

petition in the House to temporarily seize control from the House Democratic leadership and revive the vital job-saving Paycheck Protection Program.

Every one of us has heard from restaurants and stores on the brink of closure. They are not crying wolf. Many will not make it through October without more PPP funds.

I know the majority leadership is feeling tremendous pressure. How? Because they canceled votes tomorrow morning. I guess allowing my more-seasoned Democratic colleagues to be on the floor while we file this petition jeopardizes leadership's political posture.

Well, enough posturing, and enough treating the fate of small business like a chess game.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to sign my discharge petition in the morning and rescue small businesses. Be brave. Now is the time to act.

□ 1745

JUSTICE FOR BREONNA TAYLOR

(Ms. LEE of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, yesterday a Kentucky grand jury indicted one—just one—of the three officers involved in the tragic shooting of Breonna Taylor.

Rather than being held accountable for this murder of an unarmed young Black woman, the indicted officer, instead, received a slap on the fist while the others responsible remain free.

Mr. Speaker, this shows, again, how our broken, racist criminal justice system cares more about damaged property than Black lives. If this court were concerned about endangering others, how can they ignore the life that was taken in plain sight?

401 years of white supremacy and oppression have rotted our criminal justice system. If there is any doubt that systemic racism exists, look to this decision.

The Senate must take up the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act, which would finally put an end to no-knock warrants.

Breonna Taylor deserves better than this. Her family deserves better than this. We cannot give up until there is true justice. We deserve a justice system that recognizes that Black lives matter.

Say her name.

HONORING SWEET BRIAR COLLEGE

(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 Sweet Briar College for being named one of the most innovative schools in the country by U.S.

News & World Report. This is the second time in 3 years that Sweet Briar has earned this distinction in recognition of its academic and institutional innovations.

Located in Amherst County, Virginia, the college is committed to instilling in its students the knowledge and skills necessary to address the challenges facing our communities.

Sweet Briar utilizes its sprawling 2,800-acre campus, including its lakes, vineyards, apiary, and 26,000-square-foot greenhouse, as a natural canvas and laboratory to offer students an experience unlike any other in the country.

Further, not only is Sweet Briar home to one of our country's oldest award-winning riding programs, but it is also one of two women's colleges in the United States with an ABET-accredited engineering program. Thus, it came as no surprise to hear that they were once again honored for their innovation.

President Meredith Woo and the school faculty have created a truly shining example of the incredible academic opportunities the Sixth District offers students from across the Nation.

REMEMBERING ROBERTO CLEMENTE

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

Mr. VAN DREW. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize the outstanding career, life, and accomplishments of Roberto Clemente.

Born in Carolina, Puerto Rico, Roberto was a talented athlete from a young age and an Olympic hopeful in track and field. Roberto excelled in baseball from a young age and worked his way into the Hall of Fame. He had a wonderful professional career, including 12 Gold Glove Awards, among his many other achievements.

His off-the-field accomplishments were also something to be in awe of, spending much of his free time on charity work or serving with the United States Marine Corps.

His number, 21, was retired by the Pittsburgh Pirates after his untimely death. His accomplishments on the field and off the field deserve to have his number retired by Major League Baseball.

Rest in peace, Mr. Clemente. May God bless you, and we all consider you our hero.

NOTICE OF INTENTION TO OFFER RESOLUTION RAISING A QUESTION OF THE PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I seek to provide a privileged resolution here in the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will give notice of his resolution.

Mr. GOHMERT. H. Res. 1148, raising a question of the privileges of the House.

Whereas, on July 22, 2020, H.R. 7573 was brought to the House floor for a vote, with the purpose of eliminating four specific statues or busts from the United States Capitol along with all others that include individuals 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" yet failed to address the most ever-present historical stigma in the United States Capitol; that is the source that so fervently supported, condoned and fought for slavery was left untouched, without whom, the evil of slavery could never have continued as it did, to such extreme that it is necessary to address here in order for the U.S. House of Representatives to avoid degradation of historical fact and blatant hypocrisy for generations to come.

Whereas, The Democratic Party Platform of 1840, 1844, 1848, 1852, and 1856 states "That Congress has no power under the Constitution, to interfere with or control the domestic institutions of the several States, and that such States are the sole and proper judges of everything appertaining to their own affairs, not prohibited by the Constitution; that all efforts of the abolitionists, or others, made to induce Congress to interfere with questions of slavery . . . are calculated to lead to the most alarming and dangerous consequences; and that all such efforts have an inevitable tendency to diminish the happiness of the people and endanger the stability and permanency of the Union, and ought not to be countenanced by any friend our political institutions."

Whereas, The Democratic Party Platform of 1856 further declares that "new states" to the Union should be admitted "with or without domestic slavery, as [the state] may elect."

Whereas, The Democratic Party Platform of 1856 also resolves that "we recognize the right of the people of all of the Territories . . . to form a Constitution, with or without domestic slavery."

Whereas, The Fugitive Slave Law of 1850 penalized officials who did not arrest an alleged runaway slave and made them liable for a fine of \$1,000 (about \$28,000 in present-day value); Law-enforcement officials everywhere were required to arrest people suspected of being a runaway slave on as little as a claimant's sworn testimony of ownership; the Democratic Party Platform of 1860 directly, in seeking to uphold the Fugitive Slave Act, states that, "the enactments of the State Legislatures to defeat the faithful execution of the Fugitive Slave Law are hostile in character, subversive of the Constitution, and revolutionary in their effect."

Whereas, The 14th Amendment, giving full citizenship to freed slaves,

passed in 1868 with 94 percent Republican support, 0 percent Democrat support in Congress; the 15th Amendment, giving freed slaves the right to vote, passed in 1870 with 100 percent Republican support and 0 percent Democrat support in Congress.

Whereas, Democrats systematically suppressed African-Americans' rights to vote, and by specific example in the 1902 Constitution of the State of Virginia, actually disenfranchised about 90 percent of the black men who still voted at the beginning of the twentieth century and nearly half of the white men, thereby suppressing Republican voters; the number of eligible African-American voters were thereby forcibly reduced from about 147,000 in 1901 to about 10,000 by 1905; that measure was supported almost exclusively by Virginia Democrats.

Whereas, Virginia's 1902 Constitution was engineered by Carter Glass, future Democratic Party U.S. Representative, Senator, and even Secretary of the Treasury under Democrat President Woodrow Wilson, who proclaimed the goal of the constitutional convention as follows: This Democrat exclaimed, "Discrimination! Why, that is precisely what we propose. That, exactly, is what this Convention was elected for—to discriminate to the very extremity of permissible action under the limits of the federal Constitution, with a view to elimination of every Negro voter who can be gotten rid of legally."

Whereas, In 1912, Democratic President Woodrow Wilson's administration began a racial segregation policy for U.S. government employees and, by 1914, the Wilson administration's Civil Service instituted the requirement that a photograph be submitted with each employment application.

Whereas, The 1924 Democratic National Convention convened in New York City at Madison Square Garden; the convention commonly known as the "Klan-Bake" due to the overwhelming influence of the Ku Klux Klan in the Democratic Party.

Whereas, Democrat President Franklin Delano Roosevelt continued Woodrow Wilson's policy of segregating White House staff and maintained separate dining rooms for white and black staffers. He also continued the White House Correspondents Association's ban on credentialing black journalists for White House duties until outside pressure from black publications finally forced a change in policy in 1944, the last year of his presidency.

According to the American Journal of Public Health, prior to his presidency, Roosevelt not only banned blacks from receiving treatment at his polio facility in Warm Springs, Georgia, but black staff were forced to live in the basement of the facility or in a segregated dormitory while white staff lived in the hotel or in surrounding cottages.

Whereas, Democrat Congressman Howard Smith, former chairman of the House Rules Committee introduced the

"Declaration of Constitutional Principles" in a speech on the House floor where he attacked the Supreme Court's 1954 decision on *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka (KS)* which determined that segregated schools were unconstitutional. Smith's declaration urged people to utilize all "lawful means" to avoid the "chaos and confusion" which would occur if they desegregated schools. HistoryHouse.Gov states that, "Under Smith, the Rules Committee became a graveyard for numerous civil rights initiatives in the 1950s."

Whereas, In 1964 the Democratic Party led a 75-calendar-day filibuster against the 1964 Civil Rights Act.

Whereas, Leading the Democrats in their opposition to civil rights for African-Americans was a fellow member of the Democratic Party, Senator Robert Byrd from West Virginia—a known recruiter for the Ku Klux Klan.

Whereas, Democrats enacted and enforced Jim Crow laws and civil codes that forced segregation and restricted freedoms of black Americans in the United States.

Whereas, On June 18, 2020, House Speaker NANCY PELOSI ordered the removal from the Capitol portraits of four previous Speakers of the House who served in the Confederacy saying that the portraits, "set back our nation's work to confront and combat bigotry;" the men depicted in the portraits were Democrat Robert M.T. Hunter, Democrat Howell Cobb, Democrat James L. Orr and Democrat Charles F. Crisp.

Resolved,

(1) That the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall remove any item that names, symbolizes or mentions any political organization or party that has ever held a public position that supported slavery or the Confederacy, from any area within the House wing of the Capitol or any House office building, and shall donate such item or symbol to the Library of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under rule IX, a resolution offered from the floor by a Member other than the majority leader or the minority leader as a question of privileges of the House has immediate precedence only at a time designated by the Chair within 2 legislative days after the resolution is properly noticed.

Pending that designation, the form of the resolution noticed by the gentleman from Texas will appear in the RECORD at this point.

The Chair will not at this point determine whether the resolution constitutes a question of privilege. That determination will be made at the time designated for consideration of the resolution.

□ 1800

COLOR OF CRIME

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of Jan-

uary 3, 2019, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, and still I rise. And still I rise in the name of liberty and justice for all. And still I rise in the name of justice for Breonna Taylor.

Mr. Speaker, there are many questions to be answered, critical questions to be answered. In this case there has been no indictment, nor arrest. There are unanswered questions. Who killed Breonna Taylor? Was the warrant properly executed? But there are some more questions that are quite critical.

Is the system of justice in this Nation broken, or is it doing what it was designed to do? Was Breonna Taylor's death a tragedy, as has been announced and published far and wide? Or was her death a tragedy that was, in fact, a crime?

And still I rise to address the issues associated with Breonna Taylor's death.

First, let me simply say this: Breonna Taylor was a young woman. She was loved by many, especially those who were very close, such as her mom, who thought she was easy to love. She was a person who finished high school and attended college.

We have heard none of the things that one might hear in cases such as these, because it is usually immediately published, the things about the person that are newsworthy with reference to their character. Her character has not been displayed in a negative way.

So I rise today because Breonna Taylor was a 26-year-old African-American woman. Breonna Taylor was an innocent person in her home at the midnight hour. She was unarmed. She committed no crime. Breonna Taylor was doing what most people in this country do at the midnight hour. Yet, Breonna Taylor is no longer with us.

And the question that I posed earlier and I pose now is this, Breonna Taylor was a Black woman, but the question is: If Breonna Taylor were a 26-year-old innocent, unarmed White woman who was killed in the middle of the night when Black police officers intruded into her home, would her death be a simple tragedy or would it be a crime to be prosecuted?

To answer this question, I think we have to examine the color of crime.

The color of crime dates back to the arrival of Africans in the Americas. At one time when Africans were first brought to this country, they were slaves, and as slaves the White masters had the right to hold them in bondage. But the slave committed a crime if the slave sought freedom. To seek freedom, to seek the liberty and the justice that we hold so near and dear, was a crime for the slave. The slave was Black. That crime was relegated to the Black slaves. Slavery was a crime that had color associated with it.

Let us move forward. After slavery was abolished with the 13th Amendment—the Emancipation Proclamation