

Mr. NEGUSE. Let me tell you about my friend Congresswoman ANGIE CRAIG from the great State of Minnesota, who held a flood briefing to start discussions around different agencies working together in the case of major flooding.

Ms. HILL of California. Well, let me tell you about my friend JOSH HARDER from the great State of California, who is fighting for broadband in rural areas through the Save the Internet Act.

Mr. NEGUSE. I don't want to brag, but I will. Congressman JARED GOLDEN, from the great State of Maine, is advocating to lower the costs of prescription drugs for his constituents.

Ms. HILL of California. And Congresswoman JAHANA HAYES, who was Teacher the Year before, is now fighting to keep guns out of our classrooms.

Mr. NEGUSE. This freshman class truly is legislating with aggressive momentum.

Ms. HILL of California. Oh, we are indeed. Eighteen freshmen are leading House subcommittees, as my colleague, Ms. STEVENS mentioned, including: Congresswoman KENDRA HORN, Congresswoman MIKIE SHERRILL, Congressman TJ COX, Congressman MIKE LEVIN, Congressman HARLEY ROUDA, Congresswoman SUSIE LEE, Congresswoman XOCHITL TORRES SMALL, and Congresswoman LIZZIE FLETCHER.

That is a lot of people. And what is so exciting about that is that there has never been a freshman class with this many people with the gavel.

Mr. NEGUSE. Eighteen freshmen, quite an incredible feat. But I will also say that freshman Members of Congress have had much success legislating.

Congressman MAX ROSE from the great State of New York has had three amendments pass this House, including an amendment to expand childcare services for veterans seeking additional treatment.

Ms. HILL of California. Congressman ANDY LEVIN, who we just heard from, has introduced six pieces of original legislation. That is a lot.

Mr. NEGUSE. Representative HILL, I know that you know my great friend and colleague ABIGAIL SPANBERGER, who was able to include an amendment as part of H.R. 1 that would prevent foreign interference in U.S. elections.

Ms. HILL of California. Well, we really want that foreign interference not happening in any future elections, so I am glad to hear that.

Just this week, Congresswoman KIM SCHRIER introduced bipartisan, bicameral legislation to help prevent child abuse.

Mr. NEGUSE. Congresswoman CHRISSY HOULAHAN created a new bipartisan caucus to represent the interests of veterans.

Ms. HILL of California. Congresswoman ABBY FINKENAUER was the first freshman to have legislation pass the House, a bill to bring Federal investment to small businesses in rural America.

Mr. NEGUSE. I do know that Members of this House would be well familiar with Congressman CHRIS PAPPAS, who has introduced bipartisan legislation to increase protections for first responders on the front lines of our Nation's opioid epidemic.

Ms. HILL of California. My other friend, Congresswoman KATIE PORTER, a fellow member of the Katie Caucus, has introduced bipartisan legislation to make childcare more affordable.

Mr. NEGUSE. All of these accomplishments that Representative HILL and I have outlined that this freshman class has accomplished I think demonstrate that the freshman class is continuing to deliver for the people.

Nearly 100 days into our transformative majority, we have passed major legislation across issue areas.

Ms. HILL of California. A truly sweeping Democratic reform package.

Mr. NEGUSE. The first gun violence prevention legislation passed in nearly a decade.

Ms. HILL of California. The Paycheck Fairness Act and reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act.

Mr. NEGUSE. So as we conclude and head into the next 100 days, I think it is important to stress that we are going to continue to work to lower the cost of healthcare.

Ms. HILL of California. End corruption in Washington.

Mr. NEGUSE. Raise workers' wages.

Ms. HILL of California. Invest in our Nation's infrastructure and public education system.

Mr. NEGUSE. And, of course, address the existential threat—climate change.

Ms. HILL of California. Above all, we are going to stand up for the people, again, with the full force of this freshman class; and I am so excited to do it with you, Mr. NEGUSE, and with all of my fellow freshman colleagues.

Mr. NEGUSE. As am I, Representative HILL.

Ms. STEVENS. Madam Speaker, I thank Congressman NEGUSE for sharing some of his time with Congresswoman HILL from California.

This Special Order hour has truly been special, and what a delight to reflect on these first 100 days with a historic freshman class in a new season here in the Nation's Capital.

Madam Speaker, I would like to conclude this Special Order hour of the freshman class of the 116th Congress, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to yield to each other in debate.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA STATEHOOD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) for 30 minutes.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, a week from Tuesday will be what we

call Emancipation Day in the District of Columbia. We use that occasion to point out the continued inequality of the residents who live in our Nation's Capital.

Emancipation Day was the day when Abraham Lincoln freed the slaves in the District of Columbia. Yes, there were slaves working in the District of Columbia. It was considered a Southern State. He freed them 9 months before the Emancipation Proclamation freed all slaves.

Yet the residents of the Nation's Capital remain less free than any other Americans. Even without statehood, however, the people of the Nation's Capital have, indeed, made progress.

Madam Speaker, I want to discuss the problems and the progress, especially as we come close to the point when we will bring our D.C. statehood bill to the floor and the House will vote whether to make the District the 51st State.

□ 1915

We recognize we were the last to be free because we are not free yet. We won't be free until the District of Columbia becomes the 51st State of the United States of America.

Now, I recognize, of course, there are no slaves living in the District of Columbia today. But there is not a single free and equal citizen resident of the District of Columbia.

I cannot help but think of the stories that were told me of my great-grandfather, a runaway slave from Virginia. I am a third-generation Washingtonian. He was in the District of Columbia when Lincoln freed the slaves in the District of Columbia, but he was a runaway slave, so he was not free from slavery until 9 months later.

His name was Richard Holmes. My family tells many stories about Richard Holmes. This runaway slave from the District of Columbia came here to work on the streets of the District of Columbia. Actually, he came to get away from slavery.

I don't tell any heroic stories of Richard Holmes. I tell it the way it was told me. When nobody was looking, Richard Holmes just walked off that plantation. He found his way to the District of Columbia. There were not enough workers to build the streets of the District of Columbia, so he was able to get work on the streets building this city.

I understand that slave owners went around the streets of the District of Columbia looking for their slaves. The man who owned Richard Holmes found him and went up to the straw boss and said: That is my slave. I have come to get him.

The straw boss said: You called out a name. That man never answered to that name. No, he is a good worker. He is not your slave.

That is how Richard Holmes, whose name was called out, by the slave

owner, "Richard," remained in the District of Columbia so I could become Eleanor Katherine Holmes and ultimately the Member who represents the District.

"Richard," they called out. By not answering to his name, Richard Holmes must have practiced for the day when the slaveholder would come looking for him. That is the kind of discipline I am trying to bring to my work in the Congress because freedom from slavery did not give the residents of the District of Columbia freedom.

Yet we celebrate Emancipation Day. We are pleased that the slaves in the District of Columbia were freed earlier than the Emancipation Proclamation, but that is only because the Federal Government controlled the District of Columbia, and, therefore, Abraham Lincoln could say whether there would be slaves in the District of Columbia.

In a real sense, the Federal Government still has control over the District of Columbia as I speak because the District does not even have full home rule. Yes, in 1973, the District did obtain self government. That means that the District has a Mayor and a city council and governs itself, except when the Congress of the United States decides to intrude. And intrude, it does.

Until Democrats captured the majority this session, I have had to ward off bills to eliminate all the District's gun safety laws, for example. Intrusion can be very dangerous.

Of course, now that Democrats are in the majority, such a bill does not have any chance of getting through. But I have spent most of my time in the Congress in the minority, and whatever I have had to do for the District or get to the District, I have had to do from that perch.

Emancipation Day for the District is, yes, a day off for the District, a holiday. It is just that important to us. There are parades, and there are celebrations. But it is not like George Washington's birthday, and it is not like Abraham Lincoln's birthday. The reason that it is a celebration in the District of Columbia is to remind us, the 700,000 residents who live in the District of Columbia, of our continuing obligation to work until the District and its residents are entirely free.

In this country, even small matters take work. I know because I have small matters pending. But even without the vote, I have been able to get three bills passed in only 3 months of the Congress. What it takes is work. What it takes is an insistence to keep going until you secure what residents deserve.

If I have any frustration, it is not with the work I must do to make the District the 51st State. It is with the knowledge, according to the polls, that most Americans think that the residents of the District of Columbia, their Nation's Capital, have the very same rights that they do. Of course, I am on this floor this evening to make sure that they know we do not.

The new Members who just spoke on the floor must have been shocked because they would have been among the Americans who would have thought we had the same rights that everyone else does before they were elected.

Now, I don't want to say, look, I don't have any rights, and I can't do anything for the District.

You can't face your challenges that way, Madam Speaker. I do vote in committee as the representative of the District of Columbia. I even vote on the House floor.

When I first came to Congress, I reasoned that since I could vote in committee, I ought to be able to vote in the Committee of the Whole. Sometimes we meet in the Committee of the Whole, for example, to vote on amendments. So I went to the Democratic Speaker. It was a Democratic Speaker for the first 2 years I was in Congress, Tom Foley, and I asked to be able to vote on the floor of the House.

He said: Eleanor, nobody ever said the District should be able to vote on the floor of the House, so I will have to ask advice from outside counsel.

Tom Foley sent it to outside counsel. They came back, and they said: Yes, in the Committee of the Whole, if Congress votes to allow her to vote, she should be able to vote on the House floor.

Because there was a Democratic majority, I was given the right to vote on the House floor.

I will never forget what happened afterward. My Republican friends then sued the House for giving me the right to vote on the House floor. They lost in the district court. Then they took it to the court of appeals, and they lost in the court of appeals. They knew better than to take it to the Supreme Court of the United States. So I voted on the House floor then, and I am voting on the House floor again.

I only regret that I have spent most of my time in Congress in the minority, and I have not had that right as often as the Americans I represent deserve.

The District, of course, does not even have full local control. Madam Speaker, you would think that my Republican colleagues would be the first to give them that because the bywords for Republicans are "federalism" and "local control." Instead, as I have indicated, they have spent years trying to interfere with the District's local control.

The one thing that ought to guarantee Americans freedom from Federal interference, including the Congress of the United States, is localism. Time and again, I have asked my Republican colleagues to grant me that privilege that they think all Americans should have.

The failure to give the District our full rights is not only a violation of every precept of the American creed, but a violation of treaties that the United States has signed. For example, in 1977, the United States signed the

International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The Human Rights Committee, which has oversight over that treaty, has said that the United Nations "remains concerned that residents of the District of Columbia do not enjoy full representation in Congress, a restriction that does not seem to be compatible with article 25 of the covenant," the covenant the United States has signed.

One of the reasons it galls the residents of the District of Columbia not to have full rights is that, as this chart shows, the residents pay more Federal taxes than any of the 50 States. Take a look. Mississippi pays the lowest Federal taxes, but it is the District of Columbia at \$12,000-plus per person that pays the highest.

If you are from New York or California, Madam Speaker, if you are from Idaho or the other Washington, you pay fewer taxes per capita than the people I represent, but you have more rights than they do.

Nothing better illustrates, I think, in a country where "taxes" is often a dirty word, the inequity of paying more taxes than Mississippi while Mississippi has every right the District of Columbia has. I cite Mississippi only because its residents pay the lowest taxes per capita.

Madam Speaker, there is a second and perhaps more important reason to claim our full citizenship. That, of course, is that the residents of your Nation's Capital have fought and died in every war, including the war that created the United States of America, the Revolutionary War.

On this chart, we show the sacrifices during the 20th century when the United States fought major world wars. World War I, 635 D.C. casualties, that was more than three States. Understand, we are a city. We are smaller than most States, though about the size of seven States, but we had more casualties than three States. The Korean war, 575 D.C. casualties, that was more casualties than eight States. Moving on to World War II, we find 3,575 casualties. Note the number is going up, but that is more casualties than four States. Finally, the Vietnam war, 243 D.C. casualties, that was more than 10 States.

□ 1930

It is one thing to have given your treasure; it is quite another to have given the lives of your citizens.

The District, for most of its existence, has had fewer African Americans than White people. That is not the case today. It is about equal White and Black citizens.

But, when I speak of war casualties, I am reminded of citizens who have especially distinguished themselves in time of war:

The first African American general was born and raised in the District of Columbia;

The first African American Air Force general was also born in the District of Columbia;

The first African American Naval Academy graduate, born here in the District of Columbia; and

The first African American Air Force Academy graduate, born in the District of Columbia.

I cite these African Americans because the District was a segregated city as well. With segregation and no vote, you see African Americans distinguishing themselves in the Armed Forces of the United States, fighting for their country.

So we move forward to today, and we see great progress on our statehood bill. Every Democratic Senator now backs the findings of H.R. 1.

H.R. 1 is a democracy bill. It calls for many kinds of improvements in democracy, and in that bill is included findings that lay out the case for D.C. statehood. That means that those who have voted for H.R. 1 here in the House have also voted to approve statehood.

The Senate has a similar bill, but with only three sections. It is Leader Chuck Schumer's bill. Their proposals are not as fulsome as H.R. 1, but has three major components: restoring the Voting Rights Act; establishing national automatic voter registration laws; and, yes, D.C. statehood.

D.C. statehood, for Democratic Senators, ranks just that high, along with the national voting rights bills cited. In both of our Chambers, Speaker NANCY PELOSI and Minority Leader CHUCK SCHUMER have been full-throated supporters of D.C. statehood.

We are taking two paths to statehood, however, because so much of home rule remains unfinished. Most of home rule is done, but I think most Americans would be amazed to find out how much is not done.

For example, the District's budget still has to come to the House of Representatives. We can get budget autonomy by vote of the House and the Senate without going all the way to statehood.

Or, take a life-and-death matter. We are now in the midst of climate change with all kinds of weather we had not seen. If there are floods in the District of Columbia or hurricanes, the District of Columbia cannot call out its own D.C. National Guard. It has got to go to the President of the United States to ask him to call out the D.C. National Guard.

For goodness' sake, by the time it goes up the chain of command, half of D.C. could be blown away. That is life and death. That is what every single State has, and D.C. can get that without statehood.

So, while we recognize that in order to get statehood we would have a tough time in the Senate, we also rely on making sure that we complete home rule with matters having to do with the District of Columbia as another way to move toward getting more of our rights.

Now, again, I don't want to leave the impression that because I don't have the final vote on the House floor I just

can't get anything done. I have passed three laws—the third month of Congress, going into the fourth month—already, without being able to vote for those bills.

And, I must say, I am very humbled, but I also am proud at the same time, that the organization that ranks Members of Congress has ranked me as the most effective Democrat in the Congress, and that is without having a vote.

To quote them, they said: The Center defines legislative effectiveness as the “proven ability to advance a Member's agenda items through the legislative process and into law.” That means passing bills. And it went on to say that Norton's ranking is “noteworthy because she is a nonvoting Member.”

I point that out because I don't want my residents, especially, to hear me here on the floor indicating how important statehood is to then say: Well, I don't guess ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON can do anything for us until she finally gets statehood.

I point out that I will be measured not by whether I got statehood. I may not get it. I will be measured by what I was able to get for the District of Columbia, whose residents voted for me to come to Congress.

Yes, only statehood can give the District the bucket of rights, the full bucket it is entitled to. Only statehood can make the District fully equal to the residents of the States. Only statehood can mean for the District what it means for the smallest States, that you can have two Senators as well as a Member of the House.

The District of Columbia has no Senators, so I have to do the work of both Houses. That is not how it is supposed to work.

So, instead of being disheartened, I am, indeed, elated that we already have 202 sponsors, or cosponsors, for D.C. statehood. It takes 218 to pass the bill.

People rushed onto the bill because of the knowledge that there is something wrong that there are people in our country who do not have the same rights that others have, and for no good reason.

If you were to ask people, “Well, why not?” today they would not be able to tell you. Without going into elaborate detail, I will tell you that it was a fluke that the District does not have full rights, a fluke having to do with a mishap or an incident when the Capitol was in Philadelphia and the troops from the Revolutionary War marched on the then-Capitol demanding their pensions.

The Framers were caught flat-footed and said: Oh, my goodness. We better make sure that the Capitol is not part of any State, and this is part of Pennsylvania.

Well, of course, we know that that was cured long ago. The District should not be part of any State, doesn't want to be part of any State, but there are plenty of armed troops to protect the

District from people marching on the District or the Capitol for their pensions or any other rights.

I am grateful to represent the District of Columbia. I am grateful because I love a good fight. I loved it as a kid in the civil rights movement. I loved it when I grew up in the District of Columbia, going to segregated schools and recognizing that all I had to do was get a good education and I could get out of that too.

But I take it as an honor and a privilege to represent residents who, in each and every way, are fully equal to each and every American and to do all that I possibly can to make that feeling reality in the United States of America.

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

SENATE ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The Speaker announced her signature to an enrolled joint resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S.J. Res. 7.—Joint resolution to direct the removal of United States Armed Forces from hostilities in the Republic of Yemen that have not been authorized by Congress.

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 42 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 10, 2019, at 9 a.m.

NOTICE OF PROPOSED RULEMAKING

U.S. CONGRESS,
OFFICE OF CONGRESSIONAL
WORKPLACE RIGHTS,
April 9, 2019, Washington, DC.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Section 303(a) of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (CAA), 2 U.S.C. 1383(a), provides that the Executive Director of the Office of Congressional Workplace Rights “shall, subject to the approval of its Board of Directors, adopt rules governing the procedures of the Office, including the procedures of hearing officers, which shall be submitted for publication in the Congressional Record. The rules may be amended in the same manner.” Section 303(b) of the Act, 2 U.S.C. 1383(b), further provides that the Executive Director “shall publish a general notice of proposed rulemaking” and “shall transmit such notice to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate for publication in the Congressional Record on the first day of which both Houses are in session following such transmittal.”

Having obtained the approval of the Board, I am transmitting the attached notice of proposed procedural rulemaking to the Speaker of the House. I request that this notice be published in the section of the Congressional Record for the House of Representatives on the first day on which both Houses are in session following the receipt of this transmittal. In compliance with section