisis recognizes the value of public lands and healthy ecosystems in sequestering carbon dioxide and promoting biodiversity, and it calls for a full and permanent funding for the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

The Great American Outdoors Act will help mitigate the climate crisis and protect the natural beauty and robust habitats that fish and wildlife depend on for survival.

At a time when our communities are struggling to recover from the economic consequences of the coronavirus pandemic, a time when there is heightened awareness about the inequities

and injustices in our society, including inequitable access to our wild places, this bill will boost rural economies and expand access to public lands for future generations.

I am also pleased that this bill takes steps to tackle our national park maintenance backlog to support treasured places like the Lewis and Clark National Historical Park. Oregonians care deeply about protecting our parks, forests, scenic areas, and wildlife refuges, and this bill takes important steps to safeguard them for future generations.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman GRIJALVA for his leadership, and I urge all of my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. WALORSKI).

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support the Great American Outdoors Act.

Our Nation's public lands have long been treasured sources of enjoyment and beauty available to every American. They also play a critical role in our economy, with the outdoor recreation industry supporting 5.2 million jobs.

The hardworking Hoosiers I represent know that better than anyone. Manufacturers in northern Indiana build products like boats, trailers, and 80 percent of the Nation's RVs. That is why Elkhart, Indiana, is known as the RV Capital of the World.

I am a proud cosponsor of the Great American Outdoors Act because it will support RV and boat manufacturers and their workers, promote conservation, and revitalize our national parks. By investing in long-delayed maintenance projects, it will ensure our national parks can continue to be enjoyed by all Americans for generations to come. By enhancing access to our public lands, it will boost tourism, strengthen our economy, and support good-paying jobs.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in voting for the Great American Outdoors Act.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA), the senior member of the Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for his efforts to bring this legislation to the House floor.

I rise today to speak on the Great American Outdoors Act and the importance of this legislation and why we should move on a bipartisan effort to pass it.

This bill tackles a tremendous deferred maintenance backlog on public lands, including our national parks, our treasures, the great American national parks.

This funding will contribute towards making our parks safe and enhance the recreational access, such as the great Yosemite National Park, the crown jewel in California, as well as Kings Canyon and Sequoia National Parks and many others—not only in California, but across our Nation—that are

part of America's heritage and a part of our lasting legacy for future generations to come.

This bill funds the Land and Water Conservation Fund annually at \$900 million and creates a \$9.5 billion fund for deferred maintenance on public lands.

We are way in arrears in terms of deferred maintenance that we need to do not only for our national parks, but for our public lands. That is why this is so important.

Let me respond to the issue of our deficit.

Our deficit is a problem. I am a Blue Dog. But let's be clear. After 16 years here, I have come to the conclusion that trying to address incremental issues as they relate to our national deficit is not going to get us there.

Until Republicans are willing to address the issues of revenues and Democrats are willing to address the issues of expenditures together and jump off that cliff holding hands to balance revenues and expenditures, we are just not going to get there. Okay?

So we should not use that as an excuse not to do what we should do for today's generation and future generations. The creation of this permanent funding highlights the need for Congress to address the deferred maintenance backlog.

I will admit that we are not doing more to provide funding for our aging Federal water infrastructure that also needs to be invested on.

So let me close. Let's take the moment of this bipartisan success to redouble our efforts to address the need for maintenance on federally owned projects.

□ 1245

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

This bill is actually extremely poorly drafted. It assumes basic things. But if, for instance, as we said, the royalties don't show up as we are anticipating, we don't have that \$1 billion to buy more land. How do you solve that? Do you prorate that money? Do you take it from other sources? Do you put this mandatory spending above other mandatory spending, like Social Security?

CRS said those are good questions, and they don't know because this bill is silent on all those questions.

It says the President is supposed to come up with \$900 million of projects. What if he only comes up with \$800 million? Who gets that extra \$100 million? Does that go to the Department of the Interior? Is that a slush fund?

Once again, CRS said, Good questions, and no one knows because this bill is silent on those types of questions.

BLM has no idea of how much money they have spent on this program or where the land is. The State portion is actually—they are okay because they are a percentage. But this is talking about a dollar figure.

So you are going to hear a lot of platitudes, but somebody, at some

time, has got to say how this money is going to actually be funded.

To help us with that, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY), a longtime member of this legislature, who can address those things.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for the time, and perhaps we can continue that discussion in another venue because today I am rising in support of this act.

Mr. Speaker, a while back I was at the Library of Congress and I met the famous filmmaker, Ken Burns and he taught me something. He spoke to us about the creation of the National Park System last century and how it represented a singular defining moment for America; our sense of vastness, openness, and endless opportunity, and regenerated for us an understanding of an American ethos, this great ideal of conservation, caring for what we have and transferring it into the future.

Mr. Speaker, our National Park sites are majestic places, great sources of national pride, and a living heritage for all Americans. But here is the problem: We have a backlog of maintenance, but we fix it today.

Along with providing certainty for the future of the Land and Water Conservation Fund, this all is a great boost to communities eager for innovation and conservation ideals.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. HAALAND), who is vice chair of the full Committee of Natural Resources and chair of the Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests, and Public Lands.

Ms. HAALAND. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Great American Outdoors Act.

From the day I became the chairwoman of the National Parks, Forests, and Public Lands Subcommittee, I have heard from constituents, colleagues, and advocates about fixing the maintenance backlog and fully funding LWCF and making it permanent.

LWCF has helped provide recreational opportunities for underserved and low-income communities in nearly every Congressional district, and last year, we passed an historic permanent authorization.

In my district, LWCF has supported the Valle del Oro National Wildlife Refuge, Petroglyph National Monument, Tingley Beach recreation area, the Elena Gallegos Open Space picnic area, and Martineztown Park.

The great American Outdoors Act will ensure LWCF's full \$900 million is used every year for conservation and environmental protection, to boost local outdoor economies, and to protect intact ecosystems essential for adapting to climate change.

The bill also establishes the National Park Service and Public Land Legacy Restoration Fund to provide five Federal land management agencies with up to \$9.5 billion over 5 years to address

the deferred maintenance backlog on our public lands.

These agencies will now be able to aggressively address deferred maintenance, improve visitor services, and support Tribal communities in places like Carlsbad Caverns, White Sands National Parks, Chaco Culture National Historical Park, and El Malpais National Monument.

Repairing the crumbling infrastructure on our public lands today is critical so that future generations can enjoy them. I am proud of the work we did to get this bill to this point, and I urge my colleagues to invest in our National Parks and public lands, and vote "yes" on the Great American Outdoors Act.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HURD).

Mr. HURD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Teddy Roosevelt once remarked that:

We have fallen heirs to the most glorious heritage a people have ever received, and each one must do his or her part if we wish to show that the nation is worthy of its good fortune.

Passage of the Great American Outdoors Act proves we are worthy of the good fortune and glorious heritage of our National Parks.

Future generations have been counting on us to ensure these treasures can be visited for another 100 years and, with the funding secured in this bill, we aren't letting them down.

In 1893, Katharine Lee Bates was inspired hiking up Pikes Peak, and she penned the following lines:

O beautiful for spacious skies
For amber waves of grain
For purple mountain majesties
Above the fruited plain.
America, America
God shed His grace on thee
And crown thy good with brotherhood
From sea to shining sea.

Passage of this bipartisan bill is a triumphant act that will benefit countless generations to come.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. NEGUSE), a member of the Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to speak today in support of the Great American Outdoors Act. I would like to thank my colleague from Arizona, the distinguished chairman, Chairman GRIJALVA, for his leadership; and also thank my colleague from South Carolina, Representative CUNNINGHAM, for introducing this bill.

The Great American Outdoors Act, as you have heard today, Mr. Speaker, would provide full and permanent funding for the Land and Water Conservation Fund, and address the significant maintenance backlog on our Nation's public lands.

Since its inception, the LWCF program has established many of our Nation's most coveted and incredible public lands. The program has invested in over 41,000 parks, including Rocky Mountain National Park, Arapaho and Roosevelt National Forests, Lory State

Park, and so many other iconic parks in my district, the Second Congressional District of the State of Colorado.

Nearly 1,000 LWCF grants have leveraged over \$147 million dollars for local government and State park investments in Colorado. In my district alone, there have been 191 LWCF projects. Therefore, establishing permanent and full funding truly is critical.

Additionally, deferred maintenance, as you have heard my colleagues on both sides of the aisle discuss today, on our public lands is a mounting problem that we can no longer afford to ignore.

As one of our country's most popular National Parks, Rocky Mountain National Park faces a significant maintenance backlog of \$84 million. Our park employees are working incredibly hard, but they can't do it alone. We must address this by increasing funds designed to upkeep and rebuild infrastructure on our Federal public lands.

I have consistently urged Congress to fully fund LWCF and address these challenges, and I am so heartened to see this collaborative effort considered on the House floor today and, of course, grateful to the county commissioners, and to so many local officials, conservation groups, anglers and outdoor recreation businesses who have come together to contribute their time and dedication to this effort. Let's get this bill passed.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK).

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as the lead sponsor of the Great American Outdoors Act, and this is a very, very big day for this Chamber.

As my colleagues are aware, I have been pushing to both permanently reauthorize and permanently fund the Land and Water Conservation Fund literally since the day I entered this Chamber.

In addition to the LWCF, this legislation tackles the maintenance backlog that needs to be addressed on public lands and parks across our great Nation.

Mr. Speaker, this bill will have a positive impact on nearly every single Congressional District in this country, and the LWCF has already had a positive impact on many sites in my district alone, most notably, Nockamixon State Park.

Hundreds of businesses, recreation, and environmental groups have come together to endorse our legislation, including the Backcountry Hunters & Anglers, the League of Conservation Voters, the Audubon Society, the Natural Resources Defense Council, Ducks Unlimited, Clean Water Action, and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is historic; it is bipartisan; it is bicameral, with over 250 cosponsors in the House. It overwhelmingly passed the Senate, and it will be signed into law by the Presi-

dent. That is what is called bipartisan cooperation.

Mr. Speaker, for those of us who are strong advocates of our environment, this is a good day. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes."

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. LEVIN), a valued member of the Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. LEVIN of California. Mr. Speaker, I am extremely fortunate to represent a coastal district with many beloved beaches, lagoons, and State parks. In California's 49th Congressional District, our public lands bring outdoor recreation and joy to our residents, and also to many tourists and visitors looking to catch some of our famous waves or hike our scenic trails.

This defining aspect of California culture continues to make communities in my district not only economically stronger, but also active, healthier, and happier, with locals and tourists alike enjoying all the benefits and spaces that the great outdoors offer.

The LWCF is famously known as America's most successful conservation program. This historic bill is an all-around win for our communities, benefiting local economies, and protecting our planet for future generations.

Thus far, California has received approximately \$2.5 billion in LWCF funding over the last 50 years, which has helped to protect iconic places, like San Onofre State Beach, Carlsbad State Beach, San Clemente State Beach, Torrey Pines Beach and Nature Reserve, and several flourishing lagoons, all in my district.

We are not just protecting those iconic places with this bill; we are also investing in our fight against the climate crisis. By conserving natural resources across the country, we are safekeeping critical landscapes, fragile ecosystems, and important wildlife habitat which are all part of the ecosystem we depend on.

As we continue to invest in coastal conservation of wetlands, estuaries, dunes, and reefs, we are contributing to climate change adaptation planning and protecting our coastal communities from extreme weather events, sea level rise, and bluff erosion. These efforts to combat the climate crisis are incredibly important for the 50-plus miles of coastline in my district.

I am proud to support the Great American Outdoors Act, and I hope this historic conservation legislation will soon become law, as it is certainly among the biggest bipartisan environmental accomplishments we have had in many years.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY).

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for his friendship and his encouragement. Maybe not encouragement on this specific bill, but I am proud to support this bill because it

does help with the maintenance backlog in the National Parks, as well as assist with the long-term reauthorization of the Land and Water Conservation Trust, which is something I strongly support.

Since its inception over 50 years ago, the Land and Water Conservation Trust has done very important things for my State and our Nation in preserving access to public lands and to the great outdoors.

Also, for the maintenance backlog, I am proud to represent a piece of the Blue Ridge Parkway, which runs through my district and was the second most visited National Park last year. I think this year would be the same.

In North Carolina alone, we have over 260,000 jobs that are directly attributable to the great outdoors; and those millions of visitors that come to the State through the Blue Ridge Parkway, they are vital for our economy in western North Carolina.

Passage of this bill will help, both the backlog and with ensuring that we have long-term reauthorization on the Land and Water Conservation Trust. I encourage a "yes" vote.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL), an effective member and a leader on the Natural Resources Committee.

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank my wonderful chairman.

I rise in strong support of the Great American Outdoors Act. This historic legislation makes good on our commitment to preserve our Nation's environmental heritage for future generations.

This is an emotional moment for me. It provides full permanent funding for the Land and Water Conservation Fund, landmark conservation legislation that my late husband, John Dingell, wrote and helped establish in 1964.

The LWCF funding has protected Michigan and the Nation's critical natural resources, while supporting local economies, creating jobs, and providing opportunities for outdoor recreation throughout the country.

□ 1300

LWCF was permanently authorized in 2019 as part of the John D. Dingell, Jr. Conservation, Management, and Recreation Act but has received full funding only twice in its long history. The permanent full funding in this legislation is the culmination of decades of work by the conservation community; my late husband; and our wonderful current dean, DON YOUNG, who first advocated for this permanent funding through the Conservation and Reinvestment Act in 1999.

Additionally, the National Parks and Public Land Legacy Land Restoration Fund included in the legislation will allow us to finally address the \$22 billion deferred maintenance backlog in our Nation's public lands, a decades-long problem in the making.

I am proud today to stand with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to

continue that Dingell conservation legacy—I don't look like the greatest outdoors girl, but I know how important they are—which represents the boldest, most comprehensive conservation effort in decades.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN).

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for yielding. As an original cosponsor of this legislation, I would also like to thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in both Chambers for helping lead the charge to get this important victory across the finish line.

I represent the First Congressional District of New York. It is a district almost completely surrounded by water on the east end of Long Island. In my district alone, the Land and Water Conservation Fund has provided funding for over 65 parks, and that is just one example of the impact this program has made all across our great Nation. This supports public access, fishing, hunting, recreation, and our environment.

After securing permanent authorization last year, it is an honor to continue the fight today. I am not sure about everyone else, but being cooped up over the course of these last few months has probably given just about all of us more appreciation for the great outdoors.

This is an effective program that will go a long way in keeping our magnificent outdoors great for generations to come.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, before I yield to the next speaker, let me echo the words of Mrs. DINGELL. John Dingell was indeed a warrior on behalf of the Land and Water Conservation Fund. Today is a culmination of those efforts in which he played such a huge role, and I would be remiss in not thanking him and DEBBIE DINGELL.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON), who is a leader in conservation and access to our public lands.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of this historic legislation that I was proud to coauthor. It has been more than 55 years since the Land and Water Conservation Fund was enacted to establish recreation and conservation opportunities. Now is the time to ensure that LWCF is fully and permanently funded.

This bill will create jobs and boost local economies that are currently facing significant financial hardships due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

It also provides urgent funding of \$9.5 billion to fix broken park infrastructure and failing facilities. The bill supports parks in every State so hikers and anglers alike can visit and enjoy nature across our beautiful country.

This is desperately needed now for our communities' emotional and physical well-being.

Mr. Speaker, we need to protect and preserve our lands, and this bill does that at no expense to our taxpayers. I urge my colleagues to vote for this important legislation.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from the State of Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE).

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Utah for letting me weigh in on this important subject.

Mr. Speaker, the hunters and anglers, farmers and ranchers, and hikers and recreationists of central Washington are passionate advocates for access to public lands.

I strongly stand behind my constituents in supporting the restoration of our national parks, our public lands, and Federal infrastructure. That is why I am proud to cosponsor the Restore Our Parks and Public Lands Act to address our country's deferred maintenance backlog in those areas. If that bill were brought to the floor before us today, I would be a resounding "yes."

Unfortunately, that is not the bill that we are debating here this afternoon. So while I agree with many provisions within the Great American Outdoors Act, I fear that the sweeping nature of this legislation will have unintended consequences for rural communities like mine in Washington's Fourth District.

Mr. Speaker, just 2 weeks ago, I was honored to welcome Secretary of the Interior David Bernhardt to the north-central region of my district in central Washington. These were the two main takeaways from the conversations that we had with citizens in that region: one, a lack of trust with the Federal Government; and, two, the need for hope in the face of many challenges facing rural communities.

While I believe the intentions behind this legislation are grounded in the desire to improve our public lands, too many of my constituents think the approach within this bill is indicative of the same tired notion that we have all heard before: I am from the government, and I am here to help.

We have already determined the Federal Government's culpability in creating a \$20 billion maintenance backlog problem on our public lands. So the response is to permanently spend \$900 million a year, most of which will be spent on what? Get this, Mr. Speaker: purchasing more Federal land.

The farmers, ranchers, and hard-working men and women of my district support local management and control of our lands. We have seen firsthand the delinquency of the Federal Government, and I think we should work to continue to support our national parks but vote this bill down.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL).

Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL. Mr. Speaker, the Everglades, Dry Tortugas, and Biscayne National Parks are three of our south Floridian national parks that are magnificent parks that we cherish across our country. They are essential to preserving biodiversity, improving air quality, providing recreational opportunities, and sustaining our physical and mental well-being. They are also essential to our economy, bolstering local economies across our Nation, supporting countless jobs, and breathing life into our small businesses.

Unfortunately, our national parks are in need of help. Hiking trails are in disrepair, roads are crumbling, visitor centers are falling apart, and our lands are in need of protection.

That is why passing today's bill, the Great American Outdoors Act, is so crucial. It will permanently reauthorize the Land and Water Conservation Fund to address our severe maintenance backlog and ensure that these natural beauties will be there for our children and our grandchildren.

With the passage of this bill, Mr. Speaker, the ecotourism economies in both Miami-Dade and Monroe Counties will flourish. I urge support.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. KEVIN HERN).

Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I thank Ranking Member BISHOP for his work on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, in the wake of a global pandemic unlike anything we have seen in our lifetime, we have spent unprecedented amounts of money this year. We have already saddled the next generation with unthinkable debt. Digging our way out of this hole is going to take time and targeted effort. We cannot continue to spend as if our debts don't exist.

This legislation needlessly increases the deficit. The Land and Water Conservation Fund, which is already incredibly well-funded, does not need an additional \$900 million a year in perpetuity. With immediate health needs and economic recovery our top priorities, increasing the Federal real estate holding shouldn't be on anyone's to-do list.

A recent report showed that 40 percent of LWCF funds went to projects that failed to advance any agency objectives. The oversight and accountability of the fund is laughable, but this bill seeks to exacerbate the lack of transparency by removing elected officials from the situation altogether and handing unilateral power to political appointees and unelected bureaucrats.

There are more productive ways that we should spend our time this week, and I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this bill.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. RICHMOND).

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Speaker, let me say that the goal of the bill is positive, but how it is achieved is just flat wrong.

To pay for this legislation, what we do is go straight to Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Texas and take \$1.9 billion a year of potential revenue to those States to uplift their people to pay for this bill.

Let me be specific about Mississippi, Alabama, and Louisiana. They rank 48th, 49th, and 50th in terms of quality of life for their residents. They rank 1, 2, and 5 in terms of their African-American population.

So, what are we doing here, in this time of racial inequity? We are going to Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana and taking \$1.9 billion a year without sharing any of that revenue with their States where: they can improve education, where all three rank last; they can improve healthcare, where all three States rank last; and they can improve their environment, where all three States are in the bottom one-third.

So, all I am saying is, at some point, equity demands that those States get their fair share.

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Ms. SHERRILL).

Ms. SHERRILL. Mr. Speaker, New Jersey might be the Garden State, but it is also the most densely populated State in this country. So, New Jerseyans know the importance of clean air, clean drinking water, and protecting our natural resources. That is why I am proud to lead the Great American Outdoors Act with my colleagues.

Grant funding from the Land and Water Conservation Fund has helped protect sites in my district and helped expand conservation efforts from the Great Swamp National Wildlife Refuge to Morristown National Historical Park. The Great American Outdoors Act will make the Land and Water Conservation Fund permanent, ensuring that future generations of Americans are able to access our natural wonders.

For too long, LWCF's promise of protecting our Nation's public lands has been broken as the funds have been diverted. The GAO would, for the first time, mandate that such funds are used as intended to protect public lands and waters, support public access, and provide an economic boost to communities.

I am so glad Congress has stepped up to expand equitable access to the outdoors by investing in our parks and public lands at all levels.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES), who is an active member of our committee, is ranking member of another committee, and who can actually springboard on Mr. RICHMOND's comments about this particular issue.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the ranking member for yielding.

"Quick, there is a global pandemic. Let's spend billions of dollars repairing fences, putting up new signs, and fixing toilets at our wildlife refuges, parks, and forests," said no one ever. Ever.

I have been sitting here listening to this debate over the last several minutes, and I have no idea what planet people are on right now.

There is a global pandemic right now. What this legislation does is it takes everything else and puts it on the back burner. That is right. Unemployment assistance goes behind this; job opportunities go behind this; improving our schools and getting our kids actually educated go behind this; medical care for our seniors goes behind this because this is mandatory spending.

Mr. Speaker, I have heard Members sit here and say that we have a \$20 billion maintenance backlog. Do you know why that is? Because we failed to appropriate the money because we have determined it is not a priority in the appropriations process.

Why are we now stepping in and circumventing that whole process again, Mr. Speaker, in the middle of a pandemic to determine that this is the greatest priority?

Mr. Speaker, let me give you an analogy of what this bill really does. This is like someone going over to their neighbor's house, taking their credit card, and going out there and using that credit card to get a new address sign in their front yard and maybe to get a new coating of paint on their house. Meanwhile, that person who took the credit card has multiple cars and has an expansive real estate holding and never thought once about their own financial situation but instead took the credit card of their neighbor who is maybe up to their neck in medical bills because their spouse is on their deathbed. That is what this bill does.

□ 1315

I have heard people say: "Well, oh, this is not taxpayers' money."

Whose money is this? What dream world are you living in? This absolutely is funds that are taxpayer funds.

"Oh, but it comes from energy revenues."

Where do those go? They go into the general treasury. This isn't excess money. This isn't some money tree.

Mr. Speaker, let me tell you about one of the most offensive things about this bill that my friend CEDRIC RICHMOND, Congressman RICHMOND, talked about. And he tried to address this in committee by proposing a bipartisan amendment with Congresswoman SEWELL, with Congressman BENNIE THOMPSON, with Congressman SCALISE, with myself, and others, a bipartisan amendment to fix this.

Virtually all of the money that this bill is spending comes from energy production off the coast of Louisiana. This bill, as many have said, this goes on in perpetuity. In 5 years, we are spending \$1 billion a year; in 10 years, \$1 billion

a year; in 50 years, \$1 billion a year; in 100 years, \$1 billion a year.

Mr. Speaker, do you realize that today 28 percent of this country is owned by the Federal Government—28 percent?

The sensible thing to do is to look at those assets, determine which of, for example, the nearly 75,000 different National Park's units and assets still make sense today. You just heard my friend talk about how 40 percent of these funds historically have been used for projects that don't advance the mission of the very agency they are supposed to be advancing.

This is a tone-deaf piece of legislation. It is mandatory spending. It is putting this as a higher priority than everything else, including that we are in a global pandemic. We have record unemployment.

Whose idea was it to do this? This is absolutely crazy.

Mr. Speaker, I urge opposition to this legislation. I urge common sense, and I urge that we sit down and actually address some of the priorities.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the distinguished leader.

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

Mr. Speaker, I came in at the end of my friend from Louisiana's discussion. I have great respect for Mr. GRAVES and I have great respect for his concern, but, very frankly, the things he talks about have been pending in the United States Senate for 60 days untended.

The leader of the Senate said the States can go bankrupt. The sense of priority apparently does not exist there, and that is regrettable.

This legislation that I rise in support of is an important piece of legislation. If, however, it displaced any of those priorities of which the gentleman spoke, I would perhaps share his opinion. We are waiting for some of those priorities to be attended to by the Senate, even if they defeat them.

We have talked about healthcare. We have talked about equal rights. We have talked about campaign finance reform. We have talked about energy. We have talked about so many subjects that are pending silently untended in the United States Senate. So the wringing of hands about this legislation pressing out other priorities I think is not accurate.

It is accurate that this is an important piece of legislation that will do much good. And I thank Chairman GRIJALVA on the Committee on Natural Resources for steering the legislation before us through his committee and working with the Senate to get it passed through that body.

Mr. Speaker, I also thank the ranking member for his concern about the maintenance and upkeep of our parks. He and I have spoken about that.

I would especially like to thank Representatives Cummings, SHERRILL—

who just spoke before me—Congressman COX, Congresswoman TORRES SMALL, Congresswoman HORN, and Congressman GOLDEN for leading this legislation in the House, along with my good friend MIKE SIMPSON from the State of Idaho.

It should be noted that the bill before us today bears the name of our dear and departed friend John Lewis, who understood that conserving America's great outdoors and public spaces went part and parcel with protecting the legacy of civil rights.

Mr. Speaker, he was, as you know, instrumental in protecting the childhood home, neighborhoods, and church associated with Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., in Atlanta—one of America's great leaders—as part of our National Park System, using the Land and Water Conservation Fund as a critical tool in that process.

The Ebenezer Baptist Church and its visitor center are among the many sites in need of repair today. It was, of course, in Ebenezer in Atlanta, in 1957, that a young John Lewis joined Dr. King and other civil rights pioneers to create the Southern Christian Leadership Conference. What an eerie and poignant coincidence the bill before us is numbered 1957.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to think that John is still here with us, guiding us forward in spirit to continue on the good work he started in Congress some 30 years ago.

Last year, when we enacted a permanent reauthorization of the Land and Water Conservation Fund—a great accomplishment of this Congress and, yes, this President—we made it clear that doing so was only the first of a two-step process.

The second step was making sure that the Land and Water Conservation Fund is permanently paid for. That is what this bill does today, with nearly \$1 billion annually in mandatory spending to sustain the fund and support critical Federal, State, and local conservation projects across this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, not only that, but the bill creates a new fund that will help address the maintenance backlog in protecting some of our most iconic national parks. The impact of these investments will be felt not only in tourism and improved public access to our public lands, but also in a cleaner and healthier environment over the long term.

In my home State of Maryland, we have used the fund to protect some of our most historic sites, protecting nature so that every American might have the same opportunity to enjoy the sanctity of nature or contact with our history.

I was personally proud to have worked to protect the watershed and the viewshed of George Washington's Mount Vernon site permanently through the creation of Piscataway Park on our side, Maryland's side, of the river.

We also used the fund to protect the Patuxent Research Refuge established to support wildlife research, Douglas Point in Nanjemoy, and countless sites throughout the Chesapeake Bay region.

In all, Maryland has received, over the years, over \$230 million from the Land and Water Conservation Fund to preserve our State's most treasured landscape and historic places.

Mr. Speaker, this bill before us passed the Senate on a strong bipartisan vote 73–25—in other words, three-quarters of the United States Senate—and I believe we will demonstrate, hopefully, similar overwhelming support in the House later today.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to join in making this critical investment in America's public lands that will conserve them for the enjoyment of generations to come. I ask them to join me, as well, in helping to secure the legacy of our friend JOHN LEWIS.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ to the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. FULCHER).

Mr. FULCHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this legislation. While I understand the merits of the bill and while some of my colleagues support it, I still have concerns.

I spent a lot of time in the rural counties of Idaho. Residents and local governments, understandably, have serious concerns regarding additional Federal land acquisition, especially at a time when Federal resources are stretched so thin.

The Federal Government doesn't have the resources to manage the land and are often prevented from allowing local involvement. Translation: More Federal land equals less land being intelligently managed and, often, more wildlife.

Currently, about two-thirds of Idaho's land mass is controlled by the Federal Government. That means less property tax, more D.C. bureaucracy, reliance on grant programs like Secure Rural Schools, Payments in Lieu of Taxes, and the ramifications of associated strings inevitably attached.

I am also concerned about our growing national debt, now over \$24 trillion. And while I appreciate that this bill utilizes revenue streams from future oil and gas receipts, it is still ultimately taxpayer money. That authorizes permanent funding, and any time there is permanent funding, that also raises a red flag.

Mr. Speaker, to be a wise steward of the people's money, Congress should regularly reevaluate programs that it funds, not automatically renew appropriations.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), our distinguished Speaker, whom I thank for helping guide this important piece of legislation to the floor and to a vote today.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank

him for being a lifelong champion of environmental justice and environmental stewardship as chair of the Committee on Natural Resources.

Mr. Speaker, as a Californian, as an American, as Speaker of the House, I proudly rise in support of the Great American Outdoors Act, one of the most important conservation and public lands bills in decades.

This legislation builds on the progress made here by House Democrats and others earlier in our majority when we passed the John D. Dingell, Jr. Conservation, Management, and Recreation Act, named for our former colleague, a fitting testament to Chairman DINGELL's legacy, which made permanent the authorization for the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

Mr. Speaker, the Great American Outdoors Act—I love the title—takes the next step in our pro-conservation agenda, as it boldly protects our country's natural and cultural heritage for our children, our grandchildren, and generations to come.

This legislation reflects the energy and expertise of our freshmen, and I particularly salute and thank Congressman JOE CUNNINGHAM of South Carolina. Congressman CUNNINGHAM is a former ocean engineer, now serving on the Committee on Natural Resources, who was the lead author on this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, in passing this legislation, Congress is ensuring that America lives up to its conservation promises, as we finally permanently fund the Land and Water Conservation Fund at levels that were promised.

Over 55 years, the Land and Water Conservation Fund has provided over \$17 billion in funding for over 40,000 recreational and conservation initiatives in every county in the country, creating and protecting America's iconic landscapes like the Grand Canyon and historical sites like the Martin Luther King, Jr. National Historical Park.

Some of California's most treasured natural areas benefited from the protection provided by the Land and Water Conservation Fund, including Joshua Tree, Lake Tahoe, and the Golden Gate National Recreation Area in the San Francisco Bay Area.

The Land and Water Conservation Fund also addresses environmental injustice by creating green spaces near low-income communities and communities of color across the country, permanently. Funding the LWCF will ensure that we preserve our natural heritage in an equitable manner to ensure that all communities can benefit.

The Great American Outdoors Act—I love the name, as I said—also makes an urgently needed investment in our national parks, which face a crippling \$12 billion deferred maintenance backlog. Our parks are critical to preservation of our natural and cultural heritage, and we must ensure that they can be enjoyed for generations to come.

The Great American Outdoors Act enjoys overwhelming bipartisan support both in the Congress and across the country. Nearly 900 national, State, and local groups representing small businesses, ranchers, sportsmen, veterans, outdoor recreationists, and conservation organizations have written in support of this legislation sharing these thoughts:

“The Great American Outdoors Act will ensure a future for nature to thrive, kids to play, hunters and anglers to enjoy. National parks and public lands provide access to the outdoors for hundreds of millions of people every year and habitat for some of our country’s most iconic wildlife.”

□ 1330

It goes on: “These treasured places also tell the stories that define and unite us as a Nation. Funds provided in this bill will secure these vital resources while preserving water quantity and quality, sustaining working landscapes and rural economies, increasing access for recreation for all Americans no matter where they live, and fueling the juggernaut of our outdoor economy.”

Indeed, the Great American Outdoors Act supports good-paying jobs and grows the economy. Nationally, outdoor recreation supports more than 5 million jobs and adds nearly \$780 billion to the economy.

House Democrats are proud to pass this bill and send it on to the President’s desk. We hope to do so in the strongest possible bipartisan way, as it passed the United States Senate.

As we do, we will continue our work to protect our environment and natural heritage by including calling on the Senate to take up H.R. 2, the Moving Forward Act, which rebuilds America’s infrastructure, while investing in a clean energy future, including by modernizing our energy infrastructure, boosting our commitment to renewables, building a clean transportation sector, and more.

Also we want to implement the Select Committee on Climate Crisis’ action plan, Solving the Climate Crisis, the most sweeping and detailed climate plan in decades, which sets out a vision of 30 by 30, conserving at least 30 percent of land and ocean in America by 2030 to confront the threats of the climate crisis, which the Great American Outdoors Act advances.

And urging the Senate to take up H.R. 9, the Climate Action Now Act, our strong response to the American people who are demanding climate action by keeping us in the Paris Agreement.

That is not in this bill. We have a different bill here. We must invest in the future we want for our children.

I just want to put this in a little perspective, Mr. Chairman and Mr. Ranking Member. And thank you for your leadership in so many ways, Mr. BISHOP.

When our country was founded and when Thomas Jefferson became Presi-

dent, he tasked Secretary of the Treasury Gallatin to build the infrastructure of America, for an infrastructure plan that would follow the Lewis and Clark Expedition. It was Erie Canal, Cumberland Road, all kinds of things, and build into the Louisiana Purchase that would follow. It was a great undertaking. Gallatin was the Secretary of the Treasury, and so many things happened at that time to build the infrastructure into the manifest destiny of America and as we moved west.

You wonder why I am bringing that up. 100 years later, at the anniversary of that initiative, President Teddy Roosevelt did his own infrastructure initiative called the National Park Service. It was to build and respect and conserve the green infrastructure of America. It was quite remarkable. So much sprang from that initiative of Teddy Roosevelt, the great conservationist.

And now, over 200 years later, this is a tip of the hat to all of that. But so much more needs to be done. It is a recognition of the importance of the great outdoors, to the quality of life, but also the juggernaut of our outdoor economy.

So, I hope we will have a strong bipartisan vote. I once again thank the distinguished chairman, Mr. GRIJALVA, for his leadership in all of this over the years and for this bill. And I, again, salute Mr. CUNNINGHAM of South Carolina for bringing his expertise as an ocean engineer to bear as the lead author of this important legislation, the Great American Outdoors Act.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, the Dingell Act, 2 years ago, was bipartisan. If this were bipartisan, we would not be here.

But to illustrate that, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR).

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, today is a very swampy day, and I am not talking about the weather. Today, Congress will pass a bill that is, frankly, a demonstration of everything that is wrong with Washington.

The Great American Outdoors Act is a product of special interests, written not by committees, but in back rooms, full of special interest provisions, and now being forced through this Chamber without the opportunity for us to amend it.

This is permanent legislation, yet we can’t take an extra hour in the House to consider amendments to make this legislation better? Why? Because the special interests that have paid nearly \$100 million in lobbying can’t be denied another day from their victory. Well, I guess they got what they bought.

Are we not allowed to amend this bill because House leadership is afraid to offend the Senate? We can decide that the Senate isn’t perfect, their product isn’t wonderful, that the House can make amendments to make it better.

Let’s be clear. This bill is nearly nothing like the legislation introduced by the supporters in the House.

The gentleman from South Carolina may think he has got a great win, but the repeal of the 100th meridian provision, which is in this bill, allows the U.S. Forest Service to steer millions of Federal spending away from his State.

Like the Comptroller of the United States told us in December, left to their own devices, the U.S. Forest Service will spend 80 percent of their funding to the west of the meridian. And that was with Congressional oversight. Once passed and set on autopilot, this program will only get worse.

If your goal was to expand recreational opportunities to more Americans, then you have failed miserably if you vote for this bill.

But that is not the only problem with this legislation. I proposed a bipartisan amendment that would require the construction done under this act to adhere to Buy American provisions.

It was endorsed by the United Steelworkers, the AFL-CIO, American Iron and Steel Institute, and a broad coalition of trade associations and unions. The underlying bill includes billions in new spending on infrastructure. Those billions could be spent on products manufactured by American workers.

Can Congress consider this today? No.

Why? Because the Speaker rejected the amendment, rejected American workers, and rejected American manufacturing. At a time when America needs jobs, a failure to include Buy American provisions in this bill is a shame on this House.

I had amendments dealing with the infrastructure challenges facing our Native American reservations, including funding for Indian education and Indian health. In areas where COVID-19 was destructive, they need funds desperately to get back into the 21st century from their current dilapidated state.

Will Congress consider these amendments? No, because the special interests behind this legislation don’t want us to consider those needs on the floor of the House.

Considering this legislation sets the Federal Government on a massive land buying spree like never seen before, I prepared an amendment to protect our counties by ensuring full payment in the Payments in Lieu of Taxes program.

Do you remember that contract? Can we honor it? That won’t even be considered, as well as anything else.

This legislation isn’t a victory for America; it is a loss. Good process builds good policy builds good politics. It is a shame that we didn’t go there. I ask everybody to vote against this legislation.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BARRAGÁN) and thank her for her work on environmental justice legislation.

Ms. BARRAGÁN. Mr. Speaker, green spaces should be a right for everyone, regardless of where they live or the color of their skin.

Unfortunately, for too many Black, Brown, and Native American communities, parks are considered a privilege. Today, we can change this injustice.

The Great American Outdoors Act will create more local parks in low-income and urban neighborhoods. Minority communities across the country lack access to green spaces.

In my district, in Compton, we only have about half an acre of parkland for every thousand residents, well below the averages in the rest of Los Angeles County and the Nation.

Voting “yes” means more outdoor recreation opportunities, including sports fields and trails. Voting “yes” means all kids, no matter their ZIP Code, have the right to play on green space and explore the natural world.

I am proud to vote “yes” to secure this right for our young people today and for future generations.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK), one of the ranking members on the committee, who has spent a lot of time on our committee and understands these issues.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I represent the Sierra Nevada of California. Yosemite Valley, Sequoia and Kings Canyon, and Lake Tahoe are all within my district.

The Yosemite Land Grant Act signed by President Lincoln in 1864 was the first time the Federal Government set aside land for “public use, resort, and recreation . . . for all time.”

Today, the Federal estate has grown to 640 million acres. That is 28 percent of the land area of our Nation. While the Federal Government owns just seven-tenths of 1 percent of New York State and 1.8 percent of Texas, it owns 46 percent of my home State of California and 93 percent of Alpine County in my district.

Now, we in the Sierra revere our public lands, and we are proud to share them with the world. But the Federal Government now holds far more land than it can take care of. The Federal lands now face a \$20 billion backlog of deferred maintenance, which makes tourism less desirable.

Now, this is all land that is off the local tax rolls, denying our local governments vital revenues. Federal restrictions on productive use of these lands has devastated local economies and, worst of all, the Federal Government has utterly neglected the management of our forests to the point that they have become morbidly overgrown and now present a constant threat of catastrophic fire.

Now, shouldn't we take care of the land we already hold before we acquire still more land? And when we have already taken two-thirds of Alaska and Utah and four-fifths of Nevada, shouldn't we pause and ask for some balance around the country?

Now, this measure does provide enough money over the next 5 years to address about half of our current de-

ferred maintenance needs, and that is very good. But then that funding disappears, and we are left with locked-in, billion-dollar-a-year mandatory spending in perpetuity for new land acquisitions placed outside of Congress' control, while removing the requirement that future acquisitions be focused where the Federal Government owns very little land.

It means that unelected bureaucrats will have a billion-dollar-a-year slush fund to take private property off the tax rolls with no accountability to our local communities, no provisions for long-term maintenance, and no reforms to protect our people from the scourge of wildfire produced by the continuing neglect of our Federal forests.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. PANETTA).

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Great American Outdoors Act.

In my district on the central coast of California, we protect, we promote, and we never put a price on our environment. Partly because it is what drives our local economy, but also we appreciate what it means for those after us.

By fully funding the Land and Water Conservation Fund, this bill ensures the type of necessary care needed for our National Parks, forests, and critical wildlife areas. This is needed today, because those treasures have been put under extreme pressure with this pandemic, but also previously with increased visitors and decreased budgets.

That is why this legislation is so important, as it will not only address needed infrastructure projects and deferred maintenance, but also because it will promote conservation, recreation, and access to the outdoors.

By passing this bipartisan bill that ensures investments in our parks and forests, we are ensuring that our natural treasures, our postcards to the future, actually get delivered to future generations.

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. MCADAMS).

□ 1345

Mr. MCADAMS. Madam Speaker, Utah is blessed with many treasured national areas, from parks and trails to red rock canyons. Conserving these places is more important than ever, and today, we take landmark action by passing full funding for the Land and Water Conservation Fund. This successful conservation program has given us, at no cost to the taxpayer, decades of vital funding for national and State parks, wildlife refuges, and recreational areas.

State and local officials rely on the money to improve local parks and trails, which see increased demand along the rapidly growing Wasatch Front. Utah has five of the country's

most beloved national parks, including Zion National Park, which has quite literally been loved to death and has a \$67 million backlog in deferred maintenance. This bill provides some desperately needed funding to fill that backlog.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud today to be voting for this legislation and the promise it holds for our economy and an excellent quality of life in Utah for my children and for future generations.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I won't tell the gentleman from Utah that the Utah Association of Counties is opposed to this and all the trails that he is talking about come from the State's side of projects. That is beside the point.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA).

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member and colleague from Utah. I appreciate his service and his force with which he does things here.

Mr. Speaker, all right, where are we? Gigantic deficits, yet we want to add to the burden of that deficit with a forced \$900 million, nearly \$1 billion, every year in this bill for acquiring new Federal land.

Now, I come from the West, so we are already ravaged by wildfire, by unmanaged lands that are detrimental to the neighbors, to the private lands. I have three fires going on in my district right now. A lot of this emanates from unmanaged Forest Service lands. So, we want to add to their inability to manage even more lands in this legislation.

Now, the part of the bill that Mr. BISHOP had authored is a good part, taking care of the backlog that we have in our parks and our lands, if you would listen to him, \$20 billion worth of backlog that we haven't found a way to pay for yet. Yet, instead of finishing our dinner, we are already going for the dessert by buying more lands that we can't afford and we know we can't manage.

I will be thinking about this, and my constituents will, as more and more forest lands burn each year and threaten communities. These forests are gated off because they don't have time to do the maintenance and the work that needs to be done so the public can have access to these lands because of the \$20 billion backlog or the funding to take care of the juniper problem that we have in northeast California, the wild horse population that needs to be managed so they don't die out there of starvation during the draught, the sage grouse habitat so they don't become endangered, and our local counties, our rural counties, that are already struggling with the lack of PILT funds because they have to come back here and beg every year for the payment in lieu of taxes to get this place to keep its commitments on that and

to secure rural schools funds that our rural counties need.

Mr. Speaker, I say “no” on this bill and get back to managing what we should manage.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close when the gentleman from Utah is done with his speakers.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

We have talked about several of the problems with this particular bill. With this particular bill, we have talked about how the poor reckoning of its sources there do not say what is going to happen if this money does not develop. I think Mr. GRAVES would be good to talk about where this money is coming and how it is being used at the same time. And we don't necessarily know what will happen with the lowering of the royalties that we are experiencing this year from next year.

There is one other consideration I hope that people will understand, especially for all those who are speaking about it who come from the eastern coast. There was a conforming amendment put in the Senate in this particular bill, a conforming amendment. In the good old days, we used to call them earmarks, but it is a conforming amendment.

The original bill said that on Forest Service land that would be bought, 15 percent of that had to come from west of the 100th meridian and 85 percent had to come from east of the 100th meridian. That was taken out, quietly and surely taken out. The end result of that means that there is a siphoning of billions of dollars that should be and could be going to Eastern States.

I mention that because one of the Democrat speakers did speak about the need for urban recreation opportunities. That was what was supposed to happen, and with this conforming amendment, that is what is taken out of the bill.

In the 1960s, as this bill was being discussed, Orville Freeman was the Secretary of Agriculture for Kennedy. He said at that time that the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission pointed out that the greatest need for recreation opportunities lies in the areas adjacent to the metropolitan centers in the Eastern States.

It would be our purpose under this bill to expand about 84 percent of what would be available under it for acquisition in the eastern national forest acquired under the Weeks Act.

In fact, that commission went on to say that outdoor opportunities are most urgently needed near metropolitan areas. Much of the West and virtually all of Alaska are of little use to most Americans looking for a place in the Sun for their families on a weekend when the demand is overwhelming.

At regional and State levels, most of the land is where people are not. One-sixth is in the sparsely populated Alaska. Seventy-two percent of the remainder is in the West, where only 15 per-

cent of the people live. The Northeast, where one-quarter of the people live, only 4 percent of the acreage is there.

But that language was not put in there by happenstance. There was a reason for it. In one iteration of this particular act that we introduced a long time ago, there was the idea of putting a specific percentage that would go to urban recreation so there would be those urban recreation concepts, as was originally designed in the bill. That has been taken out.

What that will mean is that for you who live east of the 100th meridian, basically east of Denver, there will be \$1.19 billion less dedicated to you than there would have been if this amendment had not been put in there. That works out to an average of \$32 million per congressional district of those living east of Denver.

I am glad that all those who are for this, on whatever side, will have a good time to explain to their constituents why they are in favor of giving their area \$32 million less in recreation opportunity simply because you are going to confirm a conforming amendment that was slipped into the Senate version of this bill that really hurts this process and is not necessarily positive.

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. KILMER).

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman and all who worked on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, as someone who grew up on the Olympic Peninsula, I learned how important protecting our parks and our public lands is to driving tourism and growing jobs and supporting rural economies.

This is a big day. Permanently funding the Land and Water Conservation Fund, providing dedicated funding to make much-needed repairs at Olympic National Park and throughout our park system, this is progress for ensuring that these natural assets can continue to provide amazing visitor experiences and serve as economic drivers for rural communities that need these jobs and need these opportunities for future generations.

This is a day to also celebrate the extraordinary coalition of environmental groups, outdoor economy groups, and local civic leaders that got involved to move this bill forward today.

I am grateful for all who worked on this. I am proud to be a supporter of this bill, and I am encouraging all of my colleagues to vote “yes” today.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES).

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I want to introduce another dose of reality, something you have not heard many folks talk about today.

Where is this money coming from? How are we paying for this initially—what is it?—\$1.9 or \$2.9 billion a year in mandatory spending?

This is coming from offshore energy revenues. That is where the majority of these moneys are coming from, from oil and gas production. I want to be clear: from oil and gas production.

Now, the majority at the same time and in the same breath is taking step after step to decimate or eliminate the domestic energy industry, therefore not making us get oil and gas from the United States but getting it from places like Russia, as we have seen over and over again when these drastic policies have been put forth.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the other thing is, any time you have energy revenues like this produced on Federal land under the Mineral Leasing Act, 50 percent of the money goes to those States that host that production, and they can use it for whatever they want. They can use it for whatever they want to use it for.

In this case, the Gulf States, Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, Texas, we get about 4 percent right now.

So, Mr. Speaker, I have a question. I have a question for my friends on the majority. Can they tell me what they are going to say to the residents of Texas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, and Florida next time we have a huge hurricane come through because you have refused, under the bipartisan amendment that the Congressional Black Caucus and others advocated, you have refused to allow for a larger percentage of money to be invested back in the resilience of this ecosystem, the resilience of these communities?

Tell me what you are going to say to them whenever we have another Hurricane Katrina, Rita, Gustav, Ike, Harvey, Irma, Maria, Michael, Florence. Tell me what you are going to say to them because you are taking their money, and you are spending it in other places, and you are saying this is for the environment, these environmental groups out there advocating for this, when it is a greater environmental investment to make it in the Gulf.

Mr. Speaker, I urge opposition to the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD statements from the U.S. Farm Bureau Association and the Cattlemen's Association in opposition to this, from the American Energy Alliance in opposition to this, as well as the CRS report that analyzes from whence this money comes, whence it is going, and how much we probably won't have in the future.

JUNE 5, 2020.

Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

Hon. CHUCK SCHUMER,
Minority Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATORS: We the undersigned western state Farm Bureau organizations write to express our concerns and areas of opposition to the S. 3422, the Great American Outdoors Act (GAOA). While we recognize the significant benefits that the GAOA would

provide in addressing the extensive maintenance backlog for federally-managed lands, we also write to express our collective concerns with funding further expansion of federal land ownership in the west.

Farm Bureau members are significantly and directly impacted by federal land ownership, land-use policies and decisions. Throughout the West, our members hold public lands grazing permits, own property adjacent to federal lands and engage in public and private land forestry. For many ranchers, access to public lands grazing is economically and ecologically essential to their operation and provides access to land that may not otherwise be available to new or beginning farmers and ranchers.

Legislation or regulation that could be used to curtail viable multiple use access to these public resources is a threat to America's farming and ranching families. Historical experience illustrates, in many cases, that expansion of public land ownership over time leads to new policies that further limit multiple uses of land such as livestock grazing or create additional restrictions on access and rangeland improvements. Further, additional federal land acquisition does not adequately consider the reduction in economic activity and the loss of jobs in resource-dependent communities. For these reasons, Farm Bureau believes that it is essential for agricultural stakeholders to be represented on any sort of planning and/or advisory committees formed for federal land expansion especially in those areas where private or state land is proposed for purchase or exchange.

American farmers and ranchers have always demonstrated their fortitude and resilience in adapting to the ever-changing landscape—both political and ecological. While the resources made available through federally managed lands provide opportunities for ranchers to add value to their businesses, availability of private land is essential for successful business and commerce. The federal government already owns over 640 million acres, which is approximately 28% of the 2.27 billion acres of land in the U.S.

Since enactment of the LWCF in 1965, Congress has appropriated \$18.9 billion (not adjusted for inflation), of which \$11.4 billion was for federal land acquisition. Over 5 million acres of private land has been purchased by USDA and DOI agencies.

The Federal government already owns more land than it can effectively maintain and manage. In the west, the federal government owns roughly every other acre of land and many counties have more than 75% of their land in federal ownership. Further federal land ownership erodes the available tax base and limits the ability of local governments to effectively provide critical government services.

The second title of the GAOA establishes the Land and Water Conservation Fund as a trust fund with permanent authorization and without annual appropriations oversight. The Congressional Budget Office (CBO) estimates the price tag for the first year of this legislation could be upwards of \$20 billion. In this midst of the current pandemic and related economic crisis, we are concerned with the additional financial burden this legislation would create.

We believe, at this time, that funds allocated by the Land and Water Conservation Act (LWCA) would be better utilized to manage existing federal lands and request Congress amend the GAOA to allow for LWCA funds to instead be allocated to individual state foresters for their use in fire suppression, fire management and conservation efforts instead of utilizing funds to acquire additional private property. We request that you consider the following amendment requests:

1. Sunset in five years. This would allow the Congress to evaluate the program and decide whether to reauthorize, modify, or eliminate it. A five-year sunset would conform the LWCF title of the bill with the \$49.5 billion maintenance title.

2. Limit land acquisition to states with less than the collective average of those western states with federal owned/administered lands.

3. Require that all federal land acquisitions be subject to approval of the relevant state legislature, Governor, and county commissions.

4. Require notice of any potential land acquisition be given at least 90 days before title can be transferred to the state legislature, Governor, and county commissioners. Notice should include the annual loss of property tax revenues that will result; or if the land is already held by a tax-exempt owner, such as a land trust, the notice should include the tax revenues lost if the property were subject to property taxes.

5. Require that priority be given to the maintenance backlog, forgoing any acquisition requests in those instances when revenues are limited.

Additionally, our organizations would welcome the opportunity for inclusion of additional maintenance and enhancement projects that would benefit critical natural resources to the West. We ask that you consider including the provisions of S. 2044, the Water Supply Infrastructure Rehabilitation and Utilization Act. This amendment would create an aging infrastructure account within the Bureau of Reclamation (BOR) to provide loans to local water managers to perform extraordinary maintenance on the federal BOR infrastructure they manage. Initially, \$40 million per year over five years (\$2 billion total) would be provided to this account from the Reclamation Fund. No taxpayer funds would be used to fund the account and water users would be required to repay the loans received to repair and replace water facilities with interest. The repaid funds would be available to BOR to fund additional extraordinary maintenance projects, essentially creating a revolving fund.

The GAOA provides deferred maintenance for every federal asset agency within the Department of Interior except BOR. Yet, BOR is facing significant issues with deferred and maintenance needs at federal water supply facilities. 80% of BOR's facilities are more than 50 years old and are in need of major upgrades or replacement costs beyond regular maintenance. Since water managers do not own the infrastructure, they are unable to bond against it and therefore have limited access to other sources of capital for major repair projects. Creating this account within BOR would allow water managers to perform repairs, repay cost over time and ultimately ensure that our aging federal water infrastructure remains viable to serve the billions of dollars of agricultural and other economic activity that depends on it.

Our organizations are happy to further discuss the GAOA, our recommendations and the opportunity for inclusion of additional maintenance projects. We thank you in advance for your consideration and look forward to continuing this important conversation.

Sincerely,

American Farm Bureau Federation, Alaska Farm Bureau Federation, Arizona Farm Bureau Federation, California Farm Bureau Federation, Colorado Farm Bureau Federation, Idaho Farm Bureau Federation, Montana Farm Bureau Federation, Nevada Farm Bureau Federation, New Mexico Farm and Livestock Bureau, Oregon Farm Bureau Federation, Washington Farm Bureau Federation, Wyoming Farm Bureau Federation.

[From the American Energy Alliance, July 22, 2020]

KEY VOTE NO ON H.R. 1957

The American Energy Alliance urges all members to vote NO on H.R. 1957 as amended by the Senate with the text of the Great American Outdoors Act. The federal government already owns far more land than it can adequately manage, which is part of the reason for the large maintenance backlog this bill tries to address. However, the Land and Water Conservation Fund is simply a vehicle for buying up even more land for the federal government to mismanage.

By buying up land, the federal government hems in and impoverishes local rural communities by removing taxable land and limiting space for economic activity. Land procured through the LWCF that is later placed off limits to development further harms the local communities as well as harming the larger economy. While the LWCF itself is questionable policy, at least the current structure of the fund allows for congressional input into the land acquisition process through appropriations. Making LWCF funding permanent removes this last Congressional check on federal land acquisition. Permanent funding of the LWCF should be opposed.

The AEA urges all members to support free markets and affordable energy by voting NO on H.R. 1957 as amended with the Great American Outdoors Act. AEA will include this vote in its American Energy Scorecard.—Thomas Pyle, President, American Energy Alliance.

[From CRS Reports & Analysis]

EFFECT OF COVID-19 ON FEDERAL LAND REVENUES, JULY 13, 2020 (R46448)

EFFECT OF COVID-19 ON ENERGY AND MINERAL OPERATIONS AND RECEIPTS

The COVID-19 pandemic and accompanying recession have significantly affected energy and mineral prices, production, and consumption. Many observers expect energy consumption will remain below 2019 levels through at least 2021 . . . These expectations stem from reported and ongoing reduced demand for liquid fuels for the transportation sector and reduced demand for coal and natural gas associated with the reduced demand for electricity and industrial activity.

Royalties are the largest contributor to federal energy and mineral revenues. Royalty rates are set by statute, regulation, or for specific leases, but the rates are rarely altered once a lease has been issued. The revenues from royalties reflect the product of the royalty rate and the market value of the commodity produced. The pandemic and accompanying recession have resulted in reduced demand for oil, gas, and coal, which has resulted in lower prices and lower production for these commodities in recent months, relative to 2019.

For May 2020, ONRR reported onshore oil and gas royalty collections of \$170 million, a decline of 53% from May 2019. ONRR reported offshore oil and gas royalty collections of \$100 million, a decline of 84% from royalty collections for the same month in 2019. The royalty collections for May reflect production and sales in April. ONRR reports new monthly data on an ongoing basis.

To the extent that royalties and other revenues are reduced due to impacts from the COVID-19 pandemic and recession, disbursements to states and some federal programs would decline accordingly. The severity of these impacts on program funding and state budgets depends on the portion of total revenue coming from energy and mineral disbursements and on other factors. Some programs (e.g., the LWCF) receive disbursements up to a specified limit; in such cases,

royalties could fall but remain sufficient to fund such programs. Reductions in energy and mineral revenues also could affect the funds remaining in the U.S. Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time I actually have left here.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Utah has 3½ minutes remaining.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

We have heard all sorts of platitudes about this bill today. Whether it passes or not is actually irrelevant. It is not bipartisan, and it has all sorts of flaws. There are questions about the future source of funding.

We have heard speaker after speaker come up and say: We are not talking about taxpayers' money. This is only royalties that are off there.

One of the problems we have to face is that all the royalties that come from offshore development and onshore development from energy and gas, those royalties are placed in the general fund. In fact, the second largest source of funds that go into the general fund is from these royalties, second only to the IRS taxes that go in there. If these revenues weren't deposited in LWCF, they would be deposited in the general fund of the U.S. Treasury. If that is not taxpayer money, I don't know what is.

We have talked about the need for, actually, urban recreation areas. We would like to do it, but unfortunately, this bill diminishes that opportunity and puts it in limbo, which is not good.

I have heard speaker after speaker come up here with pretty pictures about our national parks, reservation lands, BLM land, resource lands, all these things that need to be helped. A lot of them talked about all the wonderful programs that are on State lands, that are parks, roads, picnic areas, and all those things which we are already doing.

When we permanently reauthorized the LWCF last Congress, that is when we put more money into those types of things everyone says is wonderful.

□ 1400

What we didn't put more money into is buying Federal land, buying more land to put into the Federal estate. As everyone talks about how important it is actually to now start putting money into park maintenance, into maintenance of the backlog, what this bill does is put that at the very lowest rung on priorities of where this royalty money is spent.

You will spend it first on GOMESA. You will send it to the States. It will go to historic preservation. You will spend it on buying up more land before you ever come to anything that helps the parks and helps the public lands. That is because we have disproportionately done this.

This bill is not about funding our public lands. This bill is about circumventing the limitations that we put in in the last Congress on buying more

land. The only thing this bill is about is how we can find another way to buy more property.

We can't even afford the property we already have. There is a \$20 billion maintenance backlog. But what this is attempting to do is find a way to put more money into buying more land so we can exacerbate that problem.

Now, you can say all you want to about how wonderful it is, how good it is, and, I am sorry, most of those platitudes were misstated. They were talking about things that either already exist or are actually being de-emphasized by this particular bill.

What this bill is about is: Are you going to put more money into buying more land before you put more money into actually maintaining the land we already have? That is really the only issue of this bill, and that is why we are fighting this strongly about it.

Last year, when we did the Dingell Act, that was bipartisan. We had worked together to come up with a lot of bipartisan stuff. This was not a bipartisan bill. Mr. KILMER, I appreciated his work with me on the parks. That was bipartisan. This is not bipartisan. It is still about how do we buy more land. That is the goal of this piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, how much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Arizona has 7¼ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. Speaker, the process of this legislation reaching this point on the floor to be voted upon has, to those of us involved, been difficult. It has been frustrating. Yet, the possibility of it being done was always there, and that was the goal. I think the overwhelming support in the Senate for a clean bill to come to the House was bipartisan.

I think today would have been—I didn't feel it was necessary to engage in the same arguments that we have been engaging about with the Land and Water Conservation Fund in particular and the backlog. This legislation is not about robbing Peter to pay Paul. It is not about taking money from the East to give to the West. It is not about denying coastal States their share.

If we do transition, as we transition, which we need to urgently, to clean energy in the future, future Congresses, I think, will have the foresight to look at this legislation and deal with how we move forward with it and continue to fund it.

When I went to visit Land and Water Conservation Fund sites, I went to a park in south Phoenix, the only green space and recreation area for close to 8,000 families who live in that general area, Land and Water Conservation Fund; and when I went to other locations in urban areas across this country, Land and Water Conservation Fund.

That continues to be a priority for reasons of public health, equity, and access.

Mr. Speaker, in a strange procedural trick of the House, we have spent this afternoon debating the Great American Outdoors Act, but the bill we refer to as H.R. 1957 began as something else.

H.R. 1957 was originally a bill to protect taxpayers by ensuring fair treatment under the law. It was introduced back in March 2019 by our late friend and colleague, Representative John Lewis.

Now, I can't personally speak to Representative Lewis' thoughts on conservation spending. But I do believe our late friend would be happy with the work that we have done here today and the vote that we are about to take.

Representative Lewis truly believed in a government by and for the people, all the people. He challenged us to leave petty partisanship at the door and to consider the essential pursuit of justice and equity that we have long sought and failed to meet in this country.

I am proud to have called Representative Lewis my friend. I am proud that we can honor his legacy with the passage of this bill.

There is much work left to be done to ensure real equity and justice in the United States, and I look forward to working with all my colleagues across the aisle in continuing that work in the future.

But when we come together as we have today, as the people's representatives working toward the common goal of protecting future generations, then perhaps there is hope we might see Representative Lewis' vision realized.

I thank all of my colleagues who spoke on behalf of this legislation. I thank leadership for bringing it to the floor and all the members of the committee and Members not on the committee who worked very hard to bring this legislation forward. It is historic. It is important. It is necessary. And it is an essential step. I urge us to vote "yes" on H.R. 1957.

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my support for the Senate amendment to H.R. 1957, the Great American Outdoors Act. This legislation will establish permanent funding for the Land and Water Conservation Fund and establish a National Parks and Public Land Legacy Restoration Fund supporting deferred maintenance projects on federal lands. The funding authorized by this legislation will assist many states, including my home state of Rhode Island, in improving state parks and beaches, and preserving open spaces and wildlife habitats. Additionally, funding for deferred maintenance projects within the National Park System will help ensure that resources remain available to Rhode Island in the future for required improvements and developments for sites like the Roger Williams National Memorial and the Blackstone Valley National Historic Park.

While I support this legislation, I am hopeful that the Natural Resources Committee, as well

as the House Appropriations Committee, will work to improve funding outcomes for coastal states under the Land and Water Conservation Fund. Per-capita, coastal states receive approximately forty cents on the dollar compared to funding received by inland states. Rhode Island's coastal economy generates more than \$2 billion annually, and supports more than 41,000 jobs, while New England as a whole supports nearly a quarter of a million jobs through its coastal economy. As a result of geography, coastal states face a number of challenges which many inland states do not face, including beach erosion, migrating fish stocks which impact commercial fisheries, and vulnerability to tropical storms and other weather-related disasters. All of these challenges are further exacerbated by the effects of climate change.

Congress needs to be able to support critical programs like the Land and Water Conservation Fund and also ensure that coastal communities are able to receive necessary funds to preserve their coastlines, protect wildlife, and support workers who rely on jobs supported by ocean economies. I look forward to working with Chairman GRIJALVA to discuss ways in which we may be able to achieve this going forward.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support the bipartisan Great American Outdoors Act, which, among other things, would address the National Park Service's (NPS) deferred maintenance backlog, a problem that disproportionately affects the National Capital Region and, especially, the District of Columbia. Twenty percent of the District consists of parkland, almost 90 percent of which is under the jurisdiction of NPS.

National parks are some of America's greatest treasures, yet NPS, the agency that maintains our federal parks, has a \$12 billion maintenance backlog. One-sixth of all projects in the backlog are in the National Capital Region, with \$1.3 billion in D.C. itself. The National Mall and Memorial Parks have the highest number of deferred maintenance projects in the nation, with more than \$840 million in needed repairs still outstanding, according to Pew Charitable Trusts. The most significant deferred maintenance projects involve refurbishing memorials and making necessary repairs for supporting infrastructure. Although these parks are located in D.C., they are of national significance. The National Mall and Memorial Parks accommodate more than 36 million visits each year and roughly 30,000 people use their 15 softball fields, eight volleyball courts, two rugby fields and the Washington Monument grounds for sporting events nearly year-round. This heavy use has caused a \$13 million repair backlog for the Mall grounds.

In addition to the National Mall and Memorial Parks, NPS owns most of D.C.'s neighborhood parks, including 156 small green spaces and many circles, squares and fountains throughout D.C. Also included in the backlog are historic sites such as Ford's Theatre, the FDR Memorial, East and West Potomac Parks, the Carter Barron Amphitheatre and the Belmont-Paul Women's Equality National Monument. I support passage of the Great American Outdoors Act so that NPS can properly maintain all of our incredible national parks.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support Senate Amendment to H.R. 1957. The Great

American Outdoors Act is landmark legislation that will clear the maintenance backlog at our National Parks, protect our country's ecosystems, and permanently fund the Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF). The permanent funding of the LWCF has been one of my longtime goals. When I was Chairman of the Natural Resources Committee, I introduced the Conservation and Reinvestment Act (CARA) with my dear friend, the late Chairman John Dingell by my side. Today marks the culmination of our work, and I am proud to have accomplished this with the help of John's wife, Congresswoman DEBBIE DINGELL. My enthusiasm for permanent LWCF funding is as strong now as it was then. In recognition of this day, Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the following op-ed that I authored in the Fairbanks Daily News-Miner on July 4, 2000 in support of CARA.

[From the Fairbanks (Alaska) Daily News-Miner, July 4, 2000]

LEGISLATION BESTOWS LASTING ALASKA RETURNS
(By Don Young)

There's been a lot of interesting speculation about my legislation called the Conservation and Reinvestment Act. Numerous stories and editorials have been written about what this landmark bill would do and why I led the effort to pass such a major conservation package.

Even News-Miner columnist Fred Pratt has devoted a significant amount of attention to CARA and my participation in this process. In his most recent column, he speculated that I wrote the bill to benefit Alaska Native corporations. This was a new and novel theory, but unfortunately, not accurate.

The truth is actually very simple—CARA is good for all Alaskans.

In Alaska and throughout the nation, CARA will increase funding for federal and state conservation and recreation programs, urban parks, historic preservation, and wildlife conservation. The bill also resolves a major inequity regarding the disposition of funds generated from Outer Continental Shelf activities.

Currently, states receive 50 percent of the revenues for onshore oil production but nothing from the federal waters six miles and beyond a state's coast. CARA corrects this problem by creating new programs that benefit coastal states with the OCS revenues, which have averaged between \$4 to \$5 billion annually. Under CARA, \$2.8 billion of this funding will go toward important recreation, wildlife and conservation programs each year.

In addition, CARA creates new private property protections which go beyond existing law.

Alaska will receive about \$2.5 billion during the 15-year period included in CARA for these programs. Each year, Alaska would receive: \$87 million for coastal conservation programs; \$38.5 million for state and federal land conservation under the Land and Water Conservation Fund; \$17.5 million for wildlife conservation; \$9.8 million in PILT payments; \$9 million for federal and Native land restoration; and about \$1.5 million for historic preservation and endangered species programs.

In previous years, the LWCF has helped fund several popular Alaska projects including Alaskaland in Fairbanks, the Coastal Trail in Anchorage and Eagle Crest in Juneau. The increased funding for the state programs under the LWCF will allow for local communities to determine how these funds are spent in their own communities based upon their local priorities, rather than federal dictates.

Despite inaccurate claims by fringe groups like the American Land Rights Association, CARA also includes new private property protections that go beyond existing law. No new federal land can be acquired under CARA without the specific approval of Congress. The federal government can only purchase land from willing sellers—condemnation is not allowed under CARA unless it is specifically approved by Congress. CARA also created new requirements to protect land owners who do not want to sell their land from new regulations.

Additionally, the administration must seek to use land exchanges and conservation easements as alternatives to acquisition. These new protections were included to enhance private property rights in all 50 states.

Despite the noisy opposition by some fringe groups, CARA is supported by thousands of organizations and officials throughout the nation. Last month, CARA was overwhelmingly approved by the U.S. House by a 315 to 102 vote with a majority of both Republicans and Democrats voting for passage of the bill. CARA is supported by all 50 governors, the U.S. Conference of Mayors and the National Association of Counties. CARA has also been endorsed by more than 4,500 organizations including numerous conservation, hunting, fishing, and recreation groups like the National Rifle Association, and other organizations like the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Realtors.

Alaskans know that over the past 27 years, I have lead the effort for the authorization of the trans-Alaska pipeline, oil development in Prudhoe Bay and the Coastal Plain, a strong mining industry, and numerous other economic programs in every region of the state.

During this same period, I have also authored numerous important conservation bills including the reauthorization of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation Act and a comprehensive improvement of America's national wildlife refuge system.

In addition, I have authored and supported dozens of bills to promote hunting, fishing and outdoor recreation in our state and the entire nation.

Fred Pratt is correct. CARA and its expanded conservation, wildlife and recreation programs is consistent with my 27-year congressional record of working for Alaskans.

Don Young has served as Alaska's sole representative in Congress since 1973.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 1053, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA).

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. 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.

PERMISSION TO EXTEND DEBATE
TIME ON H.R. 7573, REPLACING
BUST OF ROGER BROOKE TANEY
WITH BUST OF THURGOOD MARSHALL

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that debate

under clause 1(c) of rule XV on a motion to suspend the rules relating to H.R. 7573 be extended to 1 hour.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

REPLACING BUST OF ROGER BROOKE TANEY WITH BUST OF THURGOOD MARSHALL

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 7573) to direct the Architect of the Capitol to replace the bust of Roger Brooke Taney in the Old Supreme Court Chamber of the United States Capitol with a bust of Thurgood Marshall to be obtained by the Joint Committee on the Library and to remove certain statues from areas of the United States Capitol which are accessible to the public, to remove all statues of individuals who voluntarily served the Confederate States of America from display in the United States Capitol, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 7573

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

SECTION 1. REPLACEMENT OF BUST OF ROGER BROOKE TANEY WITH BUST OF THURGOOD MARSHALL.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) While sitting in the United States Capitol, the Supreme Court issued the infamous *Dred Scott v. Sandford* decision on March 6, 1857. Written by Chief Justice Roger Brooke Taney, whose bust sits inside the entrance to the Old Supreme Court Chamber in the United States Capitol, this opinion declared that African Americans were not citizens of the United States and could not sue in Federal courts. This decision further declared that Congress did not have the authority to prohibit slavery in the territories.

(2) Chief Justice Roger Brooke Taney's authorship of *Dred Scott v. Sandford*, the effects of which would only be overturned years later by the ratification of the 13th, 14th, and 15th Amendments to the Constitution of the United States, renders a bust of his likeness unsuitable for the honor of display to the many visitors to the United States Capitol.

(3) As Frederick Douglass said of this decision in May 1857, "This infamous decision of the Slaveholding wing of the Supreme Court maintains that slaves are within the contemplation of the Constitution of the United States, property; that slaves are property in the same sense that horses, sheep, and swine are property; that the old doctrine that slavery is a creature of local law is false; that the right of the slaveholder to his slave does not depend upon the local law, but is secured wherever the Constitution of the United States extends; that Congress has no right to prohibit slavery anywhere; that slavery may go in safety anywhere under the star-spangled banner; that colored persons of African descent have no rights that white men are bound to respect; that colored men of African descent are not and cannot be citizens of the United States."

(4) While the removal of Chief Justice Roger Brooke Taney's bust from the United

States Capitol does not relieve the Congress of the historical wrongs it committed to protect the institution of slavery, it expresses Congress's recognition of one of the most notorious wrongs to have ever taken place in one of its rooms, that of Chief Justice Roger Brooke Taney's *Dred Scott v. Sandford* decision.

(b) REMOVAL OF BUST OF ROGER BROOKE TANEY.—Not later than 45 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Joint Committee on the Library shall remove the bust of Roger Brooke Taney in the Old Supreme Court Chamber of the United States Capitol.

(c) REPLACEMENT WITH BUST OF THURGOOD MARSHALL.—

(1) OBTAINING BUST.—Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Joint Committee on the Library shall enter into an agreement to obtain a bust of Thurgood Marshall, under such terms and conditions as the Joint Committee considers appropriate consistent with applicable law.

(2) PLACEMENT.—The Joint Committee on the Library shall place the bust obtained under paragraph (1) in the location in the Old Supreme Court Chamber of the United States Capitol where the bust of Roger Brooke Taney was located prior to removal by the Architect of the Capitol under subsection (b).

SEC. 2. REMOVAL OF CERTAIN STATUES AND BUST.

(a) REMOVAL.—Not later than 45 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Joint Committee on the Library shall remove the statue of Charles Brantley Aycock, the statue of John Caldwell Calhoun, the statue of James Paul Clarke, and the bust of John Cabell Breckinridge from any area of the United States Capitol which is accessible to the public.

(b) STORAGE OF STATUES.—The Architect of the Capitol shall keep any statue and bust removed under subsection (a) in storage until the Architect and the State which provided the statue or bust arrange for the return of the statue or bust to the State.

SEC. 3. REQUIREMENTS AND REMOVAL PROCEDURES FOR STATUES IN NATIONAL STATUARY HALL.

(a) REQUIREMENTS.—Section 1814 of the Revised Statutes (2 U.S.C. 2131) is amended by inserting "(other than persons who served as an officer or voluntarily with the Confederate States of America or of the military forces or government of a State while the State was in rebellion against the United States)" after "military services".

(b) STATUE REMOVAL PROCEDURES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—

(A) IDENTIFICATION BY ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL.—The Architect of the Capitol shall identify all statues on display in the United States Capitol that do not meet the requirements of section 1814 of the Revised Statutes (2 U.S.C. 2131), as amended by subsection (a); and

(B) REMOVAL BY JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE LIBRARY.—The Joint Committee on the Library shall arrange for the removal of each statue identified by the Architect of the Capitol under subparagraph (B) from the Capitol by not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) REMOVAL AND RETURN OF STATUES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (C), the Architect of the Capitol shall arrange to transfer and deliver any statue that is removed under this subsection to the Smithsonian Institution.

(B) STORAGE OR DISPLAY OF STATUES.—The Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution shall follow the policies and procedures of the Smithsonian Institution, as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act, regarding the storage and display of any statue transferred under subparagraph (A).

(C) STATE REQUESTS.—A statue provided for display by a State that is removed under this subsection shall be returned to the State, and the ownership of the statue transferred to the State, if the State so requests and agrees to pay any costs related to the transportation of the statue to the State.

(3) REPLACEMENT OF STATUES.—A State that has a statue removed under this subsection shall be able to replace such statue in accordance with the requirements and procedures of section 1814 of the Revised Statutes (2 U.S.C. 2131) and section 311 of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2001 (2 U.S.C. 2132).

(4) AUTHORIZATION AND APPROPRIATIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—There are appropriated for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2021, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, \$5,000,000 to carry out this section, including the costs related to the removal, transfer, security, storage, and display of the statues described in paragraph (1)(A), of which—

(i) \$2,000,000 shall be made available to the Architect of the Capitol; and

(ii) \$3,000,000 shall be made available to the Smithsonian Institution.

(B) AVAILABILITY.—Amounts appropriated under subparagraph (A) shall remain available until expended.

SEC. 4. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

In addition to the amounts appropriated under section 3(b)(4), there are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this Act, and any amounts so appropriated shall remain available until expended.

SEC. 5. DETERMINATION OF BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled "Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation" for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the House Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. 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 North Carolina?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I bring this legislation to the floor today on behalf of the Committee on House Administration. I thank our chair, Congresswoman ZOE LOFGREN, for her leadership. I thank Ranking Member RODNEY DAVIS for his friendship and leadership on our committee. I thank Mr. DAVIS, and as I said to him privately, I thank him for the spirit in which he has approached this important but delicate issue.

Recognizing the issue of removing Confederate statues from the Capitol has been simmering for years. Since I recognize that, I will now approach the issue today with the utmost respect for those who are opposed to the goal of the legislation. But I ask the dissenters to consider that America has been a divided nation since its founding, and it is past time for us to close this chapter of American history by removing statues that depict an era that caused enormous pain to African-American citizens.

Mr. Speaker, as you, I grew up in the rural, segregated South. Commonplace were Confederate flags and monuments on public property, honoring Confederate soldiers and the Confederacy. Many Southern jurisdictions are now voluntarily removing these statues.

President Abraham Lincoln won the 1860 general election by winning 18 of 29 States. The 11 States that Lincoln failed to carry were slaveholding States. These States were fearful that Lincoln would find a way to end slavery and deprive slave owners of their so-called property.

Eleven Southern States, after Lincoln was elected, immediately seceded from the Union, forming the Confederate States of America. The CSA elected its leadership. They printed a currency and stood up a military.

At Fort Sumter on April 12, 1861, the Confederate States of America took military action against the United States of America. For the following 4 years, more than 600,000 Americans lost their lives on the battlefield, including, I might say, African-American soldiers who fought for the Union.

This was not a war between the States; it was a war against the United States of America by 11 Southern States.

When the Union finally won the war, and both sides buried their dead, 4 million slaves were granted their freedom by the signing of the Emancipation Proclamation and passage of the 13th Amendment.

□ 1415

In 1864, each State was granted the privilege to donate two statues of deceased persons to be displayed in the Capitol that depict the history of their State. These statues are now known as the National Statuary Hall Collection. Approximately 10 of these statues depict men who volunteered to fight against the United States in the Civil War.

All of these statues were donated many decades after the Civil War. Like many other statues around the country honoring members of the CSA, and particularly those erected in the South, these 10 statues were not donated and installed in the Capitol until the 1900s, during the height of Jim Crow.

Many Americans see these statues and the timing of their placement as a means to intimidate African Americans and to perpetuate the notion of white supremacy. We must not con-

tinue to honor these combatants by allowing their images to be on display in the Capitol.

The bill before us today also identifies several other statues for removal or replacement that are not part of the National Statuary Hall Collection, including the bust of Chief Justice Roger B. Taney, who authored the 1857 Supreme Court decision of *Dred Scott v. Sandford*, which ruled that slaves could not be considered citizens and that Congress did not have the ability to ban slavery. This opinion, Mr. Speaker, is regarded as possibly the Supreme Court's worst decision of all time, and the 7-2 decision was a major factor contributing to the war.

Another bust not part of the collection is of Vice President John Breckinridge, 1857 to 1861. In 1860, Mr. Speaker, Breckinridge ran for President on the Southern Democratic ticket and he lost.

During the Civil War, Breckinridge served in the United States Senate from Kentucky but became a traitor and enlisted in the Confederate military, and he was assigned to the army of Mississippi stationed in Jackson, Mississippi, achieving the rank of major general. He was expelled from the Senate. Jefferson Davis then appointed him as Secretary of War. After the war, he fled the country for several years.

So I ask my colleagues, I ask America: Does this bust deserve to stand outside of the Senate Chamber? I would hope that your answer to that question will be no.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to answer the summons of our time by voting to remove all of these offensive statues from the Capitol of the United States of America.

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

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his leadership in bringing us together today, along with our distinguished leader, Mr. HOYER; our distinguished whip, Mr. JIM CLYBURN; Congressional Black Caucus Chair KAREN BASS; Chairman BENNIE THOMPSON; Congresswoman BARBARA LEE; and Mr. BUTTERFIELD. I thank Mr. BUTTERFIELD for leading this critical effort, so important.

Mr. Speaker, as our country knows, nearly 2 months after the murder of George Floyd, America remains gripped by anguish as racial injustice continues to kill hundreds of Black Americans and tear apart the soul of our country.

Last month, inspired by the activism of the American people and led by the Congressional Black Caucus, the House passed the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act to fundamentally transform the culture of policing, to address systemic racism, curb police brutality, deliver accountability, and save lives.

On Juneteenth, I had the privilege as Speaker of the House, by my authority

as Speaker of the House, to remove four paintings of Speakers of the House who were in the Speaker's lobby, to remove them because they were part of the Confederacy, three of them before they came to the Congress and one who came after his participation in the Confederacy.

It was long overdue. When we were checking out the statues, we found out about the paintings, and on Juneteenth we said good-bye to those four.

Now in Congress and in the country, we must maintain a drumbeat to ensure that this moment of anguish continues to be transformed into action. That is why, today, the House is proud to pass legislation to remove from the U.S. Capitol the 12 statues of Confederate officials and four other statues honoring persons who similarly exemplify bigotry and hate.

Mr. Speaker, again I thank Leader HOYER, Whip CLYBURN, CBC Chair KAREN BASS, Chairman BENNIE THOMPSON, Congresswoman BARBARA LEE, and Chairman G.K. BUTTERFIELD for leading this effort.

As I have said before, the Halls of Congress are the very heart of our democracy. The statues in the Capitol should embody our highest ideals as Americans, expressing who we are and what we aspire to as a nation. Monuments to men who advocated barbarism and racism are a grotesque affront to those ideals. Their statues pay homage to hate, not heritage.

Among the Confederate statues in the Capitol—can you believe this?—are Jefferson Davis and Alexander Stephens, president and vice president, respectively, of the Confederacy, both of whom were charged with treason against America. Both were charged with treason against America, and they have statues in the Capitol.

Now, think of this about Stephens—I hate to even use his words, but it may be important for people to know why the statues have to go in clearer terms. The infamous words of Stephens make as clear today as they did in 1861 the aims of the Confederacy.

In his so-called Cornerstone Speech, Stephens asserted that the “prevailing ideas” relied upon by the Framers included “the assumption of the equality of races. This was in error,” says Mr. Stephens.

Instead, he laid out in blunt and simple terms the awful truth of the Confederacy. He said: “Our new government is founded upon exactly the opposite idea.”

Imagine, exactly the opposite idea of equality of races.

“Its foundations are laid, its cornerstone rests, upon the great truth”—and these are his words; I hate to even use them, but we have to face this reality—“the Negro is not equal to the White man; that slavery, subordination to the superior race, is his natural and normal condition.”

He has got a statue in the Capitol of the United States.

How can we seek to end the scourge of racism in America when we allow

the worst perpetrators of that racism to be lauded in the Halls of Congress?

This bill also removes the statue of John Calhoun, the unapologetic leader of the Senate's pro-slavery faction, who, on the Senate floor, celebrated slavery as a "positive good."

Mr. Speaker, I know Mr. CLYBURN supports removing this South Carolinian.

On the floor, John C. Calhoun made this vile assertion that "in few countries is so much left to the share of the laborer, and so little exacted from him, or more kind attention paid to him in sickness or infirmities of age."

What could he have been talking about?

It removes from the old Supreme Court Chamber the bust of Justice Roger Taney. And this is because of the persistent leadership of Mr. HOYER, who has been on this case for a long time.

Justice Taney was the author of the Dred Scott ruling, which Mr. BUTTERFIELD very clearly laid out as probably one of the worst decisions of the Supreme Court ever, certainly a horrific stain on the history of our country, and certainly on the Court.

How fitting it is that the Taney bust will be replaced with a bust of U.S. Supreme Court Justice Thurgood Marshall, a towering champion of equality and justice in America.

Mr. CLYBURN, as well as Mr. HOYER, has been working on this. Mr. HOYER is a Marylander. I am a Baltimorean. As we all know, the airport in Baltimore is named for Thurgood Marshall. So as one who was born and raised there, I take pride in his leadership and service to the country.

Let us recall Justice Marshall's words spoken nearly 30 years ago but as true today. Justice Marshall said: "Democracy cannot flourish amid fear. Liberty cannot bloom amid hate. Justice cannot take root amid rage. America must get to work. In the chill climate in which we live, we must go against the prevailing wind. We must dissent from the indifference. We must dissent from the apathy. We must dissent from the fear, the hatred, and the mistrust. We must dissent, because America can do better, because America has no choice but to do better."

How much our great Elijah Cummings reflected the words of Thurgood Marshall, two Baltimoreans.

The Congress now has a sacred opportunity and obligation to do better, to make meaningful change to ensure that the halls of the U.S. Capitol reflect the highest ideals as Americans.

Mr. HOYER, as our distinguished floor leader, had this planned for awhile that everybody would work together and bring this composite bill to the floor at this time. Little did we know when those plans were being made that, at the same time, we would be mourning the loss of our darling John Lewis. It is a death in the family for us in the Congress. But he knew that this was in the works, and he is up there looking down

on us to make sure it happens in the most bipartisan way.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a strong bipartisan vote for this important step for justice, reconciliation, and progress in America.

As far as our John Lewis is concerned: Thank you. Thank you for bringing us to this place. May you rest in peace.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, at this time, it looks like I am going to be here on the floor with many of our colleagues who are going to offer remarks on this legislation, so I will give my opening remarks after I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, first and foremost, the Confederacy was a fundamental attack on our Constitution and the founding principles of our Nation, and it should never be romanticized or lauded.

I have got no problems with removing, lawfully, any monument that specifically honors this rebellion, but that is not what this bill does. Rather, it begins by removing the bust of Roger Taney from the Old Supreme Court Chamber.

Now, it is true he wrote the absolutely worst decision ever rendered by the Supreme Court, the Dred Scott decision, but let's not forget he also presided over and joined in one of its better decisions, the Amistad slave case.

If we remove memorials to every person in this building who ever made a bad decision—and his was the worst—well, this will be a very barren place, indeed. It is only by the bad things in our history that we can truly measure all of the good things in our history.

Now, this bill also removes the statues of Confederate sympathizers sent to the Capitol by the States. Well, that is not our decision. That is a decision that has always belonged to the individual States, and several of them are already making these decisions. We should let them.

The only other one is John C. Breckinridge of Kentucky, who is honored not for his service to the Confederacy but, rather, for his service as Vice President of the United States. And, granted, we have had some absolutely terrible Vice Presidents through our history, and I am sure we will in the future, but if we are going to start down that road, we are going to be swapping out statues like trading cards at the whim of the moment. Our Nation's history should be made of sterner stuff.

Perhaps we would all be better advised to practice a little temporal humility and heed the wisdom of Omar Khayyam: "The moving finger writes; and, having writ, moves on: nor all thy piety nor wit shall lure it back to cancel half a line, nor all thy tears wash out a word of it."

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN), the Democratic whip,

the gentleman representing the Sixth Congressional District of South Carolina, the State where the Civil War began, who is a national expert on American history, having been a former history teacher, as I recall.

□ 1430

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina for yielding me the time, and for his leadership and his management of this significant piece of legislation.

I want to thank Mr. DAVIS and the other Members on the other side for their tremendous cooperation in trying to help us move to a more perfect Union.

Mr. Speaker, 7 years ago, I stood on this floor and I referred to this Chamber, this great Hall, as America's classroom. And it is in that spirit that I think of this building as America's schoolhouse. And what is taught in this building, what is experienced by the people who visit this building ought to be about the uplifting of this great Nation.

What people see when they come here, who people see lauded, glorified, and honored when they visit this building ought to be people who are uplifting to history and the human spirit.

It is in that light that I recall the writings of one great writer who wrote that if we fail to learn the lessons of history—I think it was George Santiano—we are bound to repeat them.

There are a lot of lessons to be learned from history. I study it every day. Hardly a day goes by when I don't spend some time looking at some facet of American history.

We did not come to this floor with this legislation to get rid of that history. A lot of it we don't like; a lot of it we do like. And I think that what we need to do is discern between what should be honored and what should be relegated to the museums and to other places to commemorate that history. That is not eradicating history. That is putting history in its proper place.

And for those who did not do what I think they should have done, they have got a place in the history books, but it is not to be honored, and it is not to be glorified. It ought to be put in its proper perspective.

So I don't have a problem with the fact that one of the statues in here, John C. Calhoun—he was a historical figure. He died in 1850, if my memory serves, 10 years before the war broke out. So we aren't talking about John C. Calhoun as a Confederate. We are talking about John C. Calhoun as one of the Nation's biggest proponents of slavery and the relegation of human beings.

I want to thank my home State of South Carolina, because the people of Charleston, Mayor Tecklenburg and the city council in Charleston, decided several weeks ago, the John C. Calhoun statue should be taken down, and they did it.

Clemson University—Calhoun, one of the great founders of that university—is one of the original land grant schools. Clemson University decided that they would take John C. Calhoun's name off of their honors college.

So if the State of South Carolina, where he was from sees that, why is it that we are going to laud him in this building?

I am asking my colleagues to do for John C. Calhoun what his home State is doing for him, putting him in his proper place, not a place of honor. They didn't tear down his statue; they very meticulously took it down to retire to his proper place.

Mr. Speaker, you and I spoke last night about one other gentleman whose statue is in this building, Wade Hampton. Wade Hampton, he was not a Confederate, but he was a perseverer. There were three Wade Hamptons, senior, and the third.

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

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from South Carolina an additional 1 minute.

Mr. CLYBURN. But Wade Hampton's history should not be glorified. I don't know what my State's going to do about him, but what I would like to see us do here is put him in his proper place.

So those two statues that are here representing the State of South Carolina need to be removed from their places of honor and, at some point, I would hope the State would bring them back home and put them in their proper place.

So, I would like to say here today that I am not for destroying any statue. I am not here for burning down any building. I am here to ask my colleagues to return these people very properly and lawfully to their proper place. Put them where they can be studied. Put them where people will know exactly who and what they were.

But do not honor them. Do not glorify them. Take them out of this great schoolhouse so that the people who visit here can be uplifted by what this country is all about.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to follow Whip CLYBURN and the historical context of being a history teacher, and also the historical context of serving this institution and what it means. So I thank Whip CLYBURN for his leadership.

I thank my good friend, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, for his leadership on this issue. We are going to work together today to make sure that we are sending a message to the American people that it is Republicans and Democrats standing together.

Now, I have a unique district in central Illinois. I am from the Land of Lincoln. As a matter of fact, Abe, himself, lived in my district. I represent Lincoln's Tomb, Lincoln's Home. The

old State Capitol where Abraham Lincoln delivered his "House Divided" speech in 1858 is in my Congressional District. It was there when Lincoln not only spoke out against slavery and, specifically, the Dred Scott decision, but stood unequivocally in support of a free country, famously saying: "A house divided against itself cannot stand. I believe this government cannot endure, permanently half slave and half free. I do not expect the Union to be dissolved—I do not expect the house to fall—but I do expect it will cease to be divided. It will become all one thing or all the other."

While Lincoln and many others who stood for freedom are represented throughout this Capitol, there are others that symbolize the opposite. While we cannot erase our past and should do everything we can—as Whip CLYBURN just stated—we should do everything we can to learn from it instead.

The statues in the U.S. Capitol represent to visitors throughout the world what we stand for as a Nation. I support this important discussion about which statues belong in the U.S. Capitol and, also, the goal of this legislation.

Before we began debating this piece of legislation, my friend, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, and I had a discussion, a discussion about the 13th Amendment. And I invite all Members of this institution to come to my district, to come to the Abraham Lincoln Presidential Museum and Library, where I can show you an original copy of the 13th Amendment; also, one of the first copies of the Emancipation Proclamation.

This institution is not just an extended classroom. Where Lincoln lived, where Lincoln is honored, the 13th District of Illinois, that I am truly blessed to represent, is also a living classroom of the good things in our Nation's history.

Now, we also have to remember that the National Statuary Hall Collection was created in 1864 to commemorate States and their contributions to this country. And many statues being discussed today were donated by States to the collection nearly 100 years ago. And as my colleagues earlier said, many States are already working to remove them.

While I support their removal, I believe the better route would have been to have some more hearings in the Committee on House Administration. But today, today, is not about politics. Today is about coming together as an institution. And today is a day that I can say I proudly am blessed to be a Member of Congress.

Our country, right now, is facing a very difficult time, and Abraham Lincoln's spirit of unity is desperately needed. "A house divided against itself cannot stand." As leaders, we need to come together to show there is much more that unites us Americans than divides us, and lead this country, together, Republicans and Democrats, through this difficult time.

I hope this legislation today, the bipartisanism that we will see, is a shining example to the rest of the country of what we can build together.

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

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

Let me thank the gentleman from Illinois. I am just delighted that he mentioned that his home State, the State of Illinois, was, in fact, the home of Abraham Lincoln.

I am a student of history and love to read that portion of our history, and I recall that many people believe that it was the Emancipation Proclamation on January 1 of 1863 that legally ended slavery in America. The Emancipation Proclamation, as great as it was, was an executive order.

It was the 13th Amendment, as the gentleman mentioned, that legally ended slavery in America; thereby freeing 4 million slaves, most of whom lived in the South.

Mr. Speaker, you should know, and to my friend from Illinois, that it was on January 31, 1865, a few days after Lincoln's re-election, that this body, this body, the House of Representatives, passed the 13th Amendment to the Constitution. It required the ratification of 27 States.

The gentleman from Illinois' home State was the first State, on February 1, 1865 to ratify the 13th Amendment. My State of North Carolina was the 26th State, and the State of Georgia was the final State to ratify the 13th Amendment on December 6, 1865.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the State which is the home of both Chief Justice Taney and the first African American Associate Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court, the Honorable Thurgood Marshall.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina, the former Justice of the North Carolina Supreme Court, for yielding.

I am glad that I was on the floor to hear the remarks of the ranking member, Mr. DAVIS. I am going to bring up a quote. I won't get it soon enough to read right now, but I will read it.

David Brooks wrote a column in the New York Times and he said we were facing five crises in America. One, of course, the pandemic.

He said the second crisis was the crisis of confronting racism and the history of racism and slavery and segregation in our country.

The observation he made was that Americans, post-George Floyd, have been riveted on the recognition of our past and the recognition of our present, and how we need to improve the treatment and the reality of equality in America.

□ 1445

I think Brooks' observation will be proved today on the floor, Mr. Speaker, as we come together not in partisan

disagreement but in unity of purpose, recognizing that our conscience and the conscience of America has also been pricked by the loss of John Lewis, who all his life fought for equality.

Mr. Speaker, the Capitol Building is a sacred space for our American democracy. It is where we write our laws, inaugurate our Presidents, and say a somber farewell to great Americans who earned our respect, like Dwight Eisenhower, other Presidents, and Rosa Parks.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot erase the difficult history and painful truth that this temple to liberty was built using the labor of enslaved people. But we can, Mr. Speaker, do everything in our power to ensure that how we use the Capitol today reflects our commitment to equality and justice for all.

For too long, we have greeted visitors from here and abroad with the statues of those who denigrated these values by championing secession, slavery, segregation, and inequality.

As a Marylander, I have always been uncomfortable that the Old Supreme Court Chamber prominently displays a bust of former Chief Justice Roger Brooke Taney, who was from my district, as a matter of fact, the county across the river from my house, Calvert County.

Taney, of course, was the son of slaveholders and the author of the 1857 Dred Scott ruling that upheld slavery and said that African Americans could not be citizens. This was a man, Mr. Speaker, who, in his zeal to protect the interests of slaveholders and uphold a system of white supremacy, wrote an opinion that twisted the very meaning of America's founding.

After quoting the Declaration of Independence, "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal," Taney wrote this: "The general words above quoted would seem to embrace the whole human family, and if they were used in a similar instrument at this day," meaning 1857, "would be so understood." He went on to say: "But it is too clear for dispute that the enslaved African race were not intended to be included and formed no part of the people who framed and adopted this declaration." Of course, neither did women.

In short, Mr. Speaker, Taney argued that, in his day, in 1857, people of African descent had come to be seen as human beings, but because our Founders in 1776 did not view them as such, Black people could never truly be citizens of the United States.

What he was saying, Mr. Speaker, was that Black lives did not matter. And so, Mr. Speaker, when we hear that phrase today, that Black lives matter, it is fundamental to what America is and has become.

Sadly, Roger Brooke Taney—respected in his time, the attorney general of my State, the Attorney General of the United States, the Acting Secretary of the Treasury—could not extricate himself from the false premises of the past.

Abraham Lincoln was, as Mr. DAVIS pointed out, outraged at the decision he wrote, arguably, as my friend the Justice said earlier today, the worst case in the history of the Supreme Court of the United States.

In short, Taney argued that people of African descent had come to be seen as human beings, but because our Founders did not view them as such, Black people could never truly be citizens of our country. Think of that, the blindness and schizophrenia of 1787 repeated 80 years later in 1857.

One of the great facets of America is that we can grow. We change, and we can accommodate to better knowledge, better insight, and better inclinations. The past, Taney argued, bound those in the present to follow the errors of their forebears in perpetuity. Let us reject that premise out of hand lest the more perfect Union will never be attainable.

What he could not or would not accept is that the passage of time allows us the space to grow as individuals, as States, and as a country so that we may see our faults and correct them, not repeat them.

In Maryland, we have grappled with that difficult history of our State with regard to slavery and the Civil War. While our State did not secede from the Union, many Marylanders sympathized with slavery in the South and fought for the Confederacy.

Mr. Speaker, I represent what was the largest slaveholding area of the State of Maryland. We grew tobacco and some cotton, but mainly tobacco. Early Maryland was built on the profits of slavery, and it sent individuals like Taney to serve in America's earliest institutions. Indeed, in his infamous decision, he drew on his home State's ban of interracial marriage as justification for his views.

One of the ironies, Mr. Speaker, is that I was elected to the Maryland State Senate in 1966, and one of my first votes in January 1967 as a Maryland State senator at the age of 27 was to vote to repeal the miscegenation statutes in my State. Of course, the Supreme Court had ruled on that before, but we still had not repealed it 110 years after Dred Scott.

Maryland today, like other States where slavery and segregation had a long history, is not the same place that it was when Taney wrote his opinion, nor are these States today the same places they were when many of the statues and busts of Confederates and segregationists were sent here to our Capitol during a period of intense and racially charged sectionalism.

In recent years, Maryland made the courageous and correct choice to remove a statue of Taney from the grounds of the statehouse in Annapolis. I strongly supported that decision, as did our Republican Governor, Mr. Hogan, and our Democratic legislature.

Removing a statue—as my dear friend of over one-half century, Mr. CLYBURN, observed on this floor—does not erase history. That act by itself

will not make right what was so terribly wrong in the past. But the statues we choose to set in places of honor are a reflection of the present, not the past. They show our fellow American and foreign visitors what our values are today.

Our decision to remove statues of secessionists, white supremacists, Confederates, and segregationists and replace them with defenders of justice and equality shows that, as a country, we are capable of critical introspection and growth.

That is our strength. That is the glory of America: working toward a more perfect Union.

That is why I introduced this bill along with Representative LEE, Whip CLYBURN, Chairwoman BASS, and Chairman THOMPSON, who sits in the chair today. That itself is a historic demonstration of the change that we have wrought. Not only could a Black man from Mississippi be a Member of the Congress, but he can preside over the Congress. He matters, and his life matters.

Taney was wrong because, in the 21st century, we must not be Roger Brooke Taney's America anymore, nor can we be Jim Crow's.

Our bill removes the bust of Chief Justice Taney from the Old Supreme Court Chamber and replaces it with a bust of Thurgood Marshall, a son of Baltimore. The irony is the Taney statue was on the east front of the Capitol, Mr. Speaker. If you turned around and went through the Capitol 5 years ago, 10 years ago, 15 years, if you went through about 500 feet and walked out on the west front, you walked into Thurgood Marshall Memorial, as you would today. He was our first African-American Justice.

How appropriate it is that we honor him in place of Roger Brooke Taney. Thurgood Marshall is the face of our Maryland in 2020, not Roger Taney.

Second, our bill no longer allows States to display statues in the Capitol of individuals who voluntarily served the Confederacy against our Union during the Civil War.

Let me just say as an aside that none of us are perfect. Our Founders weren't perfect, but what our Founders did was create a union. The statues we are removing tried to destroy a union.

Third, there are three specific statues in the collection of individuals who did not serve in the Confederacy but whose careers were built on the perpetuation of White supremacy and segregation. Our bill would require those statues to be removed and replaced as well, as my friend, JIM CLYBURN, said, not destroyed. We urge nobody to tear down statues—to remove them, yes; to destroy them, no.

They do not reflect the diversity and inclusivity of our Nation today, nor do they comport with our values as a nation that has reached a greater understanding of the principles enshrined in the Declaration of Independence, that all are created equal, and humankind,

Taney admitted in 1857, would have been the understanding of that phrase. There are still, sadly, a lot of people in our country in 2020 who do not understand that our diversity is our strength or recognize clearly that Black lives matter.

Taney forcefully argued they did not. He was willfully wrong. They do, and they must. I believe that most Americans are deeply distressed by racial injustice and want to see the progress of the civil rights movement continue. They want our Nation and our democracy to grow, mature, and become more perfect. Part of that process is making it clear through our symbols and public displays of honor what our country stands for and, as importantly, what it must never stand for again.

So, Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join us not as an expression of partisan opinion but an expression of America's values to our citizens and to the world that we do not glorify racism, bigotry, and exclusion in the temple to liberty and in the land of the free.

I hope our colleagues will join in making possible and making sure that all Americans, no matter their race, can come to this Capitol and know that they have an equal share in a government that is truly of the people, by the people, and for the people.

□ 1500

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from the State of Michigan (Mr. MITCHELL), my friend.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS) for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I wasn't planning on speaking on this. It is an honor to speak after Mr. HOYER.

I heard Mr. CLYBURN speak eloquently regarding the removal of statues, statues including that of former Chief Justice Taney, a statue honoring him for what we all agree was the most dreadful decision the Supreme Court has ever made in this country, not based upon the law but based upon his feelings that African Americans weren't people.

I am speaking today not so much that it convinces anybody in this Chamber, but I am speaking about history, and I am speaking about my children, my children and my grandchildren, that they need to remember the history of this Nation.

The history of this Nation is so fraught with racial division, with hatred, and the only way to overcome that is to recognize that, acknowledge it for what it is.

Mr. Speaker, I support this resolution, and I support what Mr. CLYBURN said: to remove statues such as that of Mr. Taney, to lawfully remove them—not tear them down, not destroy them—return them back to the States and places from which they came, and to study, to put them in the study of the history of this Nation, because it

should not be lost. Tearing it down does not do justice to the history of this Nation and what our young people must understand.

Mr. Speaker, what you have gone through in your life, Mr. Lewis did and others, we can't simply ignore it and say, because we tore down statues or we burn things, it is suddenly gone. No, we need to recognize those things as part of our history in order to move on beyond them. Because, as many have said, to not acknowledge, to recognize, to understand our history runs a very real risk of reliving it. And, my God, we can't continue to do that.

Mr. Speaker, I support the resolution and support the removal of statues.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), a passionate advocate for underserved communities.

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, let me first thank the gentleman for yielding and for his tremendous leadership and constantly reminding us of the accurate accounting of the United States' history.

Also, I thank our Speaker; our majority leader; our whip, Mr. CLYBURN; Chairwoman BASS; Chairman BENNIE THOMPSON; and, of course, Congressman BUTTERFIELD for moving this legislation forward with the urgency that it requires.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 7573, which would remove shameful reminders of slavery and segregation from the United States Capitol.

Now, in 2017, in the wake of the white nationalist rally in Charlottesville, I introduced the Confederate Monument Removal Act to remove all statues of people who voluntarily served the Confederacy from the Capitol building. So, thank you for including this in this current bill.

Venerating those who took up arms against the United States to preserve slavery is an affront to the human dignity of all Americans. These painful symbols of bigotry and racism have no place in public places—certainly should not be enshrined in the United States Capitol.

It is past time for Congress to stop glorifying the men who were traitors and committed treason against the United States in a concerted effort to keep African Americans in chains.

The movement to honor Confederate soldiers was a deliberate act to rewrite the very history of the United States and humanize acts designed to dehumanize African Americans. They are symbols of hatred and defiance of Federal authority and should not be held in a place of honor in the United States Capitol.

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

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, I conclude by saying this: In this moment, the horrors of systemic racism

are front and center, and the manifestations are before the public each and every day. The removal of the Confederate statues from the United States Capitol is an important step in dismantling the systems that hold us back.

As a descendant of enslaved Americans from Galveston, Texas, and enslaved human beings, I thank you for this bill, and I ask for an "aye" vote.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time each side has remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from North Carolina has 13½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Illinois has 21 minutes remaining.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN), a member of the House Committee on Administration, a great constitutional scholar and friend.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. BUTTERFIELD for his really exemplary leadership here.

Mr. Speaker, it is a proud day for Maryland as we move to replace the bust of Roger Brooke Taney with the bust of Thurgood Marshall.

One Marylander wrote the infamous Dred Scott decision, hundreds of pages of argumentation about how the Constitution is and must forever be a White man's compact and that African Americans have no rights that White people have to respect.

The other, Thurgood Marshall, whose bust will replace that of Justice Taney, argued *Brown v. Board of Education*, argued *Shelley v. Kraemer*, argued *Smith v. Albright*, became the first African-American Associate Justice of the Supreme Court. He made equal protection come alive in our country. So it is a proud day for Maryland.

I was delighted to hear the gentleman from Illinois' remarks, but I was amazed to hear another colleague in the minority defending the bust of John C. Breckinridge on the grounds that we don't honor him for his service as secretary of war in the Confederacy but we, rather, honor him for what he did before that in his prior service as United States Senator and Vice President of the United States.

Well, that is just precious. Think about that for a second.

Breckinridge was serving as a U.S. Senator from Kentucky when he defected to the Confederacy, signed up to become their secretary of war, and betrayed the Union. And they still have his bust outside of the United States Senate saying "Vice President" on it, despite the fact that, on December 4, 1861, he was convicted of treason by the Senate and stripped of all of his titles—including Senator, President of the Senate, and Vice President.

So we may as well put up a statue of Benedict Arnold to honor him for his service to the Continental Army before

he defected over to the British side and led British groups against America.

So let's go all the way here. If there are statues of traitors and racist White supremacist supporters of the Confederacy up in the Capitol, then we need to get rid of them. This is our opportunity to remake the social contract as represented by the symbolism in this great House.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY).

Mr. Speaker, before he speaks, the history that I have read over the years suggests to me that, on January 31, 1865, when the 13th Amendment was passed by this body, this Chamber, Mr. KENNEDY, the gallery was full of White abolitionist women from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts who waved handkerchiefs and cheered for a prolonged period of time, cheering the 13th Amendment.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman.

Mr. Speaker, 155 years ago, Senators from my home State of Massachusetts, Charles Sumner and Henry Wilson, knew that a bust of Roger Taney deserved no home in our government's highest institutions. Yet here we are, in 2020, and the bust of a man who tried to codify and protect our original sin remains only a few hundred feet away.

Statues honoring traitors willing to destroy our Nation so that they could own Black men, women, and children litter our Capitol, and somehow we still need to have this debate.

Let me be clear: Dismantling the symbols that glorify White supremacy is a bare minimum, but dismantling those symbols is no substitute for dismantling the system that those men created.

This cannot be the end or the best of what we can offer the millions who took to our streets demanding justice. This cannot be the end of our work. This shouldn't even be considered the beginning of that work. It should have been done 150 years ago.

Mr. Speaker, the Senate needs to pass the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act. We need to dismantle and destroy White supremacy that exists everywhere, from our education system to our healthcare system, to our incarceration and juvenile justice systems and our financial institutions and our economy. That is where we need to be working, and that is what begins.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON), the chairman of the Committee on Homeland Security, a great warrior of many years, Mr. BENNIE THOMPSON.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr.

BUTTERFIELD) giving me an opportunity to speak.

Mr. Speaker, for those of us who are sons of the South, for those of us who have endured hardship, discrimination, and a lot of things that are very difficult to even talk about, for this moment in time where we are today, where we are going to start the process of healing and setting the record straight as it relates to the real history of this country, it is fitting and proper that those individuals who fought to keep many of our ancestors enslaved should not have to be recognized in a place where people who do good expect to be recognized.

This is not a way of erasing history. It is a way of correcting history so that those people who come and see it will see it in the manner for which it is presented. So, at the end of this debate, I hope we all will be on the same page.

This notion that in America it is not your color, it is not your race, it is not your sex, we have to stand for something; our values should mean something as Americans.

So this bill establishes what America stands for, and we should not recognize traitors in order just to say we are together. Traitors have a place, but not in a place of honor.

My State recognizes the president of the Confederacy. If he had won the war as president, none of us of color would be in this institution today. But thank God he lost and the South lost and we are better because of it. Mr. Speaker, for that, I ask support of this legislation.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), from the 18th District of Texas, a senior member of the Committee on the Judiciary, Committee on Homeland Security, and the author of H.R. 40, Ms. JACKSON LEE.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the manager of this legislation for his leadership.

Let me also acknowledge and thank Mr. HOYER for his, as well, and to Mr. CLYBURN, Ms. BASS, Mr. THOMPSON, and, as I indicated, Mr. BUTTERFIELD.

Mr. Speaker, let me start as I did just a few minutes ago, "In God we trust," and recognize that God has created, in many of our faiths, all of us equal as humans. We stand together dealing with the Confederacy that diminished and denied those descendants, those African slaves, their humanity. And yet, in a place of freedom, this place, we honor them.

Mr. Speaker, I welcome H.R. 7573 and am glad to be joining as a staunch supporter, for, if Justice Taney viewed me as inhuman, then that means that those today, those babies yet unborn from descendants of enslaved African Americans, would be inhuman. This is needed not because we don't put it in the historical context, but because we need to unify America.

Mr. Speaker, as we have lost a great warrior, John Lewis, and, as well, C. T. Vivian, I know they are looking down to say that we are not to honor those who voluntarily serve to deny us our humanity and to fight for the Confederacy and were treasonous.

□ 1515

Alexander Hamilton Stephens—it is interesting that he secured the name of Alexander Hamilton—has a statue in Statuary Hall. It says:

I am not fearful of anything on Earth, I am not fearful of anything above, except to do something wrong.

That is what Alexander Hamilton Stephens said.

Well, this is wrong. It was wrong to enslave so many human beings and for that slavery to last over 200 years.

I am delighted with the gentleman from Illinois for his congenial and historic moment today, and we do it in unity. I offer peace to this Nation and to this body that we remove these by bringing America together.

I know the family of George Floyd, who struck a chord in the hearts of all Americans and Black Lives Matter, would welcome this magnificent decision today. Let us do it together, under this flag. In God we trust.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes time to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. MFUME), my friend, who is not only the representative of a district in Maryland, but also the former national president of the NAACP.

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Speaker, 33 years ago, I stood near this spot and watched Thurgood Marshall come through these doors as a member of the Supreme Court at a State of the Union address. And as a Marylander and as a Baltimorean, I had a great sense of pride.

I got to know Mr. Marshall. All he ever said by his eloquence and his example was this is how we ought to be as Supreme Court justices.

I must tell you, I was dismayed, though, years earlier, to learn as a young student at Morgan State University the history of Roger B. Taney, who did just the opposite to my spirit and just the opposite, I think, to what we believe Supreme Court Justices should act like and how they conduct themselves.

A gentleman from the other side earlier said that Mr. Taney rendered the worst Supreme Court decision ever. And he is exactly right. That decision said that Black people had no rights for which the White man must respect, and therefore that the Negro might justly and lawfully be reduced to slavery for his own benefit. It also said that Black people born in America, like Dred Scott, were not citizens and it eviscerated the Missouri Compromise of 1820.

So replacing the statue of Taney with one instead of Thurgood Marshall

seems to me the way we ought to go as a Chamber. I hope in a bipartisan fashion, not only for ourselves, but to say to all the visitors that come through this building that we will continue to hold high real American heroes that sought to keep us together, and we will not honor those who sought to divide us.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time, and I will close.

Mr. Speaker, it is great to follow our new colleague, Mr. MFUME.

Because of COVID and the restrictions we have in getting together and getting to know each other like we did before this pandemic, I have not had a chance to meet you yet. Welcome to this institution. Thank you for your service here. Thank you for your service leading the NAACP.

I don't know if Mr. MFUME is aware, but many say that the birthplace of the NAACP is also in Springfield, Illinois, because of the 1908 race riots that took place in my district.

We are trying to honor those who suffered during that instance in our Nation's history, still centuries after we saw the scourge of slavery come to our shores.

We still have a lot of work to do. But I welcome Mr. MFUME. Come to my district and see the artifacts from those race riots that have been dug up and displayed for all to see, to be honored. That is what education and history is.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. MFUME).

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's kind and overly gracious remarks. I appreciate also his sense of history and for what I think today is being displayed as a bipartisan effort to draw attention to and to reconcile a very real problem.

So I will be more than happy to do that. And Lincoln was one of my heroes in many respects, not just because he signed, as Mr. BUTTERFIELD said, an executive order in 1863, but that he reminded us of what we were supposed to be as a Nation. Was he flawed? Yes. Are we flawed? Yes. Do we increase our ability to grow together? The absolute answer is yes. So I do appreciate the gentleman's comments, and I appreciate him yielding.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I will reclaim my time.

That is exactly why we still, as a Nation, have so much to learn about each other. We have so much to learn as to why we live, and we are blessed to live in what I consider the greatest country on God's green Earth.

The opportunity for every American to do what we do, to serve in this great institution, is something that should be cherished.

Those issues that seemingly divide us more in a Nation of prosperity, we need to educate the youth, we need to edu-

cate America, and how we can come together, not just correcting some of the awful, evil parts of our Nation's history, but let's continue to correct the division that exists today, not just on this floor, but in this country.

And if we can stand together in this instance, we can surely stand together and make this country, at a time and place of civil unrest, a better place for every single American in this country.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I thank again all of my colleagues. I respect their opinions, their ideas. But today is a day of history. Today is a day that we are going to band together in a bipartisan way.

And I commend my good friend and look forward to hosting him in Springfield, Illinois.

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

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time. I thank all of the speakers for their eloquent words today.

Mr. DAVIS, we have talked a lot about President Abraham Lincoln. There is one thing I failed to mention, and the other speakers failed to mention as well. And that was, before the ratification of the 13th Amendment, Lincoln was actually assassinated on April 14, as I recall, of 1865, and did not live to see the full ratification of the 13th Amendment, which was the culmination of a lot of his work. So I just wanted to put that into the RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased with the tone of this debate. I don't even want to call it a debate. I would call it a discussion for the last few minutes. I feel the bipartisanship in the air, and I thank Mr. DAVIS so very much. It is appreciated.

History teaches us that there are times in our history where eras must be closed, and we must begin a new era in this great Nation.

We need to continue to strive for a more perfect union, and today is a good example of that.

I ask my colleagues to vote "yea" on this legislation. I ask for a unanimous vote. Hopefully, we can do this by voice vote. That is my prayer and that is my hope that we will show the world that we are united on this issue.

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

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 7573, as amended.

H.R. 7573 directs the Joint Committee on the Library to remove the bust of Chief Justice Roger B. Taney, the author of the Dred Scott decision in the Old Supreme Court Chamber with a bust of Justice Thurgood Marshall, and requires the Joint Committee on the Library to remove statues of Charles B. Aycock, James P. Clarke, and John C. Calhoun, as well as a bust of John C. Breckinridge. H.R. 7573 would also amend section 1814 of the Revised Statutes (2 U.S.C. 2131) to change the criteria for those eligible for inclusion to prohibit those who "served as an officer or voluntarily with the Confederate States of America or of the military forces or government of a State while the State was in rebellion against the United

States." The Architect of the Capitol would be charged with identifying those statues which do not meet the revised criteria and the Joint Committee on the Library would remove the statues and turn them over to the Smithsonian Institution or their respective states, if desired.

As Chairperson of the House Fine Arts Board and the Vice Chairperson of the Joint Committee on the Library I am more than pleased to remove these symbols of cruelty and bigotry from the halls of the Capitol. This has been a long time coming, and it is long past time to act.

The United States Capitol is one of the most visible, and most visited, symbols of liberty, freedom and democracy in the entire world. Who we choose to honor in this space is uniquely indicative of our values and principles.

Contrary to those who argue in opposition to this long overdue action, this action does not seek to erase history nor ask that we forget that history. We must never forget the shameful scar of slavery, segregation and racism. Instead this is about who we honor. When we think about the holocaust the words "never forget" admonish us to always remember the millions murdered by the Nazis. But we do not accomplish that by erecting a statue of Adolf Hitler to put in a place of honor.

Those who violently rebelled against our government upon the belief, as Confederate Vice President Alexander Stephens infamously said, "that the negro is not equal to the white man; that slavery subordination to the superior race is his natural and normal condition," and those who enabled and protected the practice of holding human beings as property deserve no place of honor in the halls of our nation's Capitol. Slavery is the "original sin" of our country, and its disastrous effects are felt to this day.

It is long past time to remove these symbols of bigotry and cruelty from the halls of Congress, and it is long past time to repair the lasting damage their hatred and racism has visited on the fabric of this country. The removal of these symbols from the People's House is a necessary step in this long-overdue work, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 7573 and in working to right the wrongs of the past to better perfect the promises of our country.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 7573, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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 motion will be postponed.

FOSTERING UNDERGRADUATE TALENT BY UNLOCKING RESOURCES FOR EDUCATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on concurring in the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 2486) to reauthorize mandatory funding programs for historically Black colleges and universities and other minority-serving institutions, with the amendment specified in section 4(a) of House Resolution 891, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on concurring in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 233, nays 183, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 153]
YEAS—233

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

Speier	Torres (CA)
Stanton	Torres Small
Stevens	(NM)
Suozzi	Trahan
Swalwell (CA)	Trone
Takano	Underwood
Thompson (CA)	Vargas
Thompson (MS)	Veasey
Titus	Vela
Tlaib	Velázquez
Tonko	Visclosky

NAYS—183

Aderholt	Gonzalez (OH)
Allen	Gooden
Amash	Gosar
Amodei	Granger
Armstrong	Graves (GA)
Arrington	Graves (LA)
Babin	Graves (MO)
Bacon	Green (TN)
Baird	Grothman
Balderson	Guest
Banks	Guthrie
Barr	Hagedorn
Bergman	Harris
Biggs	Hartzer
Bilirakis	Hern, Kevin
Bishop (NC)	Herrera Beutler
Bishop (UT)	Hice (GA)
Bost	Higgins (LA)
Brady	Hill (AR)
Brooks (AL)	Hollingsworth
Brooks (IN)	Huizenga
Buchanan	Jacobs
Buck	Johnson (LA)
Bucshon	Johnson (OH)
Budd	Johnson (SD)
Burchett	Jordan
Burgess	Joyce (OH)
Calvert	Joyce (PA)
Carter (GA)	Katko
Carter (TX)	Keller
Chabot	Kelly (MS)
Cheney	Kelly (PA)
Cline	King (NY)
Cloud	Kinzinger
Cole	Kustoff (TN)
Collins (GA)	LaHood
Comer	LaMalfa
Conaway	Lamborn
Crawford	Latta
Crenshaw	Lesko
Curtis	Long
Davidson (OH)	Lucas
Davis, Rodney	Luetkemeyer
DesJarlais	Marchant
Diaz-Balart	Marshall
Duncan	Massie
Dunn	Mast
Emmer	McCarthy
Estes	McCaul
Ferguson	McClintock
Fleischmann	McHenry
Flores	McKinley
Fortenberry	Meuser
Fulcher	Miller
Foxx (NC)	Mitchell
Gaetz	Moolenaar
Gallagher	Mooney (WV)
Garcia (CA)	Murphy (NC)
Gianforte	Newhouse
Gibbs	Norman
Gohmert	Nunes

NOT VOTING—14

Abraham	Hudson	Roby
Byrne	King (IA)	Rooney (FL)
Cook	Loudermilk	Sensenbrenner
Griffith	Mullin	Timmons
Holding	Riggleman	

□ 1610

Messrs. YOUNG, FULCHER, and PENCE changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

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

So the first portion of the divided question was adopted.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Speaker, I was unable to vote on July 22, 2020, due to delayed arrival to the floor. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows: “no” on rollcall No. 153.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 965, 116TH CONGRESS

Cárdenas (Sánchez)	Kirkpatrick (Gallego)	Payne (Wasserman Schultz)
Clay (Grijalva)	Kuster (NH)	Pingree (Cicilline)
DeSaulnier (Matsui)	(Brownley (CA))	(Butterfield)
Deutch (Rice (NY))	Lawson (FL)	Porter (Wexton)
Frankel (Clark (MA))	(Evans)	Price (NC)
Garamendi (Boyle, Brendan F.)	Lieu, Ted (Beyer)	Rush (Underwood)
Gomez (Gallego)	Lipinski (Cooper)	Serrano (Jeffries)
Horsford (Kildee)	(Beyer)	Trone (Beyer)
Johnson (TX)	Moore (Beyer)	Watson Coleman (Pallone)
(Jeffries)	Napolitano (Correa)	Welch (McGovern)
Kaptur (Beatty)	Pascrell (Sires)	Wilson (FL)
Khanna (Sherman)		(Hayes)

FOSTERING UNDERGRADUATE TALENT BY UNLOCKING RESOURCES FOR EDUCATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. TLAIB). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on concurring in the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 2486) to reauthorize mandatory funding programs for historically Black colleges and universities and other minority-serving institutions, with the amendment specified in section 4(b) of House Resolution 891, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on concurring in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 231, nays 184, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 154]
YEAS—231

Adams	Clyburn	Foster
Aguilar	Cohen	Frankel
Allred	Congolly	Fudge
Amash	Cooper	Gallego
Axne	Correa	Garamendi
Barragán	Costa	García (IL)
Bass	Courtney	García (TX)
Beatty	Cox (CA)	Golden
Bera	Craig	Gomez
Beyer	Crist	Gonzalez (TX)
Bishop (GA)	Crow	Gottheimer
Blumenauer	Cuellar	Green, Al (TX)
Blunt Rochester	Cunningham	Grijalva
Bonamici	Davids (KS)	Haaland
Boyle, Brendan F.	Davis (CA)	Harder (CA)
Brindisi	Davis, Danny K.	Hastings
Brown (MD)	Dean	Hayes
Brownley (CA)	DeFazio	Heck
Bustos	DeGette	Higgins (NY)
Butterfield	DeLauro	Himes
Carbajal	DelBene	Horn, Kendra S.
Cárdenas	Delgado	Horsford
Carson (IN)	Demings	Houlihan
Cartwright	DeSaulnier	Hoyer
Case	Deutch	Huffman
Casten (IL)	Dingell	Jackson Lee
Castor (FL)	Doggett	Jayapal
Castro (TX)	Doyle, Michael F.	Jeffries
Chu, Judy	Engel	Johnson (GA)
Cicilline	Escobar	Johnson (TX)
Cisneros	Eshoo	Kaptur
Clark (MA)	Españillat	Keating
Clarke (NY)	Evans	Kelly (IL)
Clay	Finkenauer	Kennedy
Cleaver	Fletcher	Khanna
		Kildee

Kilmer
Kim
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsock
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lujan
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Mfume
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell

Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Norcross
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rose (NY)
Rouda
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan
Sanchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schradler
Schrier
Scott (VA)

Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shalala
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stanton
Stevens
Suozi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres Small
(NM)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

Upton
Van Drew
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Waltz

Watkins
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman

Womack
Woodall
Wright
Yoho
Young
Zeldin

Riggelman
Roby
Rooney (FL)
Sensenbrenner
Timmons

Cox (CA)
Craig
Crenshaw
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Cunningham
Davids (KS)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny K.
Davis, Rodney
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael
F.
Duncan
Engel
Escobar
Eshoo
Espallat
Evans
Finkenauer
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fletcher
Fortenberry
Foster
Fox (NC)
Frankel
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallagher
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia (CA)
Garcia (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Gianforte
Gibbs
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez (OH)
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Granger
Green (TN)
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Guthrie
Haaland
Harder (CA)
Hastings
Hayes
Heck
Herrera Beutler
Higgins (NY)
Hill (AR)
Himes
Horn, Kendra S.
Horsford
Houlihan
Hoyer
Huffman
Huizenga
Hurd (TX)
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Joyce (OH)
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)

Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Kustoff (TN)
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsock
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lujan
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Marshall
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCarthy
McCaul
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McHenry
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Meuser
Mfume
Miller
Moolenaar
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (NC)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Norcross
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin

Reed
Rice (NY)
Rodgers (WA)
Roe, David P.
Rogers (KY)
Rose (NY)
Rose, John W.
Rouda
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Kuster (NH)
Rutherford
Ryan
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schradler
Schrier
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shalala
Sherman
Sherrill
Simpson
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Smucker
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stanton
Staubert
Stefanik
Stevens
Stivers
Suozi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres Small
(NM)
Trahan
Trone
Turner
Underwood
Upton
Van Drew
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Wagner
Walden
Walorski
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watkins
Pence
Watson Coleman
Welch
Westerman
Wexton
Wild
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Yarmuth
Young
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—15

□ 1648

So the second portion of the divided question was adopted.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 965, 116TH CONGRESS

Cárdenas (Sanchez)
Clay (Grijalva)
DeSaulnier (Matsui)
Deutch (Rice)
Frankel (Clark MA)
Garamendi (Boyle, Brendan F.)
Gomez (Gallego)
Horsford (Kildee)
Johnson (TX) (Jeffries)
Kaptur (Beatty)
Khanna (Sherman)

Kirkpatrick (Gallego)
Kuster (NH)
(Brownley CA)
Lawson (FL)
(Evans)
Lieu, Ted (Beyer)
Lipinski (Cooper)
Lofgren (Boyle, Brendan F.)
Lowenthal (Beyer)
Moore (Beyer)
Napolitano (Correa)
Pascrell (Sires)

Payne (Wasserman Schultz)
Pingree (Cicilline)
Porter (Wexton)
Price (NC) (Butterfield)
Rush (Underwood)
Serrano (Jeffries)
Trone (Beyer)
Watson Coleman (Pallone)
Welch (McGovern)
Wilson (FL) (Hayes)

NAYS—184

Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (NC)
Bishop (UT)
Bost
Brady
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Buechson
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Chabot
Cheney
Cline
Cloud
Cole
Collins (GA)
Comer
Conaway
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curtis
Davidson (OH)
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duncan
Dunn
Emmer
Estes
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxx (NC)
Fulcher

Gaetz
Gallagher
Garcia (CA)
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Gonzalez (OH)
Gooden
Gosar
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harris
Hartzler
Hern, Kevin
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill (AR)
Hollingsworth
Huizenga
Hurd (TX)
Jacobs
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Katko
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
Lesko
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Marchant
Marshall
Massie

Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
Meuser
Miller
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Murphy (NC)
Newhouse
Norman
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Pence
Perry
Posey
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (SC)
Rodgers (WA)
Roe, David P.
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose, John W.
Rouzer
Roy
Rutherford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Spano
Staubert
Stefanik
Steil
Steupe
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiffany
Tipton
Turner

TAXPAYER FIRST ACT OF 2019

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the motion to concur in the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 1957) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modernize and improve the Internal Revenue Service, and for other purposes, offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA), on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the motion.

The Clerk redesignated the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion to concur.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 310, nays 107, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 155]

YEAS—310

Adams
Agullar
Allred
Amodei
Axne
Bacon
Balderson
Barr
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Bergman
Beyer
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici

Boyle, Brendan
Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Comer
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney

NAYS—107

Bost
Brady
Brooks (AL)
Buck
Burgess
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Cline
Cloud
Collins (GA)

Conaway
Crawford
Curtis
Davidson (OH)
Dunn
Emmer
Estes
Ferguson
Flores
Fulcher
Gaetz

Gohmert	LaMalfa	Roy
Gooden	Lamborn	Scalise
Gosar	Latta	Shimkus
Graves (GA)	Lesko	Smith (MO)
Graves (LA)	Lucas	Smith (NE)
Graves (MO)	Luetkemeyer	Spano
Grothman	Marchant	Steil
Guest	Massie	Steube
Hagedorn	McClintock	Stewart
Harris	McKinley	Thornberry
Hartzler	Mitchell	Tiffany
Hern, Kevin	Mooney (WV)	Tipton
Hice (GA)	Newhouse	Visclosky
Higgins (LA)	Norman	Walberg
Hollingsworth	Nunes	Walker
Jacobs	Olson	Waltz
Johnson (LA)	Palazzo	Weber (TX)
Johnson (OH)	Palmer	Webster (FL)
Johnson (SD)	Perry	Wenstrup
Jordan	Posey	Williams
Joyce (PA)	Reschenthaler	Womack
Keller	Rice (SC)	Woodall
Kelly (MS)	Richmond	Wright
King (IA)	Rogers (AL)	Yoho
LaHood	Rouzer	

ues of individuals who voluntarily served the Confederate States of America from display in the United States Capitol, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 305, nays 113, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 156]

YEAS—305

Abraham	Hudson	Rooney (FL)
Byrne	Loudermilk	Sensenbrenner
Cook	Mullin	Timmons
Griffith	Rigglesman	
Holding	Roby	

NOT VOTING—13

□ 1730

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

Messrs. WATKINS, GIBBS, FLEISCHMANN, GREEN of Tennessee, Mrs. RODGERS of Washington, Mr. LONG, Ms. FUDGE, and MESSRS. ROGERS of Kentucky and STAUBER changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to concur was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 965, 116TH CONGRESS

Cárdenas (Sánchez)	Kirkpatrick (Gallego)	Payne (Wasserman)
Clay (Grijalva)	Kuster (NH)	Schultz
DeSaulnier (Matsui)	(Brownley)	Pingree (Cicilline)
Deutch (Rice)	Lawson (FL)	Porter (Wexton)
Frankel (Clark)	(Evans)	Price (NC)
Garamendi (Boyle)	Lieu, Ted (Beyer)	(Butterfield)
Johnson (TX)	Lipinski (Cooper)	Rush (Underwood)
(Jeffries)	Lofgren (Boyle)	Serrano
Gomez (Gallego)	Brendan F.)	(Jeffries)
Horsford (Kildée)	Lowenthal	Trone (Beyer)
Johnson (TX)	(Beyer)	Watson Coleman
(Jeffries)	Moore (Beyer)	(Pallone)
Kaptur (Beatty)	Napolitano	Welch
Khanna (Sherman)	(Correa)	(McGovern)
	Pascrell (Sires)	Wilson (FL)
		(Hayes)

Adams	Dingell	Kirkpatrick
Aguilar	Doggett	Krishnamoorthi
Allred	Doyle, Michael	Kuster (NH)
Amash	F.	Lamb
Amodei	Emmer	Langevin
Axne	Engel	Larsen (WA)
Bacon	Escobar	Larson (CT)
Balderson	Eshoo	Latta
Barragán	Españillat	Lawrence
Bass	Evans	Lee (CA)
Beatty	Finkenauer	Lee (NV)
Bera	Fitzpatrick	Levin (CA)
Beyer	Fletcher	Levin (MI)
Bilirakis	Fortenberry	Lieu, Ted
Bishop (GA)	Foster	Lipinski
Blumenauer	Fox (NC)	Loeb
Blunt Rochester	Frankel	Loeb
Bonamici	Fudge	Lofgren
Bost	Gabbard	Lowenthal
Boyle, Brendan	Gallagher	Lowey
F.	Gallego	Lucas
Brindisi	Garamendi	Luján
Brooks (IN)	Garcia (CA)	Luria
Brown (MD)	Garcia (IL)	Lynch
Brownley (CA)	Garcia (TX)	Malinowski
Buchanan	Gianforte	Maloney
Burgess	Gibbs	Carolyn B.
Bustos	Golden	Maloney, Sean
Butterfield	Gomez	Matsui
Calvert	Gonzalez (OH)	McAdams
Carbajal	Gonzalez (TX)	McBath
Cárdenas	Gottheimer	McCarthy
Carson (IN)	Green, Al (TX)	McCaul
Cartwright	Grijalva	McCollum
Case	Guthrie	McEachin
Casten (IL)	Haaland	McGovern
Castor (FL)	Harder (CA)	McNerney
Castro (TX)	Hastings	Meeks
Chabot	Hayes	Meng
Chu, Judy	Heck	Mfume
Cicilline	Herrera Beutler	Miller
Cisneros	Higgins (NY)	Mitchell
Clark (MA)	Hill (AR)	Moolenaar
Clarke (NY)	Himes	Moore
Clay	Hollingsworth	Morelle
Cleaver	Horn, Kendra S.	Moulton
Clyburn	Horsford	Mucarsel-Powell
Cohen	Houlahan	Murphy (FL)
Connolly	Hoyer	Murphy (NC)
Cooper	Huffman	Nadler
Correa	Huizenga	Napolitano
Costa	Hurd (TX)	Neal
Courtney	Jackson Lee	Neguse
Cox (CA)	Jacobs	Newhouse
Craig	Jayapal	Norcross
Crenshaw	Jeffries	Nunes
Crist	Johnson (GA)	O'Halleran
Crow	Johnson (OH)	Ocasio-Cortez
Cuellar	Johnson (SD)	Olson
Cunningham	Johnson (TX)	Omar
Davids (KS)	Joyce (OH)	Pallone
Davidson (OH)	Joyce (PA)	Panetta
Davis (CA)	Kaptur	Pappas
Davis, Danny K.	Katko	Pascrell
Davis, Rodney	Keating	Payne
Dean	Kelly (IL)	Pelosi
DeFazio	Kelly (PA)	Perlmutter
DeGette	Kennedy	Peters
DeLauro	Khanna	Peterson
DeBene	Kildee	Phillips
Delgado	Kilmer	Pingree
Demings	Kim	Pocan
DeSaulnier	Kind	Porter
Deutch	King (NY)	Pressley
Diaz-Balart	Kinziger	Price (NC)

Quigley	Sherrill	Torres Small
Raskin	Shimkus	(NM)
Reed	Simpson	Trahan
Reschenthaler	Sires	Trone
Rice (NY)	Slotkin	Turner
Richmond	Smith (NJ)	Underwood
Rodgers (WA)	Smith (WA)	Upton
Rose (NY)	Smucker	Van Drew
Rouda	Soto	Vargas
Roybal-Allard	Spanberger	Veasey
Ruiz	Speier	Vela
Ruppersberger	Stanton	Velázquez
Rush	Staubert	Visclosky
Ryan	Stefanik	Wagner
Sánchez	Stell	Walden
Sarbanes	Stevens	Walker
Scalise	Stewart	Walorski
Scanlon	Stivers	Wasserman
Schakowsky	Suozzi	Wasserman
Schiff	Swalwell (CA)	Schultz
Schneider	Takano	Waters
Schrader	Taylor	Watson Coleman
Schrier	Thompson (CA)	Webster (FL)
Scott (VA)	Thompson (MS)	Welch
Scott, David	Tipton	Wexton
Serrano	Titus	Wild
Sewell (AL)	Tlaib	Wilson (FL)
Shalala	Tonko	Yarmuth
Sherman	Torres (CA)	

NAYS—113

Aderholt	Gohmert	Palazzo
Allen	Gooden	Palmer
Armstrong	Gosar	Pence
Arrington	Granger	Perry
Babin	Graves (GA)	Posey
Baird	Graves (LA)	Rice (SC)
Banks	Graves (MO)	Roe, David P.
Barr	Green (TN)	Rogers (AL)
Bergman	Grothman	Rogers (KY)
Biggs	Guest	Rose, John W.
Bishop (NC)	Hagedorn	Rouzer
Bishop (UT)	Harris	Roy
Brady	Hartzler	Rutherford
Brooks (AL)	Hern, Kevin	Schweikert
Buck	Hice (GA)	Scott, Austin
Bucshon	Higgins (LA)	Smith (MO)
Budd	Johnson (LA)	Smith (NE)
Burchett	Jordan	Spano
Carter (GA)	Keller	Steube
Carter (TX)	Kelly (MS)	Thompson (PA)
Cheney	King (IA)	Thornberry
Cline	Kustoff (TN)	Tiffany
Cloud	LaHood	Walberg
Cole	LaMalfa	Waltz
Collins (GA)	Lamborn	Watkins
Comer	Lesko	Weber (TX)
Conaway	Long	Wenstrup
Crawford	Luetkemeyer	Westerman
Curtis	Curtis	Marchant
DesJarlais	Marshall	Williams
Duncan	Massie	Wilson (SC)
Dunn	Mast	Wittman
Estes	McClintock	Womack
Ferguson	McHenry	Woodall
Fleischmann	McKinley	Wright
Flores	Meuser	Yoho
Fulcher	Mooney (WV)	Young
Gaetz	Norman	Zeldin

NOT VOTING—13

□ 1805

REPLACING BUST OF ROGER BROOKE TANEY WITH BUST OF THURGOOD MARSHALL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 7573) to direct the Architect of the Capitol to replace the bust of Roger Brooke Taney in the Old Supreme Court Chamber of the United States Capitol with a bust of Thurgood Marshall to be obtained by the Joint Committee on the Library and to remove certain statues from areas of the United States Capitol which are accessible to the public, to remove all stat-

Messrs. WALKER, EMMER, and Mrs. RODGERS of Washington changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

Messrs. JOHNSON of Louisiana and GROTHMAN changed their vote from “present” to “nay.”

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: “A bill to direct the Joint Committee on the Library to replace the bust of Roger Brooke Taney in the Old Supreme Court Chamber of the United States Capitol with a bust of

Thurgood Marshall to be obtained by the Joint Committee on the Library and to remove certain statues from areas of the United States Capitol which are accessible to the public, to remove all statues of individuals who voluntarily served the Confederate States of America from display in the United States Capitol, and for other purposes.”

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 965, 116TH CONGRESS

Cárdenas (Sánchez)	Kirkpatrick (Gallego)	Payne (Wasserman)
Clay (Grijalva)	Kuster (NH)	Schultz
DeSaulnier (Matsui)	(Brownley (CA))	Pingree (Cicilline)
Deutch (Rice (NY))	Lawson (FL) (Evans)	Porter (Wexton) Price (NC)
Frankel (Clark (MA))	Lieu, Ted (Beyer)	(Butterfield) Rush
Garamendi (Boyle, Brendan F.)	Lipinski (Cooper)	(Underwood) Serrano (Jeffries)
Gomez (Gallego)	Lofgren (Boyle, Brendan F.)	Trone (Beyer)
Horsford (Kildoe)	Lowenthal (Beyer)	Watson Coleman (Pallone)
Johnson (TX) (Jeffries)	Moore (Beyer)	Welch (McGovern)
Kaptur (Beatty)	Napolitano (Correa)	Wilson (FL) (Hayes)
Khanna (Sherman)	Pascrell (Sires)	

GOD BLESSED AMERICA WITH JOHN LEWIS

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

Mr. SWALWELL. Mr. Speaker, God blessed America and this Chamber when we were sent John Lewis. We will miss his character, his conviction, and his kindness; and this place feels a lot emptier without him.

There is so much that will be said about our colleague, but I will never forget, just right before us in this well, after the country had gone through mass shooting after mass shooting after mass shooting, and we were so troubled about what to do next, our colleague told us, if we were willing to cause a little bit of good, necessary trouble, we could make a difference.

We will miss John. He brought his experience from movements to a moment where his country needed him. His work continues and, because of that, the next generation will march on.

God bless our colleague.

RECOGNIZING CAPTAIN CANDICE BOWEN

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

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Captain Candice Bowen who, this week, became the first woman to lead a Virginia National Guard infantry company. On Saturday, she took command of the Woodstock-based Bravo Company, 3rd Battalion, 116th Infantry Regiment, 116th Infantry Brigade Combat Team.

After being deployed to Qatar in 2016, Captain Bowen then volunteered for an

assignment in Afghanistan, where she earned a Combat Action Badge. Her superiors say that she has “demonstrated the absolute ability to lead soldiers in close combat.”

Captain Bowen had already earned the distinction of becoming the Virginia National Guard’s first female infantry officer in 2019, and when she spoke after accepting her command, Bowen encouraged other women to follow in her footsteps and join an infantry unit. In short, she said to jump in there, do it aggressively, and give it everything you’ve got.

I wish Captain Bowen the best of luck in this new endeavor and know that those under her command in Bravo Company are in good hands.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF JOHN LEWIS

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

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, great women and great men have served in Congress, walking these Halls and casting votes on this very floor. One of the greatest was our friend, John Lewis.

A civil rights icon, responsible at a young age for lasting progress and remarkable courage in the face of violence and injustice. He was the conscience of our Congress. The room quieted and people listened when he spoke. It was a true honor to serve with him in the House and, for me, on the Ways and Means Committee.

It was surreal to walk with him over the Pettus Bridge in Selma on the 50th anniversary of Bloody Sunday. And constituents thank me to this day for inviting him to my district.

Our great country is better because of John Lewis, and we should all work to be just a little more like John Lewis.

John, we miss you. Rest in peace, my friend.

REMEMBERING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF CHARLES EVERS

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

Mr. GUEST. Mr. Speaker, this evening, I rise to honor the life of Charles Evers, who passed away earlier today.

Charles and his brother, Medgar, dedicated their time on this Earth to the advancement of civil rights for all Americans. Following the tragic murder of his brother, Charles assumed Medgar’s position as head of the NAACP in Mississippi, to continue his efforts to expand civil rights for African Americans in the Magnolia State.

In 1969, he became the first African American mayor elected in Mississippi since Reconstruction, making Mr. Evers a symbol of the civil rights that he and his brother fought to advance.

He served as an adviser and mentor to many public officials, from local governments, to the President of the United States.

Today, I join our Mississippi family in thankful prayer for his time on Earth, and that he returned to our Heavenly Father having accomplished his goal of creating a better nation for all people.

Please join me in a moment of silence as we remember his service to our State and our Nation.

□ 1815

MEMORIALIZING THE HONORABLE JOHN LEWIS

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of our friend and colleague, John Lewis.

John will be remembered as one of the pioneers of the civil rights movement, and his example of courage will be talked about for generations to come.

John Lewis was loved on both sides of the aisle. Even when we disagreed, John never failed to be kind and professional.

John loved this country and never stopped his pursuit of a perfect union for all Americans. Even in the last few weeks of his battle with cancer, John was still partaking in nonviolent activism and advocating for equal justice.

When I was a freshman here in Congress, I was touring the Smithsonian with my sons and daughter. One of my sons asked who the bleeding man in the picture was. I told him it was a photo of John Lewis during the civil rights movement and that I now have the privilege of serving with him in Congress. I am lucky to have been able to call John Lewis a colleague and a friend.

His passing is a loss for American democracy and advocacy. My wife, Shannon, and I send our deepest condolences to John’s family, friends, and staff. He will truly be missed. The House will miss John Lewis greatly.

FUNDING NEVADA’S PRECIOUS PUBLIC LANDS

(Mrs. LEE of Nevada asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. LEE of Nevada. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of Nevada’s Third District, I rise today in support of the Great American Outdoors Act. This bill, which I co-sponsored, will finally secure full, dedicated funding for the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

This fund helps to conserve some of southern Nevada’s most precious public lands, like Red Rock Canyon, Sloan Canyon, and Lake Mead.

Coming together on such a vital issue is a reminder that Congress has the

ability to rise above partisanship and find solutions that benefit us all. There is no issue more universal to all Americans and all people than protecting our planet. We can't keep kicking this can down the road. This is the time to fully fund the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

In closing, my time was short with Congressman John Lewis, but I will forever be impacted and am eternally grateful for his leadership.

OPENING OUR SCHOOLS

(Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, as August approaches, reopening schools is now at the forefront of the American agenda.

The American Academy of Pediatrics strongly advocates that we should start with a goal of having students back physically in the classroom. As an experienced physician of more than 30 years, I concur with the AAP, and I believe that the science and the data point toward reopening our schools in America.

This is why I introduced the Open Schools Responsibly Act yesterday, which provides liability protection to schools that adhere to CDC and State guidelines. As we want to open schools again, then educational administrators need to have the confidence that they will not face the brunt of frivolous lawsuits.

Obviously, schools that reopen without taking the proper precautions should be held accountable, and this legislation will still ensure that is the case. We want to protect everyone, from exceedingly low-risk students up to our higher-risk older teachers.

We simply cannot allow our children, especially our higher-at-risk children, to fall further behind in their education. So, it is Congress' duty to pass liability protection to let our kids get back to school and get back on track.

KEEPING KLAMATH RIVER RENEWABLE ENERGY

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission for the decision the other day to not accept the proposal by an entity called the Klamath River Renewal Corporation, which seeks to remove four very important hydroelectric dams on the Klamath River in northern California and southern Oregon.

These dams produce enough renewable hydroelectric power to power 70,000 homes. The problem with renewing them, thinking it is going to help the fish population, is that it would unleash at least 20 million cubic yards of silt with who knows what all is in there—heavy metals, et cetera—that

will then be unleashed upon the rest of the river all the way out to the ocean.

It takes only 3 years to wipe out a salmon population, and it will take much longer for the silt to dissipate in the river.

So much more needs to be done to explore this situation. I advocate that we allow these dams to continue to operate and provide power to our grid that indeed is renewable and helps meet the renewable portfolio standard for California and not just tear them out at unknown costs exceeding \$450 million.

REMEMBERING THE LIFE OF CONGRESSMAN JOHN LEWIS

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

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise with a heavy heart to honor the life of the distinguished Congressman from Georgia's Fifth District, John Lewis.

Few members of this body have had such a profound impact on the fabric of our Nation as John Lewis. He was a man of honor, a freedom fighter, and one of the truly great leaders of the civil rights movement.

From the Edmund Pettus Bridge in Selma, Alabama, where he marched with the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., to demand an end to segregation to the Halls of the Congress of the United States of America where he dutifully and faithfully served his constituents, Representative Lewis spent a lifetime showing Americans what it means to stand up for what is right, even at great personal cost.

He understood something that is all too often forgotten: that the work of creating a more perfect union and the pursuit of liberty and justice for all is never finished, but it is an ongoing and often frustrating process. Nevertheless, he demonstrated both to the Members of this body and to the American people the value of compassion, dedication, and civility.

The world is a better place because of John, and it was an honor to serve alongside him in Congress. May he rest in peace, and may we always honor his example.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO CONGRESSMAN JOHN LEWIS

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

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of our colleague, Congressman John Lewis.

Growing up and learning about Mr. Lewis' contributions to our country, I never thought I would one day have the honor of serving alongside him in Congress or the honor of calling him my friend.

I will always remember the time I think several of us had the opportunity to watch the movie "Selma" with him.

It was amazing to watch everything I had learned about in history class with someone who had experienced it. After the movie, as we were all kind of feeling empty in our stomachs and just the feeling from seeing the movie, I walked up to Mr. Lewis, and I asked him: What is it like to have your life portrayed upon the screen such as that?

If you remember, the actor resembled him when he was younger. Mr. Lewis looked at me and he said: All I was thinking is that I had a lot of hair back then.

That was Mr. Lewis for you, a giant in our history, but unfailingly humble and kind. I am grateful I had the opportunity to know him, and I will miss him dearly.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF CONGRESSMAN JOHN LEWIS

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

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of Congressman John Lewis.

Our Nation mourns his loss. An icon of the civil rights movement, John Lewis dedicated his life to fighting for equality. He was an American hero who never wavered in his pursuit to make our country a more fair and just place.

During my first term in Congress, I met John Lewis when we sat near each other at the President's State of the Union Address my first time. We became friends after that and often spoke on the House floor and in his office. While we served on different sides of the aisle, he was always willing to hear and consider the perspectives of others.

It was an absolute honor to serve alongside him in Congress. John will forever be remembered for his strong leadership, his commitment to peaceful action, and the tremendous sacrifices he made to enact change.

I wish the family, loved ones, and all who knew and admired him peace during this difficult time.

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO TRANSNATIONAL CRIMINAL OR- GANIZATIONS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 116-137)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BUTTERFIELD) laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days before the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in

the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency with respect to transnational criminal organizations declared in Executive Order 13581 of July 24, 2011, is to continue in effect beyond July 24, 2020.

The activities of significant transnational criminal organizations have reached such scope and gravity that they threaten the stability of international political and economic systems.

Such organizations are becoming increasingly sophisticated and dangerous to the United States; they are increasingly entrenched in the operations of foreign governments and the international financial system, thereby weakening democratic institutions, degrading the rule of law, and undermining economic markets. These organizations facilitate and aggravate violent civil conflicts and increasingly facilitate the activities of other dangerous persons.

The activities of significant transnational criminal organizations continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States. For these reasons, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13581 with respect to transnational criminal organizations.

DONALD J. TRUMP,
THE WHITE HOUSE, July 22, 2020.

□ 1830

HONORING CONGRESSMAN JOHN LEWIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BASS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Ms. BASS. Mr. Speaker, it is with great honor that I rise today to co-anchor the Congressional Black Caucus Special Order hour. For the next 60 minutes, we have a chance to communicate to the American people our great love for an American hero, Representative John Lewis.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from the great State of California (Ms. PELOSI), my colleague and the honorable Speaker from the city of San Francisco.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding and appreciate her calling us together for this Special Order for a very special person.

This big picture of John Lewis was just put up here. "Rest in Power," it says. You can't see from the TV, but over here in the front row is a big bouquet of white flowers. It is in a place

where John usually sat in the front row of a section that many of the Members of the Congressional Black Caucus held fort, conspired sometimes, plotted, and made progress for the American people. It is appropriate that we have those flowers there where John sat for so many years.

Jon Meacham, who is writing a book on John Lewis, told us yesterday on a Caucus call that when John was born, he was born into a garden. He loved to be in the garden. He loved to be with the chicks, as we know, the little chickens, and he loved to see things grow. He loved to see things grow.

He lived his life in that way. He loved to see progress grow. He loved to see love and peace grow. He loved to see ideas grow, and he loved to see a more perfect Union grow.

Many of our colleagues will have many things to say this evening, and because it is a Special Order, I don't have my usual 1 minute, which is endless, so I will be briefer and save some remarks for another time. But here is what I will say.

John has always been about non-violence. That was his spirit in everything that he did. He was respectful of other views and respectful of other people. In the spirit of nonviolence, Reverend Lawson taught that to him, to Dr. King, and the rest, and much of it was in the spirit of Mahatma Gandhi and much of the nonviolence that he put forth.

In Sanskrit, Mahatma Gandhi's language, the word for nonviolence is "satyagraha." That word means two things: Nonviolence, and insistence on the truth.

And John Lewis, nonviolently, always insisted on the truth. Whether it was a lunch counter, the truth of equality, whether it was upholding the Constitution, the truth of our Founders, in everything that he did, it was about truth and peace and love.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD my statement, because, again, I am not used to not having endless time as the Speaker of the House, and I do know that our colleagues have a great deal to say.

I will say one more thing: At the end of his life, end of his time in Washington, D.C., right before he was preparing to go back to Atlanta, just a couple of weeks ago, in the middle of the night, he decided—early in the morning, 4 a.m.—that he was going to go, in the morning, to Black Lives Matter on the street.

So one of the last official or public photos that we have of John Lewis is with the Mayor of Washington, D.C., and then alone, standing on that beautiful tapestry, "Black Lives Matter," the connection from John, the boy from Troy, to Black Lives Matter, the future of a movement of which he was so much a part.

May he rest in power. May he rest in peace.

Ms. BASS. Mr. Speaker, the Nation lost an icon; the House lost its most re-

spected Member; and the Congressional Black Caucus lost the most senior member of our family.

The Congressional Black Caucus is known as the conscience of the Congress, but John Lewis was known as the conscience of our Congress. One of the greatest honors of serving in Congress was that I had the possibility of serving with him.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from the State of South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN), the majority whip.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I cringe often when I hear people talk about the 1960s as the civil rights movement. I always put an "S" on that.

The Stono Rebellion was in 1739. It was a civil rights movement.

Denmark Vesey's insurrection was in 1822. It was a civil rights movement.

The Niagara Movement that led to the creation of the NAACP more than 100 years ago was a civil rights movement.

John Lewis and I met in October 1960 at a civil rights movement. For as long as there are people held in suppression, there will always be a movement for civil rights. However, in any movement there will be a few—sometimes only one—that rise head and shoulders above all others, and so it was with my good friend, John Robert Lewis.

When we met the weekend of October 13, 14, 15, 1960, on the campus of Morehouse College, there was a little bit of an insurrection taking place. We, who were college students, felt that we knew how best to do things. We were not listening to Martin Luther King, Jr., and a few others, and so we asked King to meet with us. And he did.

We went into the meeting around 10 o'clock in the evening. We did not walk out of that room until 4 o'clock the next morning. I came out of that room having had a Saul-to-Paul transformation. I have never been the same since.

But listening to King's plea for non-violence, I decided, along with most others, to accept nonviolence as a tactic. But not John Lewis. He internalized. It became his way of life.

After going through a few issues of the 1960s, John got elected president of SNCC in 1963 and was summarily dethroned in 1966. But John then joined the effort, the Voter Education Project, where he directed. That was sponsored by the Southern Regional Council. And as he served as the director of the Voter Education Project in Atlanta, I became the chair of the Voter Education Project in Charleston, South Carolina, and we continued that relationship.

He got married to a librarian, I got married to a librarian—though I did so before he did—and they became fast friends. Lillian and Emily became fast friends.

I will never, ever get John Robert Lewis out of my system, because he

succeeded where I failed. It was a tactic for me. It was a way of life for John Lewis.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. BASS. Mr. 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 subject of this Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Ms. BASS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON), the state of the District of Columbia.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from California, KAREN BASS, for leading this Special Order to our good colleague and friend, John Lewis.

John and I were elected to the House of Representatives about the same time. Actually, he was elected a couple years before I was. But we were colleagues before either of us could have hoped to become Members of Congress. We were kids together in the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, the youth arm of the Southern Civil Rights Movement.

The difference between John and me is I was in law school so I went in the summer, and John was a full-time member, who left school in order to join SNCC. SNCC came out of lunch counter sit-ins. Ella Baker called us all together because it was clear that the Civil Rights Movement was developing a youth arm. And Ella Baker, the great elder of the Civil Rights Movement, decided all of us really should become an organization.

John was not the first head of SNCC. Marion Barry was, because he was a lot more political than John, and he is remembered more today for his politics than for his civil rights acumen. When John was elected chair of SNCC, there was nothing political about it. His qualification was not that he was the strongest. His qualification was that he was the bravest.

It is almost impossible to describe the risks John took in the more than 40 times he was arrested, because today, we are so used to civil disobedience. People right now are lying down on Pennsylvania Avenue after the George Floyd killing. I really want to call to your attention what it meant when John led young people to be arrested.

Everybody has seen the film of his being knocked down as he marched in the front of the line; he had a concussion as a result of that. He never knew, as he led these marches, whether he would come out alive.

Let me tell you about these marches when SNCC would kneel down and assume other nonviolent postures. On the other side, were not counter-demonstrators. On the other side were not other people who were confronting us nonviolently. On the other side were the police leading white mobs. They

were befuddled by the tactics of SNCC and the Civil Rights Movement. Because when you kneel down and are nonviolent, they didn't quite know what to do with you or about you.

John, of course, will always be remembered as a Member of the House of Representatives, but as I close, I must say, it will be difficult, even for John to have done more in the House than he did in the Civil Rights Movement, to do more in Congress than he did for his country.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Ms. BASS. Mr. Speaker, his legacy to our country is that he devoted his life to fighting for justice and being a moral compass to our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from the great State of Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today for a solemn occasion. Tonight we honor our friend, brother, colleague, the conscience of the Congress, a true American icon: Congressman John Lewis.

Words cannot convey the loss to this body as well as to the Nation, but very few can claim to have altered the course of American history the way that John did. He was a guiding light to all of us and was a leader trying to make America a more perfect Union. His steadfast moral leadership will be deeply missed, particularly at this complex time in our history.

Those of us here today are standing on his shoulders. His historic life and legacy will undoubtedly live on, but we must be sure to continue his life's work, particularly when it comes to voting rights and restoring the Voting Rights Act. We must make some "good trouble" to honor his enormous legacy.

Ms. BASS. Mr. Speaker, Congressman John Lewis spent his life fighting racism and injustice wherever he confronted it, from Boy Scout sit-ins and other protests in the streets to championing bold, progressive policies in Congress, including the Voting Rights Act.

□ 1845

Ms. BASS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS).

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker,

To every man there is a way, a ways, and a way.

And the high souls take the high way,
And the low souls take the low.

While all the rest on the misty flats drift to
and fro.

But to every man there is a way, a ways, and
a way,

And each man decideth which way his soul
shall go.

John Lewis always took the high road, always giving of himself in such a way that you knew that he was gracious and kind.

John had faith.

Like John, I grew up in rural America, went to a one-room school, never

had a new schoolbook. But John had the faith of a mustard seed and said: If you want to move a mountain, just say to the mountain be moved. And if it wouldn't, then you get you some dynamite, nitroglycerin, TNT, and blow that sucker down.

That was John Lewis. May he rest in peace.

Ms. BASS. Now that he is no longer with us, we have to live up to his legacy and protect the right to vote for all Americans. As we continue to face challenges due to the coronavirus and issues of systemic racism, we must protect our democracy and elections, even in the midst of adversity.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, we are all heartbroken. We all are speechless. We all are committed to John Robert Lewis' beloved community.

Each of us have been touched without ceasing for the spirit he led us in acknowledging, even in anger, that there was the beloved community.

He loved his wife and his family and his extended brothers and sisters, all the way from Alabama to Georgia. I am reminded of his ability to love Dr. Martin Luther King. It is a testament of a man that is able to extend love and not to show envy but to learn and to seek knowledge. John did that, which allowed him to carry that all the way to the fights of today.

Dr. King said: "John Robert Lewis, are you the boy from Troy?" He loved to tell that story. He loved to tell that he preached to the chickens, but his voices were heard by kings and queens.

John Robert Lewis, a saint walking on Earth.

I am reminded of our days in front of the South African Embassy, arrested, against genocide, or fighting against the children in cages. John never stopped his fight.

And so I come today to honor him in this brief moment that we have, to be able to say, Isn't it good that a saintly man walked on this Earth and reminded us of the beloved community?

I am very glad to say that I knew, and the world knows John Robert Lewis, "the boy from Troy."

Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of this body and the Committee on the Judiciary, as a colleague of a great and beloved man, and as a member of a generation that directly benefited from and was inspired by his work in the Civil Rights Movement, I am proud but heartbroken to participate in this tribute to an American original, our friend and colleague, the late John Robert Lewis who died last Friday, July 17, 2020, in Atlanta, Georgia at the age of 80 years old.

But what amazing things my friend John bore witness to in those eight decades.

John Robert Lewis was a lifelong warrior for a more just, equitable, fairer, and better America, one of the Original Big Six, and a giant of the Civil Rights Movement.

John Lewis was one of the original Freedom Riders who challenged segregated interstate travel in the South in 1961.

He was a founder and early leader of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, which coordinated lunch-counter sit-ins.

He helped organize and was the last surviving person who addressed the multitude at the March on Washington, where Dr. King delivered his immortal "I Have A Dream" speech on the steps of the Lincoln Memorial.

John Robert Lewis was born on February 21, 1940, the third of 10 children, to Eddie and Willie Mae (Carter) Lewis near the town of Troy on a sharecropping farm owned by a white man.

After his parents bought their own farm—110 acres for \$300—John shared in the farm work, leaving school at harvest time to pick cotton, peanuts and corn.

Their house had no plumbing or electricity. In the outhouse, they used the pages of an old Sears catalog as toilet paper, that seems too much to bear but John was empowered by his history.

His family called him "Preacher," and becoming one seemed to be his destiny.

John often said he drew inspiration by listening to a young minister named Martin Luther King on the radio and reading about the 1955 through 56 Montgomery bus boycott.

John Lewis met Dr. King in Montgomery, Alabama in 1958, who was touched by a letter John had written him and sent him a round-trip bus ticket to visit.

When John arrived at the Dexter Avenue Baptist Church for his appointment, Dr. King greeted him thusly: "Are you the boy from Troy? Are you John Lewis?"

John said, "I am John Robert Lewis, giving his whole name."

But Dr. King henceforth would affectionately call our beloved John, "the boy from Troy".

But in 2011, at a White House ceremony, President Barack Obama awarded John Lewis the Presidential Medal of Freedom, the nation's highest civilian honor, and said this about the boy from Troy: "Generations from now, when parents teach their children what is meant by courage, the story of John Lewis will come to mind; an American who knew that change could not wait for some other person or some other time; whose life is a lesson in the fierce urgency of now."

The first time John Lewis was arrested was in February 1960, when he and other students demanded service at whites-only lunch counters in Nashville, the first prolonged battle of the movement that evolved into the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee.

John's advocacy was fierce and joyful, as embodied in his common refrain to involve oneself in the actions and passions of one's time "to get in the way, make necessary trouble."

Less than two years after that August 1963 day, in the shadow of the Lincoln Memorial, in March 1965, John led over 600 foot soldiers across the Edmund Pettus Bridge, in Selma, Alabama, in a march demanding the right to vote. John's protest against injustice was met with violence by Alabama State Troopers.

He was beaten and his skull left bloodied, the horror left bare for a nation to see on television.

That incident, immediately known and forever remembered as Bloody Sunday, led to the passage and enactment of the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

It was my personal honor to accompany John on countless pilgrimages to the Edmund Pettus Bridge to remember and acknowledge those common persons with common dreams and uncommon courage and love for the promise of the country.

In 1986, John Lewis was elected to the United States House of Representatives from Georgia's 5th District and served in that role until earlier the evening when the sun set on his heroic and extraordinary life.

John was the conscience of the Congress, widely beloved and revered on both sides of the aisle and the Capitol.

His moral authority was colossal because he had seen the worst of us but he always appealed to the best of us and never ceased to inspire us to strive to create the beloved community.

It is no exaggeration to say he was a man, the likes of which we shall not see again.

As news of John's passing reverberates across the United States and around the world, John would want us to reflect not on his death, but his life and the unfinished necessary work ahead of us.

John never took his eyes off the prize and to his last days, continued to march and stand in solidarity with those protesting injustice and inequality.

I remember getting arrested with John, Congressman MCGOVERN, former colleagues Jim Moran of Virginia and John Olver of Massachusetts, and our late colleague Tom Lantos, for protesting the genocide in Darfur at the Embassy of Sudan on April 28, 2006.

John Lewis led us in the sit-down demonstration on the House floor to protest the Republican Congress' refusal to take up gun violence prevention legislation in the face of the tragic mass shootings that plague our country.

And in his final act of civic engagement and civil disobedience, John Lewis stood in the middle of Black Lives Matter Plaza showing solidarity and the continuity with the now global movement fighting galvanized by the horrific murder of George Floyd to peacefully protest for justice and equal treatment in the criminal justice system.

Mr. Speaker, John Lewis was among the finest Americans this country ever produced.

He lived a consequential life and his legacy is all around us, in the realization of talent and opportunity of millions of persons who walked through the doors of progress that John Lewis helped open.

I hope it is comfort to John's family and loved ones, that people the world over are mourning his death but celebrating his life.

A fitting and proper means of paying tribute to John Lewis's extraordinary life is for the Senate to immediately take up and pass the John Lewis Voting Rights Advancement Act, landmark legislation to protect the precious right to vote for all persons and to ensure that our democracy has the tools needed to remain strong.

I ask the House to observe a moment of silence in memory and thanks of John Robert Lewis, the boy from Troy, who became a leader who helped change the world.

Ms. BASS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS).

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, John Robert Lewis was short in height, yet he was a giant. John Robert Lewis was a humble man but fierce for justice.

John Robert Lewis talked softly, but roared like a lion when it was time to fight for freedom, justice, and equality for all humankind. He said there was one race—the human race.

He is an individual that compelled a Nation to change, to make it better. His voice will echo in this Chamber forever.

It was my honor and pleasure for 22 years to serve with the Honorable John Robert Lewis.

May he rest in peace and rise in power.

Ms. BASS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. David Scott).

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, John Lewis' mother and his grandmother named him John after John the Apostle, the disciple, the Scripture says, whom Jesus loved, John the Beloved.

And John Lewis dedicated his life to building the beloved community.

And one more thing. John Lewis, being named after John, Jesus' Apostle, it must be noted that the Apostle John was the youngest of the disciples. John Lewis was the youngest of our civil rights leaders who spoke at the momentous March on Washington.

God bless John Lewis, and we thank God for sending him our way.

Ms. BASS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN).

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to say thank you to a friend and a great warrior.

I thank you, dear brother, for being the sermon you preached. You walked your talk. It is said that a great person will always rise to the occasion, but it is also said that the greater person makes the occasion.

He was an occasion-maker, and he rose to the occasion on the Edmond Pettus Bridge. And for this, many of us who are here tonight are here because he marched into brutality.

So tonight, I thank you, dear brother, for being able to withstand what many of us could not and would not. I rise to just say thank you and to let you know that we will never forget you, and we will always make it perspicuously clear that we are here because you were there.

Ms. BASS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. CLARKE).

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor a great man, Representative John Lewis.

This past Friday, July 17, our country lost one of its greatest heroes, a true patriot, who literally put his life on the line in the pursuit of justice and fairness in our society.

The Honorable John Lewis was a penultimate hero who embodied the struggle for human rights and dignity. He was a fierce civil rights warrior, who refused to abide by the Jim Crow laws of the South. He embodied what it means to be a public servant, putting his life on the line and the people above his own self-interests.

I am so honored and privileged to have served with John Robert Lewis—John Robert Lewis, who was a dancer, a man who loved to have fun but was convicted for the right to vote, convicted as an activist for civil rights and civil liberties.

And I will forever hold dear the moment that we landed in Ghana together, invited by the President of Ghana for the Year of Return, and to see the wonderment in his eyes of visiting a space where it all began for all of us 401 years ago.

May he rest in peace and rise in power. The Honorable John Lewis will never be forgotten. We all hold onto his legacy.

Ms. BASS. To honor Mr. Lewis, the first thing we need to do is to pass legislation restoring the Voting Rights Act and get it signed. We know the credibility of our elections has already shown early signs of concern during several State primaries and voter suppression cases, coupled with the fact that people are going to have to vote in dangerous conditions, cannot be ignored. I know that if Mr. Lewis was still with us, he would be leading that fight.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, much has been said about my friend, teacher, and mentor, John Lewis.

He was a family man, married to Lillian for 44 years, and to that union bore a son, John-Miles, who is with us today.

Along with John Lewis' brothers and sisters, he was number three of ten. He has a large extended family. And that family entrusted John to the world. And for 33 years, he was our colleague. For 14 years, he was mine.

I just want to say to the family that we here in Congress feel your pain. We appreciate your sacrifice in allowing John to do what he did for the world and for Congress. I want you to know that we stand with you, we feel your pain, and we will never forget your dear brother, uncle, cousin, whoever he was to you. We will never forget him. We know that he loved you.

He would depart this place to go to the family reunion during the summer down in Alabama where the family still owned hundreds of acres of land that they farmed even when his two sharecropping parents gave birth to John. And so he was a family man. Thank you, family, for entrusting him to us.

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

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, there are no words to describe the pain that many Americans are feeling right now as we grapple with the loss of our conscience, our friend, our inspirational leader, John Lewis.

I am heartbroken. I am honored and humbled to have served alongside him, to have had him take my children, as he has done for so many Americans in the Faith and Politics movement through a historic march in Selma, across the Edmund Pettus Bridge.

During one of those trips I was lucky enough to have my daughter Laura and son Ray join me. Because of school obligations, they had to leave early and were going to miss the march across the Edmund Pettus Bridge. John wasn't about to let that happen.

He took the three of us in his car with him and we drove through Selma, as he told them what it was like and what he went through. They were both entranced by him and the story he was telling that was filled with graphic violence of what they endured as they fought for equal rights.

At the end of it, my daughter Laura, who was about 14 years old at the time, struck by what he had just told her, rather innocently asked him, "Mr. Lewis, did you ever have fun?"

There was a pregnant pause and then John got the biggest smile on his face. He told us that yes, they did. "And in fact, at night, we'd pitch our tents and sit around campfires and we'd sing and dance," he said. His smile then got broader as he remembered. "I can still see Andy Young doing the jitterbug in his coveralls. And he could dance . . . he could dance."

Despite everything John endured, they were still young and full of life.

One of the most inspiring memories I have of John Lewis is from 2009, when we were fighting to pass the Affordable Care Act. The day before we passed the bill, hateful protestors spewed racial slurs and spit on John Lewis, ANDRÉ CARSON, and EMMANUEL CLEAVER. Tensions were high after that. The next day at Caucus, I asked John to speak. He brought the Caucus to its feet, evoking the Civil Rights movement.

He said: "Pay no attention to what went on yesterday. We have to learn, as we did in the Civil Rights Movement, to look past this and keep our eyes on the prize. So, I ask you to stay calm and stay together." As he was walking away from the mic, he paused, and then he stepped back up and said, "Forty-five years ago, I walked across the Edmund Pettus bridge arm in arm with fellow citizens who believed strongly in Civil Rights. We faced far more difficult crowds than we are facing out here today. Let's lock arms and go across the street and pass this bill." And we did. We marched across the street, through the protesters and passed the bill.

In 2016, I worked with John to take another stand. This time, we were calling for a vote on the House floor on a bill to address the epidemic of gun violence in America. After the 2012 shooting at Sandy Hook Elementary, the House didn't take a single vote to address gun violence, until Democrats took the majority in 2019. In 2016, after the shooting at Pulse Nightclub in Orlando, John and the rest of the Democratic Caucus had had enough. He called on the Caucus to join him in causing some 'good trouble'. With that, we held a sit-in on the House floor demanding justice.

Most recently, we worked together to strengthen Social Security. Social Security is our nation's number one anti-poverty program and is a lifeline for millions. It needs to be strengthened so it's there for future generations too. Last summer we stood together outside the Capitol highlighting how important these benefits are for seniors, especially for Black seniors. He said:

"I grew up in rural Alabama, 50 miles from Montgomery, outside a little town called Troy, and I remember how seniors lived before they had Social Security. Most of the seniors in my district in Georgia depend on Social Security for the majority of their income. Without it almost half of Black and Latino seniors in this country would be living in poverty. That's not

right, that's not fair, and it's not just. Social Security is more than a right, it is a promise. A promise people paid into to secure their future. We can do better, we can do much better."

This year, even when battling cancer, he continued this fight.

I've been proud to call John Lewis a friend over my time in Congress. In 2016, I was honored to work with the Bipartisan Policy Center and Representative TOM COLE to establish the Congressional Patriot Award. John Lewis and Sam Johnson, who passed away earlier this year, were the first recipients. They were both authentic heroes. One held in captivity by the VietCong and tortured and nearly beaten to death; the other held captive by the Alabama Police, clubbed and beaten. They both had a genuine focus on doing for others, not themselves. They were humble, gracious, and kind, yet warriors for their cause.

John Lewis has forever changed our country. His legacy will live on in the policies and lives he changed. We must continue to follow his lead and cause good trouble.

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the heroic life of Congressman John Robert Lewis and his historic contribution to the nation we know and love today.

In September 1957, the Little Rock Nine walked into history as they walked up the front steps of Central High School. It was a pivotal moment in history.

John said this moment inspired him in his own leadership as an active member of the Civil Rights Movement.

I had the pleasure of calling John a friend, as did many of my colleagues, and will cherish the time we had together in the people's House.

John joining me as legislative cosponsors to expand the Little Rock Central High National Park boundary is a highlight of my congressional service.

John will truly be missed, but long remembered. As the USNS *John Lewis* sets sail as a new class of naval vessel, we are reminded to carry on his legacy of dignified leadership. I join all Americans in honoring the remarkable life of John Lewis. Martha and I offer prayers for his family and for all those he inspired and who thus grieve over his loss.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, our country lost Congressman John Lewis, an inspiring individual who stirred so much important change.

I would like to extend my deepest sympathies to Congressman John Lewis' family, friends, and staff. Congressman Lewis will always be an icon of courage to promote equality and freedom. I will always cherish his thoughtful and cheerful encouragement during our time serving in Congress together.

Congressman Lewis was especially appreciated by his neighbors—the people of South Carolina.

We will always remember Congressman Lewis for his many significant accomplishments. And although he is no longer with us, his legacy will always live on. My prayers are with the Lewis family during this incredibly painful time.

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in the passing of Congressman John Lewis, I have lost a dear friend, Georgia has lost a true leader, and our nation has lost a civil rights icon.

John Lewis and I first met upon my arrival to Congress nearly three decades ago. Yet, by

the time of that meeting, he had already made a profound impact on my life. It was because of his early work on the advancement of the Civil and Voting Rights Acts that I can stand here and address you today.

His grasp of the nuances and complexities of public policy, paired with his genuine personality, made him a dynamic presence in this Chamber. When he spoke, everyone—regardless of party or politics—listened. When he sang—like he did when we were jailed together following a nonviolent protest at the Embassy of Sudan—peace ensued. His stories captivated, his advice educated, his sermons inspired, and his speeches motivated. He brought the same passion he had as an activist to the halls of Congress, where he spent his career representing Georgia's 5th district.

It is impossible to properly eulogize John Lewis with only words—for he was a man of action. We would therefore all do well to reaffirm our commitment to the preservation of equality and justice in his honor, which is necessary now more than ever before.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to offer my condolences to John Lewis's family and to thank the Congressman for a life full of "good trouble."

Miss GONZALEZ-COLON of Puerto Rico. Mr. Speaker, for so many of us, serving in the U.S. Congress is the achievement of a lifetime. But by the time John Lewis arrived to this chamber, he had already built a historic legacy, as one of the Greats of the Civil Rights Movement. A man of inspiration and hope, committed to the struggles of freedom and justice, John had to put himself on the line and defend social justice throughout his whole lifetime.

America has lost one of its great leaders. John never relented in fighting for what he felt was right, yet he always sought the good in others. Having suffered bigotry and violence, he would not let himself be dragged down by hate.

It is a privilege to me, to have been able to know and serve in Congress with such a champion of equality and civil rights. Humble as the truly great are humble, serene and kind, but John was strong in his convictions. In his office he displayed mementos of our nation's crude history of segregation and the events of the struggle that he still remembered as if it were yesterday. I was privileged to have conversations with him asking about his experiences, in which he gladly spent much longer time than the usual congressional meeting. In his gaze as he spoke you could see an inner peace that filled the room and seemed magical.

John Lewis always supported the right of Puerto Ricans to choose their own future and achieve full equality as American citizens, and I was able to count on him as cosponsor of the Puerto Rico Statehood Admission Act (H.R. 4901). He also joined in our effort to recognize the valor and sacrifice in battle of the Puerto Rican soldiers of the 65th Infantry Regiment as cosponsor of the measure to establish the 13th of April as National Borinqueneers Day.

In the same spirit of justice and equality, he asked me to be the Republican co-lead for the Every Child Deserves a Family Act (H.R. 3114), a piece of legislation that seeks to end discrimination in adoption and foster care agencies across the nation, forbidding discrimination against children, youths, families

and individuals on the basis of religion, sex (including sexual orientation and gender identity) and marital status in the management and delivery of child welfare services. I did not hesitate to say yes. Discrimination is discrimination whether you are talking political or social issues.

Representative Lewis' gallant defense of equality and justice extended to the struggle for the rights of the LGBTQ community. I was proud to join him in the Equality Act, which would extend by law the protection against discrimination under the 1964 Civil Rights Act to LGBTQ individuals. The march towards true justice on which John Lewis spent his life goes on: it is up to us to continue it. There will be other bridges to cross, and his courage should inspire us to cross them, but always with love and care for all people.

May John's loved ones be comforted by the knowledge that his memory will continue to inspire many generations who are learning from his words, about inclusion and about fighting hatred with love. I Thank John (he never wanted me to call him Congressman or Mr. Lewis).

HONORING CONGRESSMAN JOHN LEWIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BISHOP) is recognized for the remainder of the hour as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, we are here to honor Congressman John Robert Lewis, our hero, our colleague, our brother, our friend.

Having known John for 52 years, I can tell you honestly that even in his humanity, he lived his life in the image of Jesus.

John was a voice of the voiceless—African Americans, for women, for LGBTQ people, for the least and the left out, for anyone mistreated by society.

His unwavering sense of right and wrong was a North Star for this Nation, which is why we called him the conscience of the Congress.

People as good as John don't come our way very often. Despite all of the accolades and recognition he received, John remained humble, unfailingly kind, and always fueled the capacity of people to be better, despite their past transgressions.

Where would America be today if it were not for John Lewis? Without his activism, without his courage, without his perseverance for voting rights, I doubt if I would be here today.

Thank you, John, for your lifetime of advocacy, for sacrifice of friendship and counsel.

And thank you, God, for the life of John Robert Lewis.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. CARSON).

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, John Lewis was certainly a leader amongst men. He was a mentor. He was a friend. And my heart goes out to his family. Our hearts go out to his family.

I can remember, Mr. Speaker, during the healthcare vote, I was coming out

of Cannon and I ran into John, and he asked: "How many votes do we have left, or how much time do we have left?" I said: "I think we will make it."

We crossed the street, along with his chief, Michael, and there were thousands of people yelling: "Kill the bill. Kill the bill. Kill the bill." And that wasn't it. They were yelling expletives, racial expletives, at the three of us.

And John looked at me and said: "Brother Andre, this reminds me of a darker time, brother."

John became a mentor. We would call him up, and he would speak to the Muslim community. We would call him up, and he would speak to the folks in Indiana who were there when it was announced that Dr. King had passed, because he was in Indianapolis at the time.

□ 1900

He was a true servant, Mr. Speaker. Jesus was mentioned. John was like Jesus. I am reminded of a Scripture when Jesus was having a conversation with his disciples about this notion of leadership, and Jesus looked at his disciples and said: He who wishes to be chief among you shall first be your servant.

John was a servant. He wasn't the kind of leader who looked at the protesters today and said: Oh, what you are going through is nothing compared to what we went through.

He stood in solidarity with those young folks and embraced those young folks like a real leader. John is an example to all of us, what true public servants should be.

We love you, John. God bless.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, we make our living by what we get. We make a life by what we give. John Lewis certainly made a life.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama (Ms. SEWELL).

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and outstanding legacy of our colleague, friend, mentor, and my hero, Congressman John Robert Lewis.

Growing up as a little girl in Selma, Alabama, John's incredible legacy was a hero's tale as familiar to me as any Bible story or family lore.

As a little girl singing in the choir, the children's choir at Brown Chapel AME Church, my home church, it was the church where John and so many wonderful foot soldiers would come time and time again to honor the legacy of the Bloody Sunday march.

But to know John was to know a man without ego, who, despite his many well-deserved accolades and successes, loved every person he met. He looked them in the eye. Can't you hear him? "My brother, my sister," he would say.

John loved this country more than any person who I have met, and it was his deep-seated patriotism that will live on.

His legacy, indeed, was the Voting Rights Act. And, we, in this body, can do something about that. Yes, we can

name things for John, but the biggest thing that we can do is rename H.R. 4. We should call it the John Robert Lewis Voting Rights Act of 2020 and fully restore the Voting Rights Act of 1965. That is the legacy of John Lewis.

He gave us the road map. Can't you hear him? Never give up, never give in. Keep your eyes on the prize. Keep the faith.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. George Washington Carver once said: How far you go in life depends on your being tender with the young, compassionate with the aged, sympathetic with the striving, and tolerant of the weak and strong, because someday in your life you will have been all of these. That was our friend, John Lewis.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. BEATTY).

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, America has lost a national treasure, one of the world's greatest fighters and defenders of freedom and justice. Congressman LEWIS' words and work and legacy will live forever.

I am so fortunate to have traveled to Africa with him and to have marched in my hometown with him. You see, Mr. Speaker, when Mr. LEWIS spoke, you heard the voice of history, a voice that helped stir the conscience of America at a time of ugliness and struggle, but also at a time and in an era of hope and accomplishment.

My colleagues, there is no greater time for us to stand up against injustices that we are facing, no greater time for us to fight for justice and fairness at the ballot box. So, my colleagues, let us make some noise. Let us get in trouble, good trouble.

God bless you. Rest in peace. Rest in power, my friend. Good trouble.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. KELLY).

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I want to share my letter to Congressman John Robert Lewis.

Dear John, I hope you knew how incredibly honored I was to call you colleague and to serve with you. It was such a great privilege to watch you in action and listen to your stories.

When we planned the sit-in, being a part of the Fab 5 made me so proud. It took a while to get the bill out of the House, but we finally did it. I promise you, when I encounter a situation that is just not right, I will stand up, speak out, and get in the way.

I plan to carry a piece of you with me forever. I know I will be a better person for it. I hope you, C.T. Vivian, Martin, Rosa, Edgar, Robert Kennedy, and others are having a fabulous reunion.

Rest in power, my friend, until we meet again.

Love, Robin.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, how much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia has 22 minutes remaining.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. LAWRENCE).

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, just this year, I remember John urging

Americans to "get in good trouble, necessary trouble, and help redeem the soul of America," as we combat some of the most hateful messages and priorities driven by this current administration.

Today, I stand here and, John, I promise that I will continue to carry out your legacy, to get into good trouble and to ensure that the fight for equality and justice lives on, and to challenge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to do the same and pass the Voting Rights Act.

John, rest in peace. Rest in power. You have been a good and faithful servant.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. EVANS).

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor a truly great American and a real-life hero.

I was fortunate enough to have him as a colleague for 4 years. Congressman John Lewis has been an inspiration to me at a very young age.

I remember the first time I saw him was on the evening news. He was walking across the Pettus Bridge. I felt very strongly about him and what he was doing. I was 10 years old, and I found him to be inspiring. He was purposeful. He was driven to make a difference. He was driven to make some good trouble.

Now, we must carry on with the work of civil rights and equal opportunity.

Rest in power, Congressman LEWIS.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. DEMINGS).

Mrs. DEMINGS. Mr. Speaker, on June 12, 2016, a lone gunman walked into the Pulse nightclub in Orlando, Florida, and opened fire with a semi-automatic rifle. That night, the shooter killed 49 people and injured 53 others. At the time, it was the largest mass shooting in American history.

The Pulse nightclub is in my district, but I was not in Congress at the time. When I saw the Members of Congress taking to the floor and holding a sit-in, I was not surprised that the person leading the way was Representative John Lewis. To him, the victims were a part of the big family John Lewis often spoke about.

Thank you, John, for never discriminating. Thank you, John, for never leaving people behind.

Galatians 5 defines the fruit of the spirit as love, peace, long-suffering, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, gentleness, and self-control. John Lewis was all of that to the House, to the Nation, and to the world, and I am grateful for his friendship and his counsel and grateful for a life well-lived.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Georgia (Mrs. MCBATH).

Mrs. MCBATH. Mr. Speaker, tonight, we stand in this great Chamber and mourn our friend, a civil rights icon and the conscience of Congress.

John Lewis towered over his era, and his loss is deeply felt across this coun-

try and across the globe. From marching for freedom in Montgomery to being beaten and bloodied on a bridge in Selma, John's life showed us all the fundamental need for good, necessary trouble.

As John would often say:

We have a moral obligation, a mission, and a mandate to do what we can to make our country and our world a better place and to help usher in a loving community where no one is left out or left behind.

His words and his life ring through eternity.

We will honor John's legacy with an unshakeable determination to fight for what is right and what is just. He served the Nation in love. Rest in peace, my friend. We love you. I love you.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, may I request the amount of time remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlemen from Georgia has 15 minutes remaining.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. MFUME).

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Speaker, as we have been hearing and continue to hear, the passing of John Lewis represents a loss for America of one of our greatest heroes and, for many of us, a dear and old friend.

John and I were sworn in together in this Chamber 33 years ago as classmates in the 100th Congress. There were only four African Americans elected to Congress that year, he, myself, Floyd Flake of New York, and Mike Espy of Mississippi. We huddled with John here on the floor, and he made all of us hug each other. He said: We got here in different ways, but we are one band of brothers now.

The passion and the equality that he carried with him throughout his life, as we know, never waned. His untiring quest for justice never faltered. With a big heart for compassion, John, like his mentor, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., was unawed by opinion, unswayed by flattery, and undismayed by disaster.

Born in an area of Jim Crow and vile and vicious segregation, he defied the limitedness of others' expectations.

John knew that politics changed people, so he set out early to change politics.

□ 1915

Everything about him pointed to the fact that he was emblematic of that great band of freedom fighters who realized that freedom wasn't free.

In this era where everyone seems to be searching for the next big thing or the next great thing, isn't it odd, Mr. Speaker, that the greatness of John Lewis was with us all along? We needed only to look as far as the latest movement for social change to find it.

We are sad today, but heaven is rejoicing, and John has claimed his final reward.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it has been said that service is the rent

we pay for the space we occupy on this Earth. John Lewis paid his rent, and he paid it well.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HURD).

Mr. HURD of Texas. A Freedom Rider unshaken by threats and violence, a leader in the struggle for voting rights who kept fighting even after a broken skull, a courageous American undeterred by more than 40 arrests after standing up for what is right, John Lewis spent his life fighting injustice and racism.

If it weren't for the bravery of John and men and women like him, many of us wouldn't be in this Chamber today. And as a Black man, I am not sure I would have had the same rights as my fellow countrymen.

John shaped this country in immeasurable ways. He never sat by when he saw injustice. He never stopped fighting.

At a time when America is so divided, we should look at John's courage for inspiration; we should look at John's bravery for imitation; and we should look at John's words and follow them.

I lost a mentor. John's family lost a father, son, brother, and husband. Our country lost an American hero.

Rest in peace, my brother.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

What a void we feel tonight. I rise to honor the life and legacy of a great warrior for peace and justice, a kind and gentle human being, the conscience of the Congress, Congressman John Lewis.

As a giant of, as our whip indicated, a civil rights movement, John's leadership and his courage continued as an extraordinary congressional leader. Every year, I joined John on his annual pilgrimage to Selma, Montgomery, and Birmingham, Alabama. I brought young people from the Martin Luther King Jr. Freedom Center in my district and my grandchildren each year to learn about and give thanks to the foot soldiers of the civil rights movement.

John always took time to meet with these young people. Even this year, with his failing health, he pulled them aside. He met with them. He always wanted to, and he did, inspire them to take that baton and to run the next lap of the race for justice and equality. And, yes, like with so many, he blessed my community by coming to my district to continue these efforts with my young people.

Last year, Speaker PELOSI and Chairwoman BASS led a delegation to Ghana, West Africa, to observe the 400th anniversary of the first enslaved Africans brought to America. John said that Ghana was one of the most moving trips of his life. He said: "To see and behold the inhumanity during another period of our history, it tells each and every one of us to never let this evil happen again."

Now, John was welcomed in Ghana as royalty, which he was. He was honored as a son of Africa who had come home.

John and I would compare notes on tough votes, such as on matters of war and peace and defense spending. I will miss his wise counsel and admonition—and, really, admonition—to do the right thing as he told all of us to keep our eyes on the prize.

Now, Members know how we get agitated when our colleagues poach our staff members. Well, John poached a brilliant and wonderful young woman from my office Jamila Thompson. When he told me about it, believe it or not, for the first time, I was thrilled that one of my staff members had been poached by John Lewis. What an honor.

John's presence in the people's House will be deeply missed, but one of the greatest tributes to Congressman John Lewis would be to restore the Voting Rights Act.

I would not be standing here as the 100th Black Member of Congress had it not been for the Honorable John Robert Lewis.

My deepest condolences and love and gratitude to John's family, Michael Collins, Jamila Thompson, his entire phenomenal staff, and his constituents, and to all those whose lives he touched. Let us continue to build the beloved community that he so eloquently spoke of.

In closing, I am reminded of a Scripture, 2 Timothy 4:7: I have fought the good fight, I have finished the race, I have kept the faith.

As John Lewis' soul returns to his Creator, may he rest in peace, may he rest in power.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, as we come to the close of this first hour of tribute to our friend and our colleague and our hero, John Robert Lewis, I leave you with the words of Douglas Malloch, who wrote:

The tree that never had to fight
For Sun and sky and air and light,
But stood out in the open plain
And always got its share of rain,
Never became a forest king
But lived and died a scrubby thing.
The man who never had to toil
To gain and farm his patch of soil,
Who never had to win his share
Of Sun and sky and light and air,
Never became a manly man
But lived and died as he began.
Good timber does not grow in ease;
The stronger wind, the stronger trees;
The further sky, the greater length;
The more the storm, the more the strength.
By Sun and cold, by rain and snow,
In trees and men, good timbers grow.
Where thickest lies the forest growth,
We find the patriarchs of both.
And they hold counsel with the stars
Whose broken branches show the scars
Of many winds and much of strife,
This is the common law of life.

John Robert Lewis was indeed good timber. God bless his soul. May he rest in peace and in power.

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

CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF CONGRESSMAN JOHN LEWIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Ms. CHENEY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor this evening to manage the time that we have on the Republican side to celebrate and remember the life of our tremendous colleague, Mr. John Lewis.

Mr. Speaker, I was very moved, having the opportunity to watch my colleagues on the other side of the aisle discuss and describe the impact that Congressman Lewis had on their lives, on all of our lives, and on this Chamber. I am struck by the fact that as we gather tonight in this Chamber, we rise not as representatives of two different political parties, but we rise as elected representatives of this great Nation, a Nation that is mourning the loss of a great American, and as honored colleagues of a man, John Lewis, who dedicated his life to service and to the fight for justice and freedom.

John Lewis taught us: "Nothing can stop the power of a committed and determined people to make a difference in our society. Why? Because human beings are the most dynamic link to the divine on this planet."

John Lewis understood that one man or woman can make a difference—indeed, that it is only the determined and principled action of committed men and women that brings change.

He knew the blessings of this Nation, and he knew what it took to secure those blessings for all Americans. He knew that the fight was unfinished.

Mr. Speaker, the day that I was sworn into this body for the first time, I was standing just outside these doors in the Speaker's lobby. I had just arrived with my dad, who joined me on the floor that day. By chance, as we were coming in, we met John Lewis standing in the lobby. The three of us had the chance before the ceremony to spend some time together.

The two of them didn't agree on much, but they did agree on certain critical things. They agreed on the exceptional nature of this country, on the magnificence of this, the people's House, and on the incalculable blessings of freedom.

I am blessed by the memory of that day, and I am blessed that at that moment when I was about to be sworn into this House, I was able to spend time with those two men.

Writing of his experiences fighting for civil rights, John Lewis said this: "Freedom is not a state; it is an act. It is not some enchanted garden perched high on a distant plateau where we can finally sit down and rest. Freedom is the continuous action we all must take, and each generation must do its

part to create an even more fair, more just society.”

Great men and women like John Lewis in every generation have known this, that we all have an obligation to defend our freedom, to fight for it, to do our part to be worthy of the sacrifices of those who have gone before.

One of the greatest gifts we can give to young people today is to teach them that lesson, to teach them our history, to convey to them the duty, the obligation, and the incredible blessing of being an American and of working to make sure that we pass this Nation to our children and our grandchildren more perfect than it is today.

Our colleague, Congressman John Lewis, dedicated his life to that ideal. His memory will be a blessing and an example to us all, our colleagues, his colleagues, here in the House, to his family, to his constituents, and to his fellow Americans.

God bless John Lewis, and God bless the United States of America.

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

MEMORIALIZING THE HONORABLE JOHN LEWIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WALKER) is recognized for the remainder of the hour as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to participate in this Special Order, and I will look forward to hearing from our speakers in honoring the great John Lewis.

Over this past weekend, America lost not only a civil rights icon but also a loving father, a loving husband, a caring friend to this entire House body, Congressman John Lewis.

Mr. Lewis' courage and strength in the face of oppression are unmatched. His contributions to America's soul are paramount to the progress that we have made in our histories.

His experience on Bloody Sunday left him battered, covered in blood, and on the side of the road in Selma, Alabama, yet he carried on with his unifying message for America.

Many years ago, John Lewis crossed the monumental Edmund Pettus Bridge, fighting for freedom and a path toward achieving what our Founding Fathers had pledged but fell short to uphold.

I was extremely honored to have the opportunity 54 years later to walk across this very bridge in Selma, and we all honored the brave steps he led, rallying an entire Nation. The fact that I was asked to give the closing remarks at Dexter Avenue King Memorial Baptist Church in Montgomery is something, frankly, I will always treasure.

John Lewis' protest inspired our Nation to not only do better but to reflect on all of our actions. Through his grace and humility, he made monumental

progress. He liked to refer to these acts as “good trouble.”

While we don't share many of the same political opinions, there was never a doubt in my mind that Congressman John Lewis lived his entire life fighting for our country and the American people.

He gave us all hope, hope that we could get over this partisan divide, hope that we could get over the divisions of the past to paint a brighter future.

May we never lose that spirit and forever honor his legacy by never letting the forces of division, hatred, and evil tear down those bridges that so many of us have sacrificed to build.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE), the minority whip.

□ 1930

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend and colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WALKER), for yielding.

I join with my colleagues, both Republican and Democrat, who mourn the loss of John Lewis.

We have so many honors to be able to serve in a job like this where we get to represent the people of this Nation, especially here in the people's House where we truly do bring all of the different elements of what makes America great into one body with people who represent every different type of background and every different kind of community, the kinds of people we get to serve with.

There are giants among the people we have the honor of serving with. John Lewis was at the top of that list, and you knew it when you served with him.

I remember telling colleagues years ago that, while we have our differences, it is really important to go get to know especially some of the legends, the giants we serve with in this body.

I remember talking about two Members in particular: it was John Lewis and Sam Johnson, one Democrat, one Republican, two people who were just giants. Unfortunately, we have now lost both of them in the last year.

Our institution is better because John Lewis was a part of this great body, but it is what John fought for his whole life.

I know my colleague from North Carolina as well as my colleagues in the Congressional Black Caucus talked about, earlier, his mantra of “good trouble.” What John experienced in his life, there are so many people who have freedoms today they would never have if John hadn't gone through that.

I had an honor, like so many of my colleagues, to go with John, he invited Members from both parties to go to Selma to be a part of reliving that history, which was a dark side of our history, Bloody Sunday, but one that John used as a teachable moment to bring people from all parts of this country to walk across that Edmund

Pettus Bridge. I got to walk arm in arm with John. It was one of the great honors I have had as a Member of Congress to be able to do that.

The whole time we were walking with him—this could be a moment that John wanted to just leave in his past because he was so brutally beaten, but he wanted to share the experiences. And as we were walking, we would round the corner, and he would point to different buildings. And he said: That is where we gathered. That is where some of the people who were trying to stop us would be.

He helped organize the Student Non-violent Coordinating Committee, SNCC. He started at a young age in the civil rights movement, at a time when it was not only difficult, but it was possibly life-threatening. And for many, they did lose their life in that battle.

And John lost blood. He shed blood for the cause. But he never took it as a moment to get down. He never took it as a moment to be bitter.

He wanted to continue fighting to make America a more perfect Union, and he did. And that is what we will remember about John. We will remember his warm-hearted spirit.

John was one of those very few people in a body like this where, when he stood at the podium to speak, no matter what side you were on on that issue, you stopped, you sat down, and you listened, because you knew you were listening to somebody who was larger than life.

John is in a better place right now, but America is a better place because John was here.

God bless John Lewis and his family. Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI).

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in honor of a beloved colleague and wonderful friend, John Lewis.

I first met John when my husband, Bob Matsui, was a Member of Congress. Bob loved John. He loved him for his humanity, his conviction, and the fact that he was a total human being.

I had heard so much about John because he was a historic figure, but I saw another side of him, too, when Bob brought him to Sacramento. He met many people. And I remember his walking across a university campus with the president of the university when he ran across, Bob and he and John, a bunch of chickens that the students were advocating to keep on campus. The president was saying: No. We have got to get the chickens out.

The president said: Excuse me, Mr. Lewis, but we are going to get rid of those chickens.

And John said: No way are you going to get rid of those chickens. I learned to preach by preaching to chickens.

That is the part of John that I really loved, too, that humorous part, the part you can laugh with.

But this gentle giant lived also every single day to overcome injustice, eradicate racism, and give hope to all who

walked beside him. He is a total person.

At this moment in our history when speaking truth to power is so vital, it is more important than ever to follow John's words, to "stand up, speak out, and keep your eyes on the prize."

John taught us all that America is greater than the sum of its parts. When you weave a rich, colorful tapestry, the weaving itself makes it strong. His impact will be forever felt in our Nation's conscience, and we are all better for it.

At this difficult time, my prayers are with the Lewis family and all his friends. He will be sorely missed.

I love you, John.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. FERGUSON), our deputy whip. It only makes sense to go first to John Lewis' colleagues in the delegation from Georgia.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WALKER) for allowing me to do this.

I rise tonight to honor the life and legacy of John Lewis.

John dedicated his life to equality and justice, and the Nation we are so blessed to live in is better because of his work and his sacrifice.

John was driven by his deep faith, his servant heart, and his love of his fellow human being. While John was always right to fight for legal changes to make America better, he ultimately knew that how you treated your fellow human being was a matter of the heart.

John led by example. He led by showing love and grace to all people. He showed love and grace even to those people who disagreed with him or showed him contempt.

John was always willing to offer forgiveness to those who had done him wrong, knowing that forgiveness was fundamental to building a relationship built on trust and love.

Two of my most vivid memories and treasured experiences here in my time in Congress involved John.

One was a dinner at his house. He invited the Georgia delegation over, and he retold the story of his life and experiences in the civil rights movement. What a cherished memory and experience.

The second was the night that we honored another Georgia giant here, former House Member and former U.S. Senator JOHNNY ISAKSON. I remember the night that JOHNNY ISAKSON and John Lewis met in the center and embraced in true love, friendship, and respect. It was truly an amazing moment.

John was an amazing man, and I believe that the only thing John Lewis ever hated was hate itself.

Rest in peace, our dear friend.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY).

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the memory of Congressman John Lewis, an American hero, a dear friend.

He taught us what patriotism is, that to love our country is to acknowledge and work to repair its imperfections.

Congressman Lewis endured angry mobs, death threats, and so much violence with endurance, persistence, and even warmth and optimism. Surely we can honor his remarkable life by coming together to reauthorize the Voting Rights Act, to ensure our laws reflect that Black lives matter.

Advocating for the Nation's marginalized throughout his life, acting as the conscience of Congress during his 34 years of service, he inspired generations of Americans to get in "good trouble."

I remember sitting on the floor with John. Rather than sitting in the chair, we were proving our point and all sitting on the floor.

He has taught us so much with his sweet, sweet manner, but the strength of his conviction.

We must honor Congressman Lewis' legacy by striving to achieve the equitable and just society for all that he fought so hard to attain. In the words of John himself, "If not us, then who? If not now, then when?"

Dear, sweet, kind John, we will miss you. We love you. May you rest in peace.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT).

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WALKER) for yielding to me to speak about my friend and colleague, Congressman John Lewis, a man that I loved.

I will miss dearly him saying, "I love you too, brother."

There is no telling how many times John Lewis told the people of this House, "I love you too, brother." He looked at everybody, no matter who you were, as a brother.

I selfishly thought about how much I was going to miss him and seeing him and Michael Collins on a Delta ready to fly up here. I always got a kick out of the fact that people from my district would sit down next to me and say: Did you see John Lewis on the plane? And, by the way, what do you do?

That was just the way people loved John Lewis.

There is not a person walking in this country today who didn't benefit from John Lewis and what he did for mankind, and I would venture to say that the majority of the people in the world benefited from his love and what he did.

I thought about a few passages. We have talked about him preaching to the chickens, and maybe we are the chickens he was preaching to his whole life.

I remembered the Beatitudes:

Blessed are the peacemakers, for they should be called the children of God.

If there was ever a peacemaker that I met, it was John Lewis.

Following from there:

Blessed are they which are persecuted for righteousness' sake, for theirs is the kingdom of Heaven.

A little further into the book of Matthew:

Let your light shine before men that they may see your good works and glorify your Father, which is in Heaven.

There is no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that John Lewis was a special man. He was a special man of God. And while his bones may rest, his legacy will live on forever in this body.

I, for one, look very forward to the day that a statue of John Lewis rests in the Halls of this Congress representing not only the great State of Georgia and the people of the State of Georgia, but all of the men and women of the United States.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative SCOTT for his comments tonight.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS).

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, with John Robert Lewis' passing, we lose and deeply mourn a great friend and mentor, and the world loses the most respected "good trouble" maker of our time.

John's standing will only grow as his legacy endures.

Mr. Speaker, every year since I have been in Congress, I asked John to speak to entering high school seniors from San Diego who visited our Capitol as part of an in-depth civics and leadership program; and for 20 years, with each new group of 45 very diverse students, he gave his time, his energy, and his wisdom, graciously answering their many spirited questions. They, too, will never forget him and how he changed them. Here is just a brief example:

Alejandra Cordova, from 2001, said Mr. Lewis taught her "not to be afraid to rock the boat every once in a while."

David Hickman, from 2015, said he "truly showed us what it meant to be a change-maker, to live through our actions and speak up against injustice."

He taught our children well.

John, you taught and changed me and everyone you touched. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Michael Collins and all of John's staff, who had the hardest task of all to say to visitors captured by John's words: "I am sorry, but the Congressman must depart now."

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. HICE), a fellow pastor.

Mr. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WALKER), my good friend, for yielding to me.

There is no question that all of us who have served with John Lewis mourn the passing of this towering figure who devoted his life to fighting for freedom and equality.

□ 1945

An interesting perspective of his life, as a son of Alabama sharecroppers, John Lewis demonstrated that, in America, a single individual, even one

coming from the most humble of backgrounds, can have an enormous impact in this country.

We all know that he rose to be a powerful leader in the civil rights movement; worked very closely with Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., and so many other great heroes who sacrificed their lives to ensure that Americans of all races live in liberty in this country. But he did so peacefully.

He once wrote this, and this has a great, powerful meaning. He said: "Release the need to hate, to harbor division, and the enticement of revenge. Release all bitterness. Hold only love, only peace in your heart, knowing that the battle of good to overcome evil is already won."

John Lewis knew that it was necessary to fight the sins of this country; but he understood also to fight those in a nonviolent way.

I just have the deepest respect for John Lewis, and I am honored to have considered him a dear friend.

I just want to thank all my colleagues this evening for joining in this time to honor such a great man and an icon, obviously, particularly in the civil rights movement.

My wife, Dee Dee, and I continue to pray for the Lewis family. Again, I thank all my colleagues for joining tonight.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE).

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from North Carolina for allowing me several minutes to pay my respects to a great man.

And it is not remiss that I see the Speaker pro tempore; it is very appropriate that you are in the seat tonight, sir.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor John Lewis. He was an American icon, civil rights legend, and dear friend and an inspiration to millions. Yet, these words truly fail to describe the difference he made in our country.

He always spoke of "getting into good trouble," and I know that has been echoed here on numerous occasions, but it sums up what Mr. Lewis was all about.

His efforts led to the Civil Rights Act. His efforts led to the Voting Rights Act. And his efforts led to the Congressional Black Caucus, and even the election of President Barack Obama.

But his loss is more than his legacy. For me, once again, I have lost one of my fathers on the floor of Congress. He was a role model for what makes a great Congressman, and I constantly watched as he moved about his business: Like the way he always fought for the right thing; the way he could convey such power and strength through such a gentle demeanor.

But when he had passion, and was committed, there is no one else on this floor you would rather have with you going into that fight.

And the way he stood up to abuse to make this country a better place. One of my greatest honors was to be a part of the sit-in he led on the House floor to fight for gun control legislation after the terrible, dreadful Florida issue. We got into some good trouble that day.

He inspired us then, and his words and deeds will inspire new generations; whether they are civil rights pioneers, elected officials, or any American with a dream or cause.

God bless you, Mr. Lewis. Your life made our country and our world a better place.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, may I get a time remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 32 minutes remaining.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN).

MR. ALLEN. I thank the gentleman from North Carolina for this privilege.

Mr. Speaker, many Americans learned about the civil rights movement in the news or read about it in history books. John Lewis lived it.

One of my greatest memories here was to have dinner with Congressman LEWIS at his home, where he shared with the entire Georgia delegation his experience in leading the civil rights movement.

He shared with me that Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. prayed with them on those buses before the demonstrations and urged everyone to remain at peace to ensure lasting change.

I know we can all learn from the example Congressman Lewis set as a civil rights icon. We must meet injustice with humility and perseverance to do what is right.

Pride and fear are the opposite of humility. John Lewis and all those in this movement demonstrated perfect love while being persecuted. Perfect love casts out all fear and only comes from God and obedience to His word and was perfectly demonstrated at the cross of Jesus Christ.

My wife, Robin, and I pray that his family finds peace during this difficult time. And this is a lesson for this body as we honor those like John Lewis, who have come before us and fought for an America that is stronger and is unified, by putting aside our differences to serve the American people in perfect love.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN), with his own amazing civil rights history.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the time.

I say to the gentleman from North Carolina that I remember that the last time I saw John Lewis was March 5, his birthday; and the gentleman offered the prayer. That meant a lot to me, and it showed me the respect that you had for him and that he had for you. It was a beautiful moment.

There was not a more perfect person that has probably served in the Con-

gress and, certainly that I have known in my life, than John R. Lewis. He had every quality that you would desire in a human being and couldn't even imagine a person to have them altogether.

He was a hero of the civil rights movement and cared greatly about the injustices that he had seen as an African American, and that is what launched him on his civil rights struggles. But once he got moving, it was people of different issues of discrimination that he championed; whether it was gay and lesbian; whether it was Native Americans; whether it was women, or just simple people being victims of gun violence, John Lewis took up the cause and he stood up for everybody.

He did not know color. He did not know gender. He did not know any differences in people. He loved all people.

It was such an honor to serve with him.

Early in my career, the American Bar Association presented the Day Award to John Lewis, Richard Lugar and myself. The award was nothing compared to the fact that I was with John Lewis that day. It made me feel much greater than I ever could become.

I had the great honor to travel with him to South Africa for the 50th anniversary of Robert F. Kennedy's Ripple of Hope speech in Cape Town. I saw and I sat across from he and Bishop Desmond Tutu, and I knew I was seeing two angels together, two special souls united.

Mr. Lewis loved two people in life that were his heroes; one was Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., and the other was Robert Kennedy. The purpose of that speech on that trip was to honor Robert Kennedy and the 50th anniversary of that speech.

In that speech, Robert Kennedy said: "It is from numberless diverse acts of courage and belief that human history is shaped. Each time a man stands up for an ideal, or acts to improve the lot of others, or strikes out against injustice, he sends forth a tiny ripple of hope, and crossing each other from a million different centers of energy and daring those ripples build a current which can sweep down the mightiest walls of oppression and resistance."

Robert Kennedy might as well have been speaking about John Lewis that day in 1964, because that is what John Lewis did; and he was more than a ripple of hope, he was a tsunami of hope. He was in every good cause there was, and he sacrificed himself physically in South Carolina, in Alabama, in Mississippi, for civil rights. And he sacrificed himself even when he was a Member of Congress for different causes, getting arrested.

And when he was on death's doorstep, he got himself to Washington, D.C., to appear at Black Lives Matter Plaza and give hope and encouragement and support to the young people that were striving for the causes that he had strived for his whole life.

I value every single moment I spent with Congressman Lewis. It was an honor to know him. I miss him.

And just the other day, I looked up at the scoreboard, and when I didn't know quite how to vote on some issues, I would look to John Lewis and see how he voted. And he wasn't there.

He was my hero.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER), another one of Mr. Lewis' colleagues.

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, in our lives there are people and places we remember. I will always remember John Lewis.

There are some people that you feel especially honored to have met. You feel like you are one of the lucky ones who had the opportunity to hear their stories, to learn their convictions, and to feel their triumphs. I believe just about anyone who had the opportunity to meet John Lewis would agree that he is one of those people.

He was born the son of sharecroppers. He grew up on his family farm, and he attended segregated public schools in Alabama. He told the story often, and I remember him telling us this story, about how he used to preach to the chickens.

He went on from that humble beginning to be called one of the most courageous persons the civil rights movement ever produced, a title he rightfully deserved.

John Lewis dedicated his entire life to securing equality and justice for all people, while remaining a devoted advocate for nonviolence. It must have been an incredible blessing for him to see how his fight changed our Nation and the entire world with his own eyes.

For me, it was a blessing to know him. His office was over in the Cannon Building for many years, and my office was in the Cannon Building. And oftentimes, as we were walking over here, I would get to walk with him. I hung on every moment, on every word, just to have the opportunity to spend time with someone like John Lewis. I will always be grateful for those walks.

Many of my colleagues in the Georgia Delegation have mentioned the time that he invited us to dinner at his home here in Washington. What great stories he told that night; truly, one of the greatest experiences I have had while I have been up here in Washington, D.C.

John Lewis was a giant among men. He will be deeply missed, but his legacy will live on forever.

□ 2000

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN).

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, sharing a jail cell with John Lewis was one of the greatest privileges of my life.

When we were arrested for protesting the genocide in Darfur a few years back, we were put into a police van,

booked, and fingerprinted. John had been arrested over 40 times for peaceful protests by that point, so let's just say he had some advice.

John made trouble like this because he knew that words aren't enough and that real change requires action. He called it the struggle of a lifetime, but it was never his struggle alone. He challenged all of us to fight injustice and oppression and to stand up for civil rights and for human rights.

Mr. Speaker, John was a great man. He was an American hero who called our country to a higher standard. But perhaps more importantly, he was a very good man. He treated every single person he met, no matter who they were, with dignity and respect. When he saw wrong in this world, he did his best to make it right.

Lisa, Patrick, Molly, and I miss you already, John. We love you, and we will never stop making good trouble in your name.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TURNER).

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, John Lewis has a true legacy of leadership in this House, and he changed the world that we live in.

When Congressman Lewis would take the podium, everyone in this House would fall silent and listen to him. I doubt in his long career in this House that the Speaker ever had to hammer the House into order to listen to John Lewis speak.

A man who fought for the Voting Rights Act, John Lewis' legacy demands that Congress act. I call on Congress to pass and send to the President's desk for signature the bipartisan H.R. 1799 renewing the Voting Rights Act.

Congressman Lewis was a giant in history, but he was a humble man in this House. He treated every Member the same and with dignity. He will be missed.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. CÁRDENAS).

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this hour to honor one of the most beautiful human beings that ever walked this Earth. Many of us believe in God, and many of us try to be the best that we can be, but few of us are capable and able to live a life of true love and of tremendous dignity and respect for every single person who comes our way.

I wish I could learn how to turn my cheek the way John Lewis proved he could and did.

I mourn his passing, but I celebrate the honor of knowing that he lived and also knowing that I could go to him on the floor of this House or in the hallways of Congress and speak with him, learn from him, and then say "I love you, brother," and then to have him tell me—and I selfishly relished the opportunity to hear him say it—"I love you too, brother," as I gave him a hug and he hugged me back.

I am unfortunate that I grew up in a very strict household where my mother

and father only said "I love you" to the big boys and girls and adults very few times. Once we got off their knee, it just didn't happen very often. But John Lewis reminded me how much I missed that, and in a selfish way, that is one of the reasons why I always rushed to him and asked him, by saying "I love you," to know that he would say "I love you" and with all his heart mean it.

I am going to miss him. Some of my family members were fortunate to meet him and to know him, and I feel blessed to know that he was my friend as well.

May he rest in peace.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind if we can keep the remarks about 1 minute, we will get as many as we can in tonight.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mrs. BROOKS).

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor and remember my friend, the civil rights pioneer, Congressman John Lewis, a true gentle giant among us.

He walked the talk, and we watched him walk the talk in these Halls of Congress for many years, from his years as a student at Fisk University to his last days as one of the most influential Members of Congress.

He didn't let bad actors and people who were trying to do him harm or even cancer slow him down from his fight for equality until the very end.

He led many Members of Congress on that march in Selma, a civil rights pilgrimage that my husband and I were honored to join him on a couple of years ago when we went to Memphis, Montgomery, Birmingham, and Selma. He walked the talk and walked with us and shared with us the memories of that painful journey for him and all of those students and all the people that he led across that bridge. He took our hands, and we all walked together.

He then later that year came to Indianapolis, where he was the keynote speaker because our community celebrated the Kennedy King Memorial Initiative becoming a national historic site. Indianapolis was the site where Senator Robert Kennedy informed our city that Dr. Martin Luther King had been killed on that night 50 years ago.

It was in Indianapolis, in 1968, that John Lewis learned from Robert Kennedy about Dr. King's death. Dr. King was his friend, his mentor, and his hero. He had not been to this park in Indianapolis for 50 years, yet he came there as the keynote speaker. He brought together our community—Democrats, Republicans, Hispanics, African Americans, and White. Everyone stood together to hear his words, to honor him, and to pay tribute to his legacy, to the legacy of Dr. King, and to the legacy of Senator Robert Kennedy.

John was our friend. He walked the talk. He is walking in Heaven now. He is showing us all how to walk the talk, and now it is up to us to not let him down.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. STEVENS).

Ms. STEVENS. Madam Speaker, Congressman John Lewis was the embodiment of human prosperity as measured by love. Not only was he the richest man I have ever known, but he was absolutely the most generous. John Lewis gave out love and, boy, did love come back. He was always showering people in love.

When I saw him in Kentucky long before I knew I would ever join this Chamber at the encouragement of a friend from Georgia, he was talking about Comic-Con and that his new book with pictures, "March," had just come out.

We have so much work to do. John Lewis, we will heed your words. We will not despair. We will look up. We will keep moving and marching forward. We will pass that Voting Rights Act. And we will remain dedicated to your pursuits.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. CRAIG).

Ms. CRAIG. Mr. Speaker, last week, our country lost a fearless fighter and hero for civil rights, and we in this Chamber lost a colleague and a friend.

Representative John R. Lewis' sense of fairness and of right and wrong was always ahead of his time. That sense of fairness extended to all civil rights issues.

His willingness to support opening up the 1964 Civil Rights Act to add protections for the LGBTQ community was critical and personally incredibly meaningful to me. My colleague and I, over my term in Congress, found that we had something very important in common. We both were adoptive parents.

His bill, the Every Child Deserves a Family Act, is another example of his commitment to fairness, eliminating discrimination against the LGBTQ community in foster care and adoption.

He took time to listen to my story of my fight to keep my son, Josh, in a years-long court battle. He understood that all that should matter is that children have safe, loving homes. He understood that right is always right.

My heart tonight is with his family, and my commitment is to continue his work to restore and protect the Voting Rights Act, to address systemic racism, and to do what is kind, good, and just.

Rest in power, Mr. Lewis. We promise to work today, next week, next month, and next year, just as you did for our lifetimes.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to introduce the majority leader. As he is coming, I want to express to him my thanks for allowing me to have the honor to pray for Representative John Lewis at his birthday party this past March. It is a privilege and a memory that I will cherish.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

Some in my generation remember the song "Abraham, Martin and John." Then, of course, there was Bobby. All four were taken from us far too early in their lives.

God blessed each of us, this institution, and this country by giving to John Lewis health for eight decades. He used that health and strength, mind and body, to serve his God, his faith, his country, and his people.

I can say that John Lewis was my friend, but then again, we could all say that John Lewis was our friend and be right in that claim because John Lewis was a person who loved his fellow human beings.

So many of you have heard me refer to John Lewis as the most Christlike person I have ever met. He was human, and he represented the best of humanity and all the positive attributes that humanity can summon. That is why you hear from both sides of the aisle, from all ideologies, from people of different colors, different races, different genders, different nationalities, and perhaps even different languages—certainly, different languages—for he was not just an American—though proud he was of that appellation—he was a citizen of humanity.

JIM CLYBURN said a little earlier today that we hear about Gandhi, and we talk about Christian values, but no one we know has lived and breathed who was those attributes, not that he believed in them or talked about them, but he embodied the best attributes that are in us all.

We have a short time because time is limited, and so many want to speak because they were touched by John Lewis, because they were inspired by John Lewis, and because they were motivated and uplifted by John Lewis.

Mr. Speaker, how lucky we are to be able to say that John Lewis was our friend. I knew John Lewis. John Lewis made a personal difference in my life and the lives of millions of other people who may not even know the name of John Lewis.

□ 2015

Mr. Speaker, if I had another hour or another day or another week, I would not run out of good things to say about John Lewis. But his life and his contributions need no elevation from me or any others, for his life is a book of goodness, of courage, of commitment, of vision, and of great accomplishment.

We sing the song "God Bless America," and God blessed America and the world with John Robert Lewis.

Thank you, Lord.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, may we make a commitment to make sure this next generation does know the name "John Lewis."

Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from North Carolina has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CASTEN).

Mr. CASTEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, John Lewis was a legend. He was also just a man. I knew the legend, but I was only just getting to know the man. And I guess I just hope we remember both, because somehow the legend feels unattainable.

On our best days, none of us are half the man that John Lewis was every day. And the real inspiration, I think, is the man, because it was that proof of his life that showed us our potential: if only we can summon his decency and his courage and his conviction.

The legend was the guy whom I could never muster the courage to call anything but Mr. Lewis. And the man was the guy who always said, "Just call me John."

The legend was the orator at this podium, or that one, or the one down there. And the man was the guy who would sit there and pull me aside and say, "How are you doing?"

But somehow, the legend and the man are one in the same, because it was a man who stood on that bridge, and it was a man who made all that "good trouble," and it was a man who showed us that the amount of love we can spread into this world isn't constrained by our mortality, but by our ambition.

Thank you, Mr. Lewis. And while I never quite mustered up the courage to say this while you were alive, thank you, John.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas (Mrs. FLETCHER).

Mrs. FLETCHER. Mr. Speaker, John Robert Lewis was one of the most courageous and committed citizens that our country has ever known. With unparalleled courage, with deep faith, and with profound hope, he personified a belief in this country and a belief in his fellow citizens all the days of his life.

Through his life, he gave all of us a gift: a chance to see the world as it should be and a way to make it so.

At this pivotal time in our country's history, his faith in America and in Americans must guide us now. We have the opportunity and the responsibility as Members of Congress and as citizens to honor him by believing, as he did, in an America as good as its promise and by working to make it so.

We have many miles to go to build the beloved community, but he showed us the way. How lucky we are, and how we miss him so.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, as we conclude this Special Order, I am most reminded by my colleagues this evening of the immense impact of a life that was John Lewis.

In our current House, who can we think of that has more of an impact in the civil rights movement than John Lewis?

His legacy is not simply of humility and kindness in the pursuit of equality, but one in which we should all aspire

to replicate. We have talked many times tonight of his nonviolent approach, but do not hesitate for one second to think that John Lewis was not a strong man, a strong man with a lion's heart.

America is the greatest country in the world, but let's be transparent. It took us a few years to really act out that all men were created equal. John Lewis dedicated his life to making sure this country lived up to the ideals of our Founding Fathers in making this Nation a better place for everyone.

John was a man of faith. He grew up as a young preacher and later became an ordained Baptist minister, and I can relate to that. It was under this background that he began this fight for equality. Had the church joined him, I am convinced there would be less division today.

As a member of the Freedom Riders, John and his fellow Riders were subjected to mob beatings and arrested for his efforts. Despite this opposition, he remained steadfast in his conviction and continued onward with his courageous message as he pressured our Federal Government to do the right thing.

Mr. Speaker, 25 years ago, John Lewis ascended to a seat in the U.S. Congress and continued to make "good trouble," as he would deem it. During this distinguished time as a Member of the United States House of Representatives, John left no stone unturned in his fight for the American people.

As you can see this evening, Congress has felt this impact resoundingly. It has been made clear: John Lewis' kindness and humility in the many faces of oppression and adversity have lifted up Congress and America for decades. To say he will be sorely missed is a vast understatement.

Let us continue to tell the story of John Lewis for generations to come. Remember his guidance, and let his presence live on in our hearts. In other words, let's keep on a walkin' and keep on a talkin'.

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

HONORING CONGRESSMAN JOHN LEWIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES) for 30 minutes.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the topic of tonight's Special Order hour.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as we honor the life and legacy of the Honorable John Robert Lewis. I am thankful for my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, Republican Con-

ference Chair LIZ CHENEY and Republican Conference Vice Chair MARK WALKER, for their dual participation here on the House floor today, which is a recognition that, yes, John Lewis was a Democratic hero; he was a progressive hero; he was a civil rights hero; but above all else, John Robert Lewis was an American hero.

So we are here today on the House floor, not as Democrats or Republicans, not as progressives or conservatives, not as the left or the right, but as Americans because of what John Lewis meant to all of us: to our communities, to the country, to the Constitution, to the principle of liberty and justice for all, equal protection under the law, to the principle of the righteous cause of nonviolence as a pathway to the beloved community, as he would share with all of us.

John Robert Lewis was the connective tissue between the civil rights movement and the Black Lives Matter movement.

John Robert Lewis was the connective tissue between the dream of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., and the Presidency of Barack Obama.

And John Robert Lewis was the connective tissue between the tragedy on the Edmund Pettus Bridge and the tragedy that occurred in Minneapolis, Minnesota.

John Robert Lewis' life journey is the American journey, and he has guided the way as we have traveled and marched toward a more perfect Union; and through the sheer will of his morality, he has helped to bend the arc toward justice.

And so we are all thankful for his life and his legacy, honored by the privilege to have been able to call him "colleague."

We learned from John Lewis how to be a good American, a good patriot, a good neighbor, a good leader, a good human, a good activist, and how to get into "good trouble." And so we are thankful for this opportunity just to humbly communicate what John Lewis meant to all of us.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from the great State of Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ).

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, few of us will ever leave the mark on history and every human we encounter the way our dear friend Congressman John Lewis did. His profound generosity and goodness was so beautifully balanced by his courageous, unyielding demands for justice.

I saw it as we sat-in on this House floor demanding gun safety reforms after the Pulse nightclub shooting.

I saw it as young and old met him, sensed his moral bearing, and he patiently made each one the world's most important person in that moment.

We saw it plain as day as he bravely crossed the Edmund Pettus Bridge to confront America's racist sins, know-

ing that batons and beatings blocked the pathway to justice.

I saw it when he traveled to my district, and the outpouring of joy and reverence overflowed for this truly good man.

And I saw it when he took the time, 5 seconds of his time, in that room off the House floor, when he recorded a campaign video to help my then high school-age daughter win her student government campaign, which she did. That is a memory that she will treasure—and does treasure—throughout her life.

His lifetime of "good trouble" is a model for us all, especially now as we must carry on his work of racial justice. The more perfect Union John Lewis lived in and risked his life for is what our Founders expressed but did not necessarily exemplify and one that future leaders must aspire to. His courage and generosity are strengths we must all draw upon now.

Rest in power, my friend.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO), the distinguished chair of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise today with a heavy heart to honor the passion of a dear friend, a colleague, a personal hero of mine, Congressman John Lewis.

Mr. Lewis often spoke of building a beloved community, one that required us to get into "good trouble" to achieve. His vision for America and her world was one of justice, equality, and compassion for one another.

During dark times, his strength and his optimism lit the way to a path forward that brought us closer to justice.

During doubtful times, his words and his wisdom inspired confidence that progress was still in reach.

And during this difficult time for our country, as we mourn his death, may the life and the legacy he left behind inspire us to keep building that beloved community.

John Lewis, you taught me that optimism is a moral duty, and now that you are gone, sir, I will no longer have you around to remind me to keep the faith. I will have to do that all by myself.

□ 2030

Mr. JEFFRIES. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BUSTOS).

Mrs. BUSTOS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to mourn and also to celebrate a historic life, a man I was honored to know, privileged to serve with, and to call my friend.

Congressman John Lewis has been called home to God. I met Mr. Lewis right after I was elected to Congress, but over the years, I had the pleasure of getting to know him, a civil rights icon, a true American hero.

Too rarely are the most powerful also the most humble, the most caring, and the most kind. But Mr. Lewis had that

rare combination and more. He was the best among us.

In one moment, he would fearlessly stand in harm's way to stand up for what is right, and in the next, he wouldn't hesitate to take a minute to share his insights, his lessons, his personal stories with those lucky enough to cross his path or to walk into his office.

In 2015, so many of our colleagues and I joined him for the 50th anniversary walk across the Edmond Pettus Bridge in Selma, Alabama, to honor the moment that young John Lewis forever changed our Nation.

As we all gathered to follow in his historic footsteps, the magic and the power of John Lewis' action on that fateful day in 1965 could be felt by all of us. Our country is better, our Congress is better, and I am better for having known him.

I will miss you, Mr. Lewis, but I will forever celebrate and honor the impact you made on our Nation and on me.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. REED).

Mr. REED. Madam Speaker, I rise today to join with my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to express my condolences and express the spirit that John Lewis represented to all of us.

John Lewis was a humble man. I knew John serving on the Ways and Means Committee with him.

I traveled with my colleague, Mrs. BUSTOS, from Illinois down to Selma, Alabama, on that 50th anniversary day. And I will tell you, one of the moments that inspired me the most in my tenure here in Congress was not just that day, when we walked across the Edmond Pettus Bridge arm in arm in celebration of his victory over hatred, but it was the following day, when we sat at the doors of the Montgomery, Alabama, State Capitol, and I saw the daughter of Governor Wallace express to John an apology for the sins of yesterday. And John, in typical John Lewis fashion, stood up and embraced her when she said: "I'm sorry."

John Lewis epitomizes the best of the human race. John Lewis was an inspiration to all of us.

My predecessor, my mentor, Amo Houghton, who served in my seat for 18 years, expressed to me early on in my tenure: "Get to know John Lewis. Get to know and listen to his story." And I will tell you, that is some of the best advice I received from his friend, Amo Houghton.

And so I come here tonight to express my grief, but most importantly, my hope that the spirit of John Lewis does not die with us tonight. The spirit of John Lewis, who is now resting with the glory of God, will shine down upon us and improve this institution, improve each of our souls, and inspire us, the way that he did, as that proud, quiet, humble giant of a human being that inspired me and will continue to inspire me to search for our better angels each and every day.

So to my colleagues on the other side, I join you in your grief, but we are united in our love for the great John Lewis.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RUPPERSBERGER).

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Madam Speaker, I rise to recognize the life and legacy of Congressman John Lewis.

I first met John at a church event in Maryland 20 years ago in Anne Arundel County when I was a candidate running for Congress. And John was there to support me but also there to speak to a junior day event.

At that time, I first saw John speak and talk about his relationship with Dr. Martin Luther King. He recounted many brutal beatings and arrests that he endured during the height of the civil rights movement. From that point on, I considered John a mentor.

I am fortunate to have served with many inspiring people, but John stands out as one of the finest leaders I have ever known.

John encouraged us to get into good trouble, to make a difference. Though not typically my style, I was proud to participate in a sit-in on the House floor, led by John, to protest gun violence in 2016. He told me that by sitting down, we were standing up for thousands of Americans who have lost their lives in mass shootings after mass shootings. And so I sat.

The best way to honor John's life and legacy is by continuing the fight against gun violence, against police brutality, against veteran disenfranchisement, against systemic racism.

We will carry the torch for you, John.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. WILD).

Ms. WILD. Madam Speaker, shortly after I came to Congress, I learned through the grapevine that a couple of my staff members wanted nothing more than to meet the great John Lewis in person.

So with some trepidation, and very cognizant of the demands on his time, I approached him as a freshman Member on the House floor to inquire whether I could make an appointment with his staff. And in his usual warm and gregarious manner, Mr. Lewis said: "Of course. Of course."

A few weeks later, I took these staffers on a mystery field trip to the Cannon House Office Building. And the look on their faces when they realized we were about to enter John Lewis' office was priceless.

I figured it would be a quick handshake and a photo op, and then we would be on our way back to our office. But no. Mr. Lewis greeted my 6-foot-4-inch legislative counsel Zach and my speechwriter Yann with: "Hello, young brothers" and took them into his office where he proceeded to give them a narrated history of the civil rights movement with the aid of large photographs that were stacked all over his office.

Zach and Yann and Sara, another member of my team, asked many questions, and he answered them all. We took the obligatory photos for which I am thankful, because now they have the treasure of those memories forever.

A full hour-and-a-half elapsed, and our meeting with him ended only because my team needed to get back to work, so we had to break away. I am convinced he would have gladly spent the rest of the afternoon speaking with them. That is just one example of the generosity of spirit of the great John Lewis.

Rest in peace, Mr. Lewis. I hope you are starting a whole lot of good trouble wherever you are. It is the greatest honor of my life to have served with you.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Madam Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. AXNE). The gentleman from New York has 14 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Madam Speaker, John Robert Lewis, an American hero, a civil rights icon, a movement leader, a peacemaker, a teacher, a drum major for justice, a mentor, a colleague, and a friend.

I want to begin by thanking John's family for sharing him with us and with our country.

As I listened to my colleagues tonight speak about John, I realize that he made each one of us feel like a very special person to him. I also realize that words can't really capture John Lewis and what he meant to us, to our country, and to the world.

I had the privilege, like so many of my colleagues, of walking across the Edmond Pettus Bridge with John and listening to him speak about his work in the civil rights movement; to be part of an effort to organize a sit-in here on the House floor to demand action on gun violence; to work with John when we played a really critical role in our right for passage of the Equality Act and made the case that LGBTQ Americans were entitled to full equality in this country; on his visit to Newport News, Rhode Island; or traveling to South Africa to celebrate Robert Kennedy's "Ripple of Hope" speech.

John Lewis made America more just, he made us all more human, because he deeply believed in justice and equality. They weren't just things that he believed in; it is who he was.

And most importantly, he reminded us always to be optimistic, because he believed in the fundamental decency of every human being. And even in the darkest moments, he would encourage us: "Keep the faith, brother. Keep fighting."

And it is that belief in the fundamental goodness of everyone, that optimism, that John left with us.

And so, John, knowing you, serving with you, has been the greatest honor

of my life. I thank you for all that you have done for me and for our country, and we promise you that we will keep the faith and keep up the fight.

Rest in peace, my friend.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT).

Mr. CHABOT. Madam Speaker, the word "hero" is used a little too often these days. But make no mistake, John Lewis personified the word. He was, without question, a true American hero.

The fearlessness he demonstrated throughout the civil rights movement, but especially on the Edmund Pettus Bridge in Selma on March 7, 1965, demonstrated to people across the globe how to stand up for equality, justice, and basic civil and human rights in the face of overwhelming odds. Quite simply, his heroic actions transformed our Nation and our world.

Early on in my time in Congress, I had the pleasure of meeting Congressman Lewis for the first time. When he found out I was from Cincinnati, he immediately asked me a question that I would hear from him many times in the coming years, how was his friend and fellow civil rights leader, Reverend Fred Shuttlesworth, doing.

The two men had worked together throughout the 1960s, along with Dr. Martin Luther King, organizing marches, sit-ins, and freedom rides. Like John Lewis, Reverend Shuttlesworth remained committed to civil rights throughout his life and worked diligently to improve conditions in Cincinnati.

Not surprisingly, when I would see Reverend Shuttlesworth back home, he would ask how John Lewis was doing up here. As a result, I was kind of a messenger between these two-larger-than-life civil rights icons, and they will always be inextricably linked in my memory.

Madam Speaker, the world needs more heroes like John Lewis and the Reverend Fred Shuttlesworth. Now, more than ever, their dedication to overcoming inequality and changing hearts and minds through nonviolent protests points the way forward as we continue to strive to come together and achieve a more perfect Union.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Virginia (Ms. SPANBERGER).

Ms. SPANBERGER. Madam Speaker, I rise tonight to remember Congressman John Lewis.

And for me, the best way to honor the memory of this beautiful man, this kind soul, our colleague, our friend, and for so many of us, our teacher, is to share his best lessons.

And in his 2017 book, Congressman John Robert Lewis said the following: "Freedom is not a state; it is an act.

"It is not some enchanted garden perched high on a distant plateau where we can finally sit down and rest.

"Freedom is a continuous action we must all take, and each generation

must do its part to create an even more fair, more just society."

These are words to drive our work and our lives. And he spoke them to the world.

But to us, on June 4, on a call with so many of our colleagues, he told us: "Be brave. Don't get weary. Let's continue to work."

And I wrote those words down, because like everything John Lewis said, they struck me as powerful and important and worth remembering. And in his memory and in his honor, we should all do just that, continue to work.

□ 2045

Mr. JEFFRIES. Madam Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL).

Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL. Madam Speaker, it is difficult to express the immense loss and pain that not just myself but that this body feels at the passing of our good friend, John Lewis.

It has been one of my greatest honors and privileges to be able to serve alongside him in my short time here in this body and to get to know him. He brought to us courage. He inspired love and gave us optimism in some of the most difficult times.

He worked with joy in his heart, with courage and faith, and without fear. He was a fighter against injustice to anyone. I remember him saying that he was inspired to see the young men and women of all backgrounds, creeds, and religious backgrounds rise up in non-violent protest, demanding justice. I wonder if he knows that he started that back in 1965 in Selma, Alabama.

My kids, Jude and Siena, every time they came to Washington, they always sought out John Lewis because they looked up to him, just like all of us did.

It is silly that I am crying, Madam Speaker. I just met him a year ago. I think it is because, during some of the most difficult moments in our country, we can't afford to lose someone like him.

But I am so inspired today to hear my colleagues stand together in unity, and I know, and I am filled with optimism, that we will be able to exemplify his work, continue his work, and carry his dream of a better America forward.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. KILMER).

Mr. KILMER. Madam Speaker, when you meet your hero and they turn out even more amazing than you expected, it is really cool. That was my experience getting to work with John Lewis. In fact, sometimes when he spoke in Caucus, I would find myself texting a colleague, saying: You work with John Lewis.

The last time many of us heard his voice was early this summer on a Caucus conference call. He spoke up and said that he was sad because he was reminded that we weren't as far on the path to justice as any of us want our country to be. But then he said he was

hopeful because people, and particularly young people, were speaking up, standing up, and working for change.

In 2019, I brought one young person, my daughter, Sophie, to Selma, Alabama. We crossed Edmund Pettus Bridge with him. We listened to his stories. He was so kind to her and so patient with her questions. At the end of the trip, Sophie approached him at the airport, and she thanked him.

She said: I have one more question.

He said: Go ahead.

And she said: Were you ever scared?

And he said to her: You know, I was scared. But I knew I was doing the right thing, and I knew there were others who were depending on me standing up for them, too.

He stood up for so many for so long. One of the honors of my life was to get to serve with this extraordinary man, even watching him preside over the House as we passed a new Voting Rights Act.

His legacy of peace and love, of fighting for justice, fighting for voting rights, and of causing good trouble will live on.

Rest in peace and rest in power, Mr. Lewis.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN).

Mr. LANGEVIN. Madam Speaker, from the moment I arrived in Congress, the aura of John Lewis loomed large. He will rightfully be remembered as a giant of the civil rights movement and the conscience of the Congress.

To me, though, he will always be remembered as a man who I felt privileged and honored and humbled to call colleague and friend. He will always be remembered as the kind, humble, approachable gentleman from Georgia, a tireless fighter who rallied our Caucus at pivotal moments to make positive change, to stand for what is right, to give a voice to the powerless, to protect the rights of the disenfranchised. Of course, he was well-known for making noise and getting into good trouble, necessary trouble.

It was one of the great privileges of my life to join John Lewis in making some good and necessary trouble when he organized a peaceful sit-in on the House floor to demand action on gun violence.

John Lewis made a difference in the lives of millions, and his presence was always felt in Congress, but his absence will be felt even more.

Rest in peace, my friend.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Madam Speaker, how much time do we have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Madam Speaker, let me simply close this portion of our special hour in honor of our friend, our colleague, our mentor, our hero, the legendary John Lewis, by simply recounting his words: Never give up. Never give in. Keep the faith. Keep your eyes on the prize. And make some good trouble.

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

PAYING TRIBUTE TO
CONGRESSMAN JOHN LEWIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL) for 30 minutes.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I very much appreciate the time tonight to honor one of Georgia's favorite sons.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, one of the greatest honors of my life has been to serve alongside John Lewis in this House of Representatives. John was my friend, and I know that thousands of people say the same thing, and guess what? They are all right.

John was my leader. I sat down in the well of this House with him in the morning, and we didn't get up again until the next morning because we were fighting, with him in the lead, to end gun violence. I got arrested with John Lewis, he probably for the 60-something time and me for the first, because we were fighting for immigration reform.

My husband and I had the honor of walking behind John to cross the Edmund Pettus Bridge three different times at a place where the State troopers in Alabama nearly took his life.

Over the years in our Democratic Caucus meetings, there was a tone that would get gloomy sometimes, and those were John Lewis moments. John would stand up and, in no uncertain terms, he would remind us of our mission. What people really wanted to hear from us, he told us, was hope, and no one could deliver hope like John Lewis.

I give you his words, words we needed to hear: Do not get lost in despair. Be hopeful. Be optimistic. Our struggle is not a struggle of a day, of a week, of a month, or of a year. It is the struggle of a lifetime.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHNEIDER).

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Madam Speaker, I count among my life's greatest blessings the distinction of being able to call John Lewis my colleague and my friend.

Martin Luther King said the moral arc of the universe bends toward justice. John Robert Lewis spent his entire life working to accelerate and complete that bend fully committed to justice, to nonviolence and, in his own words, to good trouble.

John Lewis' incredible capacity for love, his steadfast belief in nonviolence, and his limitless humility inspired all of us, Democrat and Republican, to be better. His singular character established him as the conscience of the Congress.

I have too many personal stories to share in a short 1-minute speech,

enough stories, in fact, to more than fill the entire hour. I will hold each of these treasured memories in my heart for the rest of my life.

I join with my colleagues to honor his legacy and together hope we will continue his work bending that arc toward justice.

Rest in peace, John, knowing your memory will be a blessing to your Nation and to all whose lives you touched.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY), the former chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, the committee on which John Lewis did so much of his important work for the great State of Georgia.

Mr. BRADY. Madam Speaker, John Lewis was many things. He was a father. He was a Congressman. As you know, he was a civil rights pioneer who marched with Martin Luther King, Jr. He was a husband. He was a son of the South, one who walked in the wind to bring equality to America and is now walking in the heavens with his Creator. He was a colleague.

John was all these extraordinary things, and he was also my friend. We are a better Nation and a better people because of him. This institution, of all of our country, will miss him dearly.

I always struggle to explain back home just what an extraordinary person he was. To know John was a blessing. To get to work with him on so many important issues on the Ways and Means Committee, including the first reform to the IRS in over two decades, making important improvements to Medicare for our seniors and those who need our help the most, that was an honor of a lifetime.

I served with him on the Ways and Means Committee for many years. He was a warm, needed, inspirational presence in that storied committee room. When I look down the dais, I will be sad to miss my friend. But I will always be proud to have had the privilege of working with such a remarkable spirit.

Each day he walked in these halls, we all witnessed firsthand his remarkable integrity, his intelligence toward the complex policy issues we debate, and his willingness to work across the aisle if it means Americans will have greater dignity, opportunity, and equal rights.

God loved this remarkable servant, and I know John is walking hand-in-hand with God and his beloved Lillian today.

I miss you, John. Cathy and I will continue to pray for you and all those who call you family. May you rest in peace and rise in glory. God bless you.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Madam Speaker, I rise today in honor of our friend and colleague, Congressman John Lewis.

With every march, every sit-in, every time we reject unjust rules and institutions designed to oppress any group, we honor the legacy of John Robert Lewis.

A record number of Americans have stood up, spoken up, and laced up their marching shoes in recent weeks. Millions of them are too young to know about the man in whose footsteps they are following as they make what he so rightly called good trouble.

□ 2100

May we all model his grace, courage, kindness, and commitment to nonviolence as a way of life and continue the good trouble he started even when—especially when—it is unpopular.

I feel so much gratitude to have learned from this giant of history, this singular American genius, and to have served, however briefly, alongside him. His loss is devastating. His memory everlasting.

Rest in power, my beloved brother.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, at this time, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COOPER).

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

No one loved Nashville, Tennessee, more than our friend and colleague John Robert Lewis.

As a young man, he arrived in Nashville on a bus with a ticket purchased by the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Dr. King wanted young John to attend American Baptist College.

For anyone wondering how to honor John Lewis and his legacy, think of his alma mater, American Baptist, and remember also the historically Black college and university that he later attended, Fisk University. If you want more John Lewises in the world, think of his beloved training grounds, American Baptist and Fisk.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI).

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise today with a heavy heart to honor the life of Representative John Lewis, whose passing is a tremendous loss for Congress and for the entire country.

I will always remember walking across the Edmund Pettus Bridge with him on the 50th anniversary of Bloody Sunday. I took my son with me on that trip, and when John passed last weekend, my son said this: "He is the most memorable person I have ever met. I will never forget what it feels like to be in the same room as him."

We will never forget what it felt like to serve in the same Chamber as him.

And as the Nation reckons with centuries of systemic racism, we owe a great debt to John Lewis and the "good trouble" he made in the civil rights movement, past and present. If we only had half his courage.

We as a Congress and we as a country would be better if we all exemplify his kindness, his passion, and his stoic ability to remain calm in any kind of storm. I can hear his voice urging us: Never give up, never give in, and always keep the faith.

Rest in peace, rest in power, John Lewis.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BARRAGÁN).

Ms. BARRAGÁN. Madam Speaker, like so many here tonight, I was inspired by John Lewis and his lifelong fight for our country to live up to its ideals to be more tolerant, more just, and more equal.

He was fearless. He sacrificed his body, bloodied by billy clubs and beatings from police, in hopes that future generations of people of color would not have to.

He was my hero. I called him "Mr. Lewis" when I first arrived to Congress, and I will never forget, he would say, "Call me John." He was so humble and supportive.

Hearing John Lewis tell firsthand stories of the fight for civil rights was a privilege. Walking the Edmund Pettus Bridge with him was something I will never forget.

We will honor his life by continuing to, and as he said, cause "good trouble, necessary trouble, and help redeem the soul of America."

As he wrote: "Freedom is the continuous action we all must take, and each generation must do its part to create an even more fair, more just society."

We will try.

Thank you, John.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Washington State (Mr. HECK).

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

Early in my service, I got out of the car in the parking garage to walk into Cannon, and Mr. Lewis walked up behind me. I turned and he said: "Good morning, my brother." I opened the door to try to point for him to enter first, and he said: "You first, my brother."

I often heard him refer to my colleagues as "my brother" or "my sister," and for a while I actually was fooled into thinking that was because he hadn't yet learned our names. But that wasn't it. He knew. It was more a sign of respect and affection and mutuality.

No one has ever walked in this Chamber on this floor, before, now, or in the future, who will ever command the love and reverence of him, because he was a great man.

Godspeed to you in your journey, John Robert Lewis, my brother.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Oklahoma (Ms. KENDRA S. HORN).

Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

It is my honor to rise today to recognize, honor, and celebrate the life, legacy, and impact of Congressman John Lewis.

Of those who have left their mark on history, the unique and indelible imprint of John Lewis stands in a category all its own. His strength, cour-

age, commitment, compassion, kindness, and fierce determination to challenge injustice made the world a better place for all of us and truly bent the arc of history ever closer to justice.

John showed us that being bold and standing up for those whose voices aren't heard are inextricably linked with the need for compassion and hope.

Though I don't think any of us were ready to let him go—I know I certainly wasn't—I simply cannot imagine the world had he not been in it. And it is one of the greatest honors of my life to be able to have served with him and to call him a colleague and to join him on the civil rights pilgrimage last year, as I know many voices have said before.

And it was on this journey that I had the opportunity to share with him a blessing that had been bestowed upon me that I believe embodies the life and the lessons and the legacy of John Lewis that I will share today in his Honor.

"May God bless you with a restless discomfort about easy answers, half-truths, and superficial relationships, so that you may seek truth boldly and love deep within your heart."

"May God bless you with holy anger at injustice, oppression, and exploitation of people so that you may tirelessly work for justice, freedom, and peace among all people."

"May God bless you with a gift of tears to shed with those who suffer from pain, rejection, starvation, or the loss of all that they cherish so that you may reach out your hand to comfort them and transform their pain into joy."

"May God bless you with enough foolishness to believe that you really can make a difference in this world so that you are able, with God's grace, to do what others claim cannot be done."

Thank you, Mr. Lewis, for living those lessons and those words. God-speed.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), a cardinal on the Appropriations Committee.

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

In October 1995, the Black clergy in my community asked if I could get Congressman John Lewis of Georgia to come to New Haven for our local elections. I was honored to welcome John to my hometown. Here is what I said about him that evening.

"John Lewis is a true hero of the cause of progress. It is often said that John Lewis is 'one of the most courageous persons the civil rights movement ever produced.' The most astonishing thing about that sweeping statement is that it probably doesn't go far enough to describe the heroics of the man you see before you. John Lewis has dedicated his life to protecting human rights, securing personal dignity, and building what he likes to call 'The Beloved Community.' His display of ethics and morality has won him rare admiration from both his House

colleagues and from leaders around the world over."

He thanked me for the introduction, and he said to the congregation, "I love my sister ROSA DELAURO."

And I loved that our offices, when I first came to the Congress, were next to each other.

I served with Congressman John Lewis for 30 years, and I consider myself blessed. My grandchildren, Teo, Rigby, Sadi, and Jasper, met John Lewis. He signed for them his book, "March."

John Lewis' "March" tells the story of a poor sharecropper's son who transformed America and so much more. There are few in the world who change it. John Lewis changed it.

The Black clergy in my community, my grandchildren, my family, you can be sure we will carry on your work, John Lewis. Count on it.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOULTON).

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

When I was younger, we seemed to have a lot of American heroes around, from the Greatest Generation that won World War II to the civil rights leaders of the 1950s, to the men who walked on the Moon. To call one of them a colleague was one of the greatest honors of my life, and it hit me every day I saw John Lewis on the House floor.

"Good morning, sir," was may usual greeting. Not because of my Marine background or his age—most people in Congress are older than me—but simply because there is nobody in Congress who had more respect. Nobody.

But he was much more than just a towering figure. He was a loving, caring, indefatigably optimistic friend and mentor, especially to young people like me.

John and I took bets on the 2017 Super Bowl, with the winner committing to visiting the loser's district. After the Patriots had the greatest comeback in Super Bowl history, we started talking dates for his trip to Massachusetts. But with a few conflicts and his getting older, I proposed an alternative: a visit to some of the civil rights sites in his hometown.

Through all the turmoil of the last few years, there are only two times I have cried in Congress: visiting the prison in Hanoi with John McCain and visiting Atlanta with John Lewis.

If you ever doubt what a hero John and his fellow American patriots were, spend some time in Atlanta or Birmingham or Selma, where he came within an inch of his life fighting to uphold a nation's ideals even when the nation said they don't apply to you or your family.

I found myself wondering if I would have had the courage to join in those protests to be a freedom fighter, to change a nation. That is what John Lewis did. He changed America, and in so doing, he changed the world.

And he never lost faith in either as he did it.

During the impeachment trial, I asked him if he had ever seen it this bad. And while he told me never, not even during the civil rights movement, because he said there was more hope, more movement, he nonetheless maintained his characteristic optimism and looked at me confidently like a preacher to his Sunday school student and said: But, don't worry. We will get through it. Keep the faith, brother. Keep the faith.

We miss you, John.

□ 2115

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I would inquire how much time remains.

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

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. DEAN).

Ms. DEAN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, like many others in this Chamber, the last time I heard Mr. Lewis' voice was on a Caucus call recently. Congressman Lewis implored us: Be bold. Be brave. Keep the faith. Keep your eyes on the prize. Keep working. There is much work to be done. Don't get weary. Continue the work.

John Lewis was a hero to all of us for causing "good trouble" and for standing on the right side of history, for standing for our common humanity.

His humility, strength, and belief in the greatness of this country never faltered. What a blessing it has been to me to serve with him.

I had the privilege of being with him on a visit in Florida to the detention camp where immigrant children were kept separated from their parents, and through an interpreter, he spoke to the children.

He had two messages. So whether he was speaking to us in Congress or to a President or to children, his message was the same, and the same was: Believe in the promise of America. Keep the faith. Be bold. Don't be disturbed.

His other message, his second message, was one of welcome, and the beaming children loved that. He said: Welcome to America. We welcome you.

His was a memory of kindness and humility and optimism for a better place, an America that was promised in our founding documents.

On many occasions, we have fallen short, short of the American promise of equality and justice for all. Mr. Lewis' scars revealed that.

His memory will be a beacon for justice and equality and for the unfinished business of the people to be a country of mercy, of decency, and of love.

Thank you, Mr. Lewis. Lucky us to have passed this way with you.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I didn't have the 52-year relationship with Mr. Lewis that SANFORD BISHOP talked about earlier. I wasn't even born when that relationship started. This very powerful and imposing face beside me, I have very little association with.

If Mike Collins goes back and looks in the files, I believe he will find that they turned down a young man named ROB WOODALL for a job back in 1994. It wasn't that I didn't try to get a good mentorship from John Lewis, I just didn't meet the John Lewis bar at that time.

But my experience with him has been Biblically based, as so many have. But mine has been: Let the children come to me. Do not hinder them, for to such belongs the kingdom of God.

If I could arrange it, I would walk down the steps behind John as he was going down the Capitol steps after a vote, because children from all over the country would come running up, "Mr. Lewis, Mr. Lewis," just wanting to say hello.

Whether it was the steps of the Capitol, the busiest airport in the world at Hartsfield International, or anywhere in between, I never once saw John in too much of a hurry with too much on his mind to take the time to make sure the next generation understood what happened in the last generation and the difference they could make for yet another generation.

The story has already been told that staff members would say the only thing they want to do on Capitol Hill is meet Mr. Lewis before they leave.

Time and time again, that is the story of any Georgia Member because, growing up, Mr. Lewis was Mr. Lewis. He always says, "Call me John," but he is always Mr. Lewis and always will be.

So much of the story that we have heard told about John tonight, Madam Speaker, has been about John the fighter. It is so meaningful to me that the other half of the stories we have heard tonight are about John the embracer.

We have plenty of fighters in this institution, and we have our fair share of embracers in this institution. We don't have as many folks who are every bit as good at embracing as they are at fighting.

We will miss John's leadership in that respect in the great State of Georgia, Madam Speaker, and we will miss him here in this institution.

Madam Speaker, I thank my colleagues for coming out tonight, I know, to honor their friend and their colleague, but certainly to honor our great son from Georgia.

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

HONORING CONGRESSMAN JOHN ROBERT LEWIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. JACKSON LEE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. CLARK) for 30 minutes.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and ex-

tend their remarks on the topic of tonight's Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Madam Speaker, what a privilege it has been not only to serve with John Lewis, but to be witness tonight to the remembrances of our icon, the peacemaker, the justice seeker, Congressman John Robert Lewis.

Personally, I never got used to working with John Lewis, and I struggled to call him "John."

I met him right after I got sworn in, in a special election, near the chair in which he often sat. I was completely tongue-tied.

Whether it was a casual hello, a walk back and forth from the Capitol for votes, or planning a sit-in, every single interaction with John was profound.

John knew oppression and he knew racial violence. He had been beaten, clubbed, spat on, and denigrated. John had experienced the worst forms of bigotry. He had seen the worst in people, and yet it steeled his determination and it deepened his faith.

John Lewis is the kindest man I have ever known. Love, compassion, integrity were the hallmarks of everything he did, big or small.

Like so many of you, I was fortunate enough to be able to go to Selma on several occasions with John and walk the Civil Rights Trail.

To hear John Lewis speak on the Edmund Pettus Bridge is transformative. That bridge is an unusual structure. It has a steep rise as it comes up, it flattens in the middle, and then there is a steep descent.

I could imagine John Lewis, as I saw him speak from that bridge, being a young man leading, with Hosea Williams, a column of 600 marchers and getting to the middle of that bridge and for the first time being able to see what awaited them, the sea of State troopers, of angry crowds. I am sure he could feel the violence in the air like electricity.

But John did not turn back. He did not falter in the face of hatred and of violence. He was fortified by the moral clarity of why he was marching: to ensure that every American had the right to vote.

And we know what happened. We know they were beaten, trampled, and gassed. But they reconvened and marched to Montgomery and made the Civil Rights Act the law of the land.

Today we find ourselves again in this country in the middle of the bridge, and we can see the danger ahead. We can see those who seek to divide this country, suppress the vote, and cut off opportunity. While John Lewis cannot physically lead us across that bridge, he has taught us what to do.

Many of us have referenced what would be the last words for us to hear from John Lewis, and he spoke, as always, inspirationally about the true

sorrow he felt for the soul of America, that in the wake of the brutal murder of George Floyd we were not in a better place, and that those poisonous, toxic roots of slavery still entangled our institutions and our Nation.

But he also said to us that he had never been more optimistic, watching the peaceful protesters across this country assemble.

He told us, as he always did, to be bold, to not be weary. He told us that the winds of change are blowing.

So we must honor him by continuing our work, by unfurling those sails to catch that wind, and to live for justice; to see, as he saw, the divinity in not only John Lewis, but in all of us; and to know that, collectively, we can continue the march that he started for us, and we can bring this country to live up to the ideals of justice and equality for all.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. RUIZ), a distinguished Member.

Mr. RUIZ. Madam Speaker, when I stood in John Lewis' presence, I stood in awe, in reverence, and with great respect.

John Lewis was an extraordinary man of faith, perseverance, virtue, and kindness. He endured ridicule and beatings during his nonviolent fight alongside Dr. King.

He spent a lifetime fighting against injustices, poverty, white supremacy, and racism, and for equality and human dignity. He was a social justice and civil rights warrior who inspired me, all of us in this Chamber and this Nation.

He was a man of God on a relentless mission of peace to create the kingdom and bring to Earth life as it is in Heaven.

As great a man as he was, he was always humble and gentle. He was always faithful in his fight for freedom from oppression.

John was also a friend. He always asked how my daughters, Sky and Sage, were doing on the House floor and in the hallways, and even visited them during their birthday parties in my D.C. office.

He will undoubtedly be greeted in Heaven by our creator with the words, "Job well done, my humble servant," an honor well-deserved and greater than life itself.

May John Lewis rest in God's almighty power.

I love you and I miss you, brother.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ESPAILLAT).

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Madam Speaker, I represent the 13th Congressional District in New York. It has many wonderful neighborhoods in it, the iconic neighborhood of Harlem, which has given birth to many luminaries, including the great late Adam Powell and, of course, the Lion of Lenox Avenue, Charles B. Rangel.

But when I came here, Madam Speaker, there sat John Lewis in his dig-

nified serenity. He brought to this Chamber and he bore the wounds and the scars of a struggle over 400 years old, and they could not be ignored.

Even in his dignified serenity, beyond his great words that were conciliatory and peaceful in scope, the scars and the wounds of the struggle that he bore in this august Chamber could not be ignored.

□ 2130

So, Madam Speaker, I say to John Lewis today, that from Harlem, and from all the Harlems in all the States of this great Union, a very important message I bring to this floor.

Rest in peace, great warrior.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Madam Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from the great State of Florida (Mr. SOTO); and I would ask my colleagues to keep their comments to 2 minutes.

Mr. SOTO. Madam Speaker, Mr. John Lewis has often been called the conscience of the Congress.

He also led our Democratic Caucus during some of our toughest moments. In 2017, there was a strong effort to repeal the Affordable Care Act. We were in the minority. We were demoralized. Things seemed hopeless.

It was in this darkest hour that the legendary John Lewis thundered; channeling Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., he said, We may have all come on different ships, but we are all in the same boat now. We have to stick together. We have to stand up. We have to do what is right. Millions of Americans are counting on us.

And as he thundered those words, chills ran down my spine, and a moral righteousness took over me as he brought our entire caucus to our feet. And we fought the good fight, though we lost the vote in the House. But we still inspired the American people.

The effort to repeal ObamaCare ultimately failed in the Senate, and Mr. John Lewis lit the spark with his words, his spirit, and his courage.

Rest in power, Mr. Lewis.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Madam Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO), my good friend.

Mr. TONKO. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

It is with the heaviest of hearts that I stand in tribute to Congressman John Robert Lewis this evening.

Brother John, your imprint on my heart and soul is forever.

The loss of John Lewis has left us with a deep, unanswerable sadness, and a resolve that will echo in this Chamber and within all of our hearts forever.

Time and again, John gave us the gift of his courage and lit our path with a humble but fierce moral light. He risked everything to teach us, to remind us what it really means to fight for liberty and justice for all; and why we must fight on, even after our great champion has fallen.

My thoughts, my prayers, and my heart go out to John's family, to Mi-

chael, and his staff, his community, and all who knew and loved this giant of a man.

May John's light always fill the halls of our Capitol. May his hope guide our hands, and his vision for a more perfect Union continue to inspire us with timeless faith and purpose.

Of late, when I would talk to Brother John, he had a concern that those wheels of progress toward a more perfect Union might roll backward. We cannot tolerate that. Brother John taught us that; that we will only go forward.

So if we truly loved this man, if we truly want to honor his spirit, let us make certain that those wheels of progress toward a more perfect Union, in fact, go forward and upward.

God bless you, my friend. You walked so humbly with your God. Rest in peace. Rest in power, my dear and so noble of a friend.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Madam Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER).

Ms. SPEIER. Madam Speaker, I rise to celebrate the life of a man I loved, our colleague, John Robert Lewis.

To John-Miles, his son, to Michael Collins, his remarkable and devoted chief of staff, to his entire staff, we grieve with you.

When I think about John Lewis, and to describe him:

A commitment to God? Immovable.

A commitment to believe that we are all equal before God? Immutability.

Belief that the law must support the biblical belief in the equality of all mankind? Unyielding.

Because his great-grandfather was the victim of grave injustice, he didn't have to watch a movie to hear the call of a slave master's voice in the wind. He rebelled against that voice to deliver justice during his life.

In the 1960s, he was deemed a radical, a radical with a passionate belief in peaceful civil disobedience, so much so that he was arrested 40 times and beaten multiple times.

John knew that the televised images of police beatings and cracked skulls animated the just souls of 1965 to build a chariot of liberty in the Civil Rights Act of that era.

John wept at the sight of George Floyd being murdered, but also saw that another moment to create a more just and perfect Union was upon us.

In the coming days, when the streets are filled with those who mourn John, we will see people in fine suits and people in rags. We will see laborers and professionals. We will see faces pained by disease or poverty. But all of them will rejoice that John Lewis lived.

There will never be another John Lewis. In fact, I believe no Member of Congress is greater than the John Lewis that has walked across the threshold of this Chamber.

God rest, good man. You changed our country. You were a purveyor of good trouble. You taught us what was non-

negotiable. You changed this country forever more.

I will end with his quote, and he said: "I say to people today, you must be prepared if you believe in something. If you believe in something, you have to go for it. As individuals, we may not live to see the end."

Well, my dear friend, you may not see the end, but before this year is over, the John Lewis Voting Rights Act of 2020 will be delivered; and I hope someday a statue of you will be in Statuary Hall so we can all pass by it and touch your shoes and have your spirit fill our hearts.

God rest your soul. Rest in power.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Madam Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN).

Mr. SHERMAN. Madam Speaker, John R. Lewis honored us with his presence on this floor for over 3 decades. That a man of such courage and such accomplishment would dedicate so much of his life to this House confirmed the decision of all of us to give up our private lives and private measures and to spend our time here in the people's House.

Five years ago, I was honored to go to TERRI SEWELL's hometown of Selma and on the 50th anniversary to walk with John Lewis across the Edmund Pettus Bridge where, 50 years prior to that time, John Lewis had been beaten down and his skull fractured. We walked forward across that bridge with John Lewis, and with the President of the United States, President Barack Obama, to prove that America walks forward, and that the progress that we have made cannot be turned back.

Years later, many of us joined John on this floor to make some good trouble when we took over the floor of this House to demand a vote on common-sense gun control.

President Barack Obama, when he awarded John the Presidential Medal of Freedom, said: "Generations from now, when parents teach their children what is meant by courage, the story of John Lewis will come to mind; an American who knew that change will not wait for some other person or some other time, whose life is a lesson in the fierce urgency of now."

And that is why I say now is the time to pass what should be called the John R. Lewis Voting Rights Act. John Lewis was too great a man for us to fail to provide a substantive memorial.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Madam Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GOTTHEIMER).

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. Madam Speaker, as someone who was on the battlefield of nearly every civil rights fight of the last century, Mr. John Lewis taught us that our Nation is always a work in progress, always perfecting our Union.

Through it all though, regardless of what he faced, John Lewis always walked gracefully with the wind, following the words of Isaiah: "They shall

mount up with wings like eagles; they shall run and not be weary; they shall walk and not faint."

My friend, our hero, John Lewis never grew weary, no matter what the fight, including his last.

It was a remarkable blessing, as we heard tonight, from so many, to serve with your hero, to have him meet and hug your children, to meet a true American hero. There was none like him in this Chamber, and I think there never will be.

I will never forget the last hug that I got from him when I told him how much he meant to me; how much I appreciated his counsel; when he visited, how much I appreciated him coming to my district to speak with my community, and just all he did for all of us.

And he whispered back, as he said to so many others, "Just stay strong, my brother."

Mr. Lewis, that is the least we can do for you is to always stay strong.

Congressman Lewis was an American icon, as we all know. But he was a gentle giant, and his life's work will live on forever. His presence, his humble kindness will always loom large over this House and over our great Nation.

As Congressman Lewis said: "If you see something that is not right, not fair, not just, you have a moral obligation to do something about it." And I think we all need to remember that, especially now. I know that I will.

Thank you, Congressman John Lewis, our friend. God bless you.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Madam Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from Iowa (Mrs. AXNE). But please, I urge my colleagues, our time is very short. We want everyone to be able to speak, so please try to keep your comments under 2 minutes. One minute would be preferable.

Mrs. AXNE. Madam Speaker, tonight I had the rare privilege to preside over the House as our colleagues spoke about our beloved colleague, John Lewis, an honor I will remember for the rest of my life.

And as I turned to hear the stories from both Republicans and Democrats, I was struck by the sentiments over and over about how John not only gave them hope, but made them better human beings because of his silent strength, his hopeful nature, and his love for all, even in the face of despair.

□ 2145

As a new Member who is truly here because I believe there is need for more good trouble in this world and the need for those who will stand up for what is right, I am blessed to have been in John's presence and to have learned from him even in quick moments on the floor. His hope was contagious, as was his love for God, our country, and his fellow Americans. His enduring teachings will live on in all who seek out justice.

God bless John Lewis, God bless his family, and may he live in peace and power.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Madam Speaker, I yield to the distinguished Member from New Mexico (Mr. LUJÁN).

Mr. LUJÁN. Madam Speaker, I rise today in remembrance of our friend and colleague John Lewis, the gentleman from Georgia, a great man, a treasure, and our brother.

Congressman Lewis spent his life fighting for justice. When Mr. Lewis spoke, he did so with a force and moral clarity.

He was an original freedom fighter who embodied what it means to be a humble public servant.

John never let anything stand in the way of doing what was right. His legacy will continue by the generations of brothers and sisters he inspired to get in good trouble.

It was a blessing to have known Congressman Lewis, and I know his light will continue shining bright in the courage and conviction of the American people. As we lay our friend to rest, the torch of justice shines bright. Let us honor Congressman Lewis by continuing his fight.

Rest in power, my friend.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN).

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, I thank Ms. CLARK for organizing this beautiful observance and testimony to our beloved colleague.

I want to praise John Lewis, not the Congressman, but John Lewis the member of SNCC, the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, a relative handful of students who began a process that transformed America forever and brought down the walls of American apartheid and Jim Crow through the extraordinary force of their physical courage, their moral courage, and their political courage to confront an entire system of racism bearing down upon them.

The end of their struggle was non-violence, to create a nonviolent society committed to justice and equality for everyone, and the means of arriving at that nonviolent society was non-violence itself. So even as the sheriffs and police officers unleashed the German shepherds and the billy clubs on them, the water hoses and the teargas, they still remained remarkably non-violent the entire way there.

I asked John Lewis when we got to travel down South on the civil rights tour with the Faith and Politics Institute about where he thought things were. I think he felt that, in terms of civil rights, we have been moving things forward, but in terms of violence, we still had not remotely turned the corner.

I said, what is going to make the difference? He said: When people realize that violence doesn't work. Leaving aside the morality of it, violence doesn't work.

We talked about the Vietnam war. We talked about the Iraq war. We talked about gun violence sweeping the

streets. And we talked about domestic violence.

I want to say that the spirit and the memory of John Lewis live in this body and this institution, which loves him. But I see the spirit of John Lewis today in the streets with the hundreds of thousands and millions of young Americans who are demanding non-violent, just, and peaceful transformation of our society. John Lewis lives in the young people today, and he would be so proud of the young people of America.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Madam Speaker, it is difficult to close such a remembrance and a celebration, and we will never close the chapter on our friendship, admiration, and reverence for John Lewis. But John Lewis, for me, has always been the embodiment of the words of Micah 6. John has shown us what is good: to love justice, love mercy, and walk humbly with your God.

Rest in peace, power, and glory, Brother John.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. GRIFFITH (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today on account of health concerns.

PUBLICATION OF BUDGETARY MATERIAL

REVISION TO THE AGGREGATES, ALLOCATIONS, AND OTHER BUDGETARY LEVELS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2021

COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, July 22, 2020.

MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (CBA), the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (BBEDCA), and the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2019 (BBA), I hereby submit for printing in the Congressional Record a revision to the aggregates and allocations set forth in the statement of aggregates, allocations, and other budgetary levels for fiscal year 2021 published in the Congressional Record on May 1, 2020.

This revision is for allowable adjustments for amounts for wildfire suppression, program integrity, Overseas Contingency Operations, and disaster relief, pursuant to sec-

tion 251 (b) of BBEDCA, as provided in bills reported by the Committee on Appropriations. The amounts for wildfire suppression are contained in the text of H.R. 7612, the Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2021. The amounts for program integrity are contained in the text of H.R. 7614, the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2021. The amounts for Overseas Contingency Operations are contained in the text of H.R. 7617, the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2021. Finally, the amounts for disaster relief are contained in the texts of H.R. 7668, the Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Act, 2021 and H.R. 7669, the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2021.

Accordingly, I am revising aggregate spending levels for fiscal year 2021 and the allocation for the House Committee on Appropriations for fiscal year 2021. For purposes of enforcing titles III and IV of the CBA and other budgetary enforcement provisions, the revised aggregates and allocations are to be considered as aggregates and allocations included in the budget resolution, pursuant to the statement published in the Congressional Record on May 1, 2020.

Questions may be directed to Jennifer Wheelock or Raquel Spencer of the Budget Committee staff.

JOHN YARMUTH.

TABLE 1.—REVISION TO ON-BUDGET AGGREGATES

	2021	2021–2030
[On-budget amounts, in millions of dollars]		
Current Aggregates:		
Budget Authority	3,867,565	n.a.
Outlays	3,834,593	n.a.
Revenues	2,800,378	35,724,078
Revision for the Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2021 (H.R. 7612):		
Budget Authority	2,350	n.a.
Outlays	1,722	n.a.
Revenues	---	---
Revision for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2021 (H.R. 7614):		
Budget Authority	1,631	n.a.
Outlays	1,302	n.a.
Revenues	---	---
Revision for the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2021 (H.R. 7617):		
Budget Authority	---	n.a.
Outlays	1,500	n.a.
Revenues	---	---
Revision for the Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Act, 2021 (H.R. 7668):		
Budget Authority	143	n.a.
Outlays	110	n.a.
Revenues	---	---
Revision for the Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2021 (H.R. 7669):		
Budget Authority	5,060	n.a.
Outlays	1,365	n.a.
Revenues	---	---
Revised Aggregates:		
Budget Authority	3,876,749	n.a.
Outlays	3,840,592	n.a.

BUDGETARY EFFECTS OF PAYGO LEGISLATION

Pursuant to the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (PAYGO), Mr. YARMUTH hereby submits, prior to the vote on passage, the attached estimate of the costs of H.R. 7573, a bill to direct the Architect of the Capitol to replace the bust of Roger Brooke Taney in the Old Supreme Court Chamber of the United States Capitol with a bust of Thurgood Marshall to be obtained by the Joint Committee on the Library and to remove certain statues from areas of the United States Capitol which are accessible to the public, to remove all statues of individuals who voluntarily served the Confederate States of America from display in the United States Capitol, and for other purposes, as amended, for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

TABLE 1.—REVISION TO ON-BUDGET AGGREGATES—
Continued

	2021	2021–2030
[On-budget amounts, in millions of dollars]		
Revenues	2,800,378	35,724,078

n.a. = Not applicable because annual appropriations acts for fiscal years 2022 through 2030 will not be considered until future sessions of Congress.

TABLE 2.—ALLOCATION OF SPENDING AUTHORITY TO THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

	2021
[Unified amounts in millions of dollars]	
Current Discretionary Allocation:	
BA	1,375,000
OT	1,451,628
Revision for Wildfire Suppression (H.R. 7612):	
BA	2,350
OT	1,722
Revision for Program Integrity (H.R. 7614):	
BA	1,881
OT	1,512
Revision for Overseas Contingency Operations (H.R. 7617):	
BA	0
OT	1,500
Revision for Disaster Relief (H.R. 7668):	
BA	143
OT	110
Revision for Disaster Relief (H.R. 7669):	
BA	5,060
OT	1,365
Revised Discretionary Allocation:	
BA	1,384,434
OT	1,457,837
Current Law Mandatory:	
BA	1,172,696
OT	1,152,482

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The Speaker announced her signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 4148. An act to extend the Chemical Facility Anti-Terrorism Standards Program of the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes.

S. 4209. An act to amend title IX of the Social Security Act to improve emergency unemployment relief for governmental entities and nonprofit organizations.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 4(b) of House Resolution 967, the House stands adjourned until 9 a.m. tomorrow for morning-hour debate and 10 a.m. for legislative business.

Thereupon (at 9 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, July 23, 2020, at 9 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

ESTIMATE OF PAY-AS-YOU-GO EFFECTS FOR H.R. 7573

By fiscal year, in millions of dollars—

	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2020-2025	2020-2030
Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Impact	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5

Components may not sum to totals because of rounding.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

4744. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of General David L. Goldfein, United States Air Force, and his advancement to the grade of general on the retired list, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 1370(c)(1); Public Law 96-513, Sec. 112 (as amended by Public Law 104-106, Sec. 502(b)); (110 Stat. 293); to the Committee on Armed Services.

4745. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's report on the Social and Economic Conditions of Native Americans for FY 2017, Focusing on: Curbing Opioid Abuse in Native American Communities, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 2992-1; Public Law 88-452, Sec. 811A (as added by Public Law 102-375, Sec. 822(12)); (106 Stat. 1299); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

4746. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — Indian Education Discretionary Grant Programs; Professional Development Program (RIN: 1810-AB58) received July 7, 2020, 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.

4747. A letter from the Program Analyst, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's Declaratory Ruling — Promoting Broadcast Internet Innovation through ATSC 3.0 [MB Docket No.: 20-145] received June 25, 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.

4748. A letter from the Program Analyst, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Authorizing Permissive Use of the "Next Generation" Broadcast Television Standard [GN Docket No.: 16-142] received July 7, 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.

4749. A letter from the Program Analyst, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's Declaratory Ruling — Implementation of State and Local Governments' Obligation to Approve Certain Wireless Facility Modification Requests Under Section 6409(a) of the Spectrum Act of 2012 [WT Docket No.: 19-250] (RM-11849) received June 25, 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.

4750. A letter from the Director, Office of Acquisition Policy, Office of Government-wide Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's Small Entity Compliance Guide — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Federal Acquisition Circular 2020-07 [Docket No.: FAR-2020-0051, Sequence No. 3] received July 16, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

4751. A letter from the Director, Office of Acquisition Policy, Office of Government-

wide Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Technical Amendments [FAC: 2020-07; Item VI; Docket No.: FAR-2020-0052; Sequence No. 2] received July 16, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

4752. A letter from the Director, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Orders Issued via Fax or Electronic Commerce [FAC 2020-07; FAR Case 2018-022; Item V; Docket No.: FAR-2019-0010; Sequence No. 1] (RIN: 9000-AN80) received July 16, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

4753. A letter from the Director, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Evaluation Factors for Multiple-Award Contracts [FAC 2020-07; FAR Case 2017-010; Item III; Docket No.: FAR-2017-0010; Sequence No. 1] (RIN: 9000-AN54) received July 16, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

4754. A letter from the Director, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Modifications to Cost or Pricing Data Requirements [FAC 2020-07; FAR Case 2018-005; Item IV; Docket No.: FAR-2018-0006; Sequence No. 1] (RIN: 9000-AN69) received July 16, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

4755. A letter from the General Counsel, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting the Board's Semiannual Inspector General Report for the period October 1, 2019 through March 31, 2020, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, as amended; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

4756. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's Administration for Community Living's Elder Justice Coordinating Council 2016-2018 Report to Congress, pursuant to Title XX of the Social Security Act, Subtitle B, the Elder Justice Act of 2009; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4757. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's IRB only rule — Guidance on Waiver of 2020 Required Minimum Distributions [Notice 2020-51] received July 7, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4758. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final regulation — Guidance Under Section 6033 Regarding the Reporting Requirements of Exempt Organizations [TD: 9898] (RIN: 1545-BN28) 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 Ways and Means.

4759. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's "Report to Congress — Annual Update: Identification of Quality Measurement Priorities and Associated Funding for the Consensus Based Entity (currently the National Quality Forum) and Other Entities", pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 1395aaa(e); Aug. 14 1935, ch. 531, title XVIII, Sec. 1890(e) (as amended by Public Law 115-123, Sec. 50206(b)); (132 Stat. 184); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

4760. A letter from the General Counsel, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting a report on the actuarial status of the railroad retirement system, pursuant to 45 U.S.C. 231f-1; Public Law 98-76, Sec. 502 (as amended by Public Law 104-66, Sec. 2221(a)); (109 Stat. 733); jointly to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure and Ways and Means.

4761. A letter from the General Counsel, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting the 2020 annual report on the financial status of the railroad unemployment insurance system, pursuant to 45 U.S.C. 369; Public Law 100-647, Sec. 7105; (102 Stat. 3772); jointly to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure and Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Ms. SHALALA: Committee on Rules, House Resolution 1060. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 7608) making appropriations for the Department of State, foreign operations, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2021, and for other purposes (Rept. 116-459). Referred to the House Calendar.

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. BASS (for herself, Mr. RESCHENTHALER, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, and Mrs. LESKO):

H.R. 7718. A bill to address the health needs of incarcerated women related to pregnancy and childbirth, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER (for himself, Ms. BONAMICI, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. NORTON, Mr. BEYER, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. COOPER, Mr. CORREA, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. GOMEZ, Ms. HAALAND, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. KENNEDY, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LEVIN of California, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MOORE, Ms. PINGREE, Mr.

RASKIN, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. TONKO, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. COHEN, Mr. PAYNE, and Ms. OMAR):

H.R. 7719. A bill to limit the use of Federal law enforcement officers for crowd control, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CISNEROS (for himself and Mr. BACON):

H.R. 7720. A bill to permit child care providers that receive payment for services provided under the of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 to use a portion of such payment to pay the cost of sanitization and other costs associated with the COVID-19 public health emergency, necessary to protect the health of participating children and child care workers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

H.R. 7721. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a refundable credit against tax for farmers who hire unemployed workers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FORTENBERRY (for himself and Ms. CRAIG):

H.R. 7722. A bill to limit the price of insulin drugs accessible for participants, beneficiaries, and enrollees enrolled in group or individual health insurance coverage and group health plans and for uninsured individuals who have diabetes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. TONKO, Mr. CÁRDENAS, and Mr. TRONE):

H.R. 7723. A bill to establish the position of Interagency Coordinator for Behavioral Health to coordinate the programs and activities of the Federal Government relating to mental health, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. MENG (for herself, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. COOPER, Mr. VELA, Ms. SHALALA, Mr. PAYNE, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. GALLEGO, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. RUSH, Ms. NORTON, Mr. NADLER, Ms. HAALAND, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. WELCH, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. POCAN, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. TITUS, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. SOTO, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. SIRES, Mr. PANETTA, and Ms. GARCIA of Texas):

H.R. 7724. A bill to prohibit the use of Federal funds to implement, administer, or enforce the Presidential Memorandum on Excluding Illegal Aliens From the Apportionment Base Following the 2020 Census, issued on July 21, 2020; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. MOORE (for herself and Mr. ESTES):

H.R. 7725. A bill to amend part D of title IV of the Social Security Act to allow States to use incentive payments available under the child support enforcement program to improve parent-child relationships, increase child support collections, and improve outcomes for children by supporting parenting time agreements for noncustodial parents in uncontested agreements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL:

H.R. 7726. A bill to permit child care providers that receive payment for services provided under the of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 to use a portion of such payment to purchase personal protective equipment, and other equipment, necessary to protect the health of participating children and child care workers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PAPPAS (for himself, Mr. PALAZZO, and Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire):

H.R. 7727. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to ensure that grants provided by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs for State veterans' cemeteries do not restrict States from authorizing the interment of certain deceased members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces in such cemeteries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee (for himself, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. BILLRAKIS, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, Mr. BOST, and Mr. BERGMAN):

H.R. 7728. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish presumptions of service-connection for members of the Armed Forces who contract COVID-19 under certain circumstances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RUIZ:

H.R. 7729. A bill to release the City of Banning, California, from all restrictions, conditions, and limitations on the use, encumbrance, conveyance, and closure of the Banning Municipal Airport; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. SUOZZI (for himself, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. ZELDIN):

H.R. 7730. A bill to extend the special air traffic rule for civil helicopters operating VFR along the North Shore, Long Island, New York, to require the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration to promulgate a new special air traffic rule, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. VAN DREW:

H.R. 7731. A bill to promote workforce recovery through the provision of additional training services and workforce investment activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ (for herself, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. MENG, Mr. PAPPAS, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. SHALALA, Ms. SCANLON, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, and Mr. MFUME):

H.R. 7732. A bill to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services, acting through the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, to carry out a national campaign to increase awareness and knowledge of the virus that causes COVID-19; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CHABOT:

H. Res. 1061. A resolution condemning war crimes committed in Idlib, Syria, by the regime of Bashar Al-Assad and its backers and calling for a political solution to the Syrian civil war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

185. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 11, to memorialize the United States Congress and the Louisiana congressional delegation to remove the revenue sharing cap on the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act of 2006 for Gulf producing states and to take such actions as are necessary to rectify the federal revenue sharing inequities between energy producing states; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

186. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 16, to memorialize the United States Congress and the Louisiana congressional delegation to take such actions as are necessary to clarify and provide guidance regarding the ability of freshwater fisheries affected by the COVID-19 pandemic to receive assistance funding from CARES Act dollars; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

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. BASS:

H.R. 7718.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 7719.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section VIII of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. CISNEROS:

H.R. 7720.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, of the United States Constitution

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

H.R. 7721.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Sec. 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have the power to ... to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.

By Mr. FORTENBERRY:

H.R. 7722.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority for this bill is pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

H.R. 7723.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. MENG:

H.R. 7724.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution

By Ms. MOORE:

H.R. 7725.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8

By Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL:

H.R. 7726.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. PAPPAS:

H.R. 7727.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution states that "Congress shall have the authority to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee:

H.R. 7728.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, which states "[t]he 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; but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States"

By Mr. RUIZ:

H.R. 7729.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution, to provide for the general welfare and make all laws necessary and proper to carry out the powers of Congress.

By Mr. SUOZZI:

H.R. 7730.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution, Congress has the power "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 any Department or Officer thereof".

By Mr. VAN DREW:

H.R. 7731.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ:

H.R. 7732.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 555: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 645: Mr. FOSTER, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. RUSH, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, and Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 733: Ms. MOORE.

H.R. 874: Mrs. FLETCHER.

H.R. 906: Mr. PENCE, Ms. HOULAHAN, Mr. FULCHER, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. CORREA, Mr. REED, Mr. TAYLOR, and Mr. HURD of Texas.

H.R. 1074: Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois.

H.R. 1164: Mr. FOSTER.

H.R. 1255: Ms. PINGREE.

H.R. 1434: Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina.

H.R. 1636: Mr. NEAL and Ms. DEGETTE.

H.R. 1799: Mr. UPTON.

H.R. 2150: Mr. RASKIN.

H.R. 2350: Mr. BEYER.

H.R. 2442: Mr. SERRANO, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. HECK, Mr. UPTON, and Ms. TLAIB.

H.R. 2653: Mr. SAN NICOLAS.

H.R. 2859: Mr. STEUBE.

H.R. 2908: Mr. KHANNA.

H.R. 3711: Mr. TRONE.

H.R. 4052: Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. SCANLON, and Ms. DEGETTE.

H.R. 4104: Ms. SHERRILL, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. BEYER, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mrs. TRAHAN, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. ESCOBAR, Mr. ROSE of New York, Mr. CONNOLLY, and Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 4236: Ms. PRESSLEY.

H.R. 4248: Ms. FINKENAUER.

H.R. 4549: Mrs. MILLER.

H.R. 4764: Mr. HECK and Mr. TRONE.

H.R. 4903: Mr. WALTZ.

H.R. 5002: Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. KIND, and Mr. GAETZ.

H.R. 5306: Mr. GROTHMAN and Mr. SOTO.

H.R. 5416: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 5902: Mr. KIND.

H.R. 6129: Mr. TRONE.

H.R. 6143: Mr. TRONE.

H.R. 6144: Mr. TRONE.

H.R. 6297: Mr. KATKO.

H.R. 6364: Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER.

H.R. 6384: Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. COHEN, Mrs. LURIA, and Mr. SAN NICOLAS.

H.R. 6561: Mr. DEUTCH.

H.R. 6646: Mr. SAN NICOLAS.

H.R. 6697: Mr. KELLY of Mississippi.

H.R. 6802: Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana and Mr. ZELDIN.

H.R. 6909: Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 6939: Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 6950: Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 6962: Mr. SAN NICOLAS.

H.R. 6975: Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois.

H.R. 7019: Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana.

H.R. 7023: Mr. NEWHOUSE.

H.R. 7058: Mr. COSTA and Mr. LAHOOD.

H.R. 7061: Mrs. HARTZLER.

H.R. 7079: Mr. REED.

H.R. 7092: Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. YOUNG, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, and Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 7153: Ms. HOULAHAN, Mr. PETERS, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. SOTO, Mr. NEGUSE, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Ms. GARCIA of Texas.

H.R. 7197: Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. DEAN, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. CLAY, Ms. MATSUI, and Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 7200: Mr. KELLER.

H.R. 7211: Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina.

H.R. 7224: Mr. RIGGLEMAN.

H.R. 7292: Mr. TRONE and Mr. SOTO.

H.R. 7321: Mr. VAN DREW.

H.R. 7327: Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. HAALAND, and Mr. MOULTON.

H.R. 7328: Mr. COSTA.

H.R. 7334: Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee.

H.R. 7349: Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee.

H.R. 7355: Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee.

H.R. 7414: Mr. CARTWRIGHT and Mr. DEUTCH.

H.R. 7433: Ms. NORTON, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. CÁRDENAS.

H.R. 7449: Mr. CÁRDENAS.

H.R. 7456: Ms. PINGREE.

H.R. 7457: Mr. STAUBER, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. ROUZER.

H.R. 7496: Mr. COSTA and Mr. O'HALLERAN.

H.R. 7497: Mrs. HARTZLER.

H.R. 7499: Mr. SOTO.

H.R. 7512: Mr. LATTA.

H.R. 7515: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.R. 7520: Mr. CASE and Mr. THOMPSON of California.

H.R. 7521: Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. POCAN, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. COHEN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. EVANS, Ms. TLAIB, and Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 7531: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 7550: Mrs. HAYES.

H.R. 7551: Mr. YOUNG.

H.R. 7562: Mr. KIND.

H.R. 7566: Mr. GOLDEN.

H.R. 7578: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 7587: Mr. TRONE.

H.R. 7601: Mr. RESCHENTHALER.

H.R. 7606: Mr. TAYLOR and Ms. ESCOBAR.

H.R. 7615: Mr. SMUCKER, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. FLORES, and Mr. LATTA.

H.R. 7642: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. PINGREE, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 7650: Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL.

H.R. 7651: Mr. LONG and Mr. UPTON.

H.R. 7652: Mr. BABIN.

H.R. 7674: Ms. PINGREE, Mr. COHEN, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. RYAN, and Mr. TED LIEU of California.

H.R. 7679: Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. BALDERSON, and Mr. CONAWAY.

H.R. 7693: Ms. BARRAGÁN.

H.R. 7700: Mr. WELCH, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, and Mr. RYAN.

H.R. 7710: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. MEUSER, Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee, and Mr. WALKER.

H.R. 7714: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.

H.J. Res. 14: Mr. GARCÍA of California.

H. Res. 702: Mrs. DAVIS of California.

H. Res. 902: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H. Res. 1042: Mr. PAYNE, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Ms. KELLY of Illinois.

H. Res. 1043: Mr. SAN NICOLAS.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII, petitions and papers were laid on the clerk's desk and referred as follows:

121. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Hamburg, NY Town Board, relative to a resolution addressing the dire need for direct funding from the federal government to state, town, village, and city governments to assist in alleviating some of the financial distress caused by the COVID-19 global pandemic; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

122. Also, a petition of Mr. Gregory D. Watson, a citizen of Austin, TX, relative to respectfully requesting enactment of Federal legislation that would completely halt the issuance of HI-B visas and Optional Practical Training visas — or renewals of such visas — to immigrants and aliens during periods of decline in the Gross Domestic Product of the United States, during periods in which the nationwide unemployment rate in the United States exceeds 5%, or during periods of a Presidentially-declared public health emergency in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.