

CONGRATULATING DR. DEBBIE LUPEIKA

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate a great woman and a doctor who is from my district in northern California, who earned an incredible honor over the weekend.

Dr. Debbie Lupeika has been named as the 2019 National Clinician of the year by the Association of Clinicians for the Underserved.

She teaches residents at Mercy Medical Center in Redding, California, and Shasta Community Health Center, which serves mostly underserved or uninsured patients.

Dr. Lupeika has helped treat many families that were displaced from their homes in Shasta County by the Carr fire last year—everyone from children to adults.

In rural communities like ours, it is even more important to have great doctors who truly care about their patients and their craft when also faced with these rural issues that are so difficult for retaining doctors in rural areas. Dr. Debbie Lupeika fully embodies that in every way.

Madam Speaker, I thank her for her commitment to improving healthcare in our rural communities, and I congratulate her on receiving this prestigious award.

THE CENTENNIAL OF 19TH AMENDMENT

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

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the 19th Amendment passing in the House giving women the right to vote.

Today, along with my yellow rose, I stand here wearing a purple and a black ribbon honoring the history of African American women who are unsung heroes, like Sojourner Truth, and Ida B. Wells, and Mary Church Terrell.

These women fought tirelessly so all women would have the right to vote. Although, even after the ratification of the 19th Amendment, many Black women and Native American women were still denied their voting rights.

Madam Speaker, let us not forget the sacrifices and the achievements of Black women and all women of color who continue to fight for women's right to vote, many of whose names we may never know, but without whom many of us would not be here today.

As we celebrate this important milestone with this historic number of women and women of color in Congress, let us remember the words of suffragette Mary Church Terrell. She said: "And so, lifting as we climb, onward and upward we go."

[From ACLU, May 18, 2019]

CELEBRATE WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE, BUT DON'T WHITEWASH THE MOVEMENT'S RACISM

My 94-year-old great-aunt, Paralee Wilmer—we call her Aunt Lee—voted for the first time after moving to Cincinnati, Ohio, in 1944. Born to no-nonsense, small farmers in Millers Ferry, Alabama, and the youngest daughter of 12 children, Aunt Lee was one among many African Americans who moved from the South to the North in search of better job opportunities and greater freedoms during the The Great Migration. These freedoms included the right to vote without intimidation or any other hindrance.

Aunt Lee's memory is a bit cloudy regarding whether the first time she cast her ballot was in an election for local politicians or a presidential race, but one thing she knows for sure is her pastor at the time inspired her to exercise her constitutional rights and fulfill her civic duties. He said, "When it's time to vote, make sure you vote. When it's time to do grand jury, make sure you go."

At age 20, Aunt Lee understood the magnitude of her pastor's advice, given the disenfranchisement of Black folks that she witnessed growing up in Millers Ferry—including poll taxes, literacy tests, and outright violence and intimidation that prevented Black people from voting. To be a Black citizen in America but denied full citizenship rights epitomizes the hypocrisy of American democracy. This is a sad truth that I repeat like a blues refrain to my students.

This summer—as the nation celebrates the 170th anniversary of the first major convention for women's rights at Seneca Falls and the 98th anniversary of the 19th Amendment to the Constitution, which granted women the right to vote—how do we reconcile widespread narratives of a triumphant, steady march towards women's enfranchisement with the more complicated and painful reality of my great-aunt's lived experience as a young, Black woman in Jim Crow America? One word: intersectionality.

Legal scholar Kimberlé Crenshaw argues that racism and sexism intersect in a manner that compounds Black women's oppression. Although the above historical events occurred long before Crenshaw articulated intersectionality, this insightful theory should be applied to all historical narratives that do not fully engage with the lived experiences of African-American women.

What do we notice when we take an intersectional view of the events that transpired at Seneca Falls? How does our understanding of the history of all women's political empowerment in the United States change?

When suffragists gathered in Seneca Falls, New York, in July 1848, they advocated for the right of white women to vote. The participants were middle and upper-class white women, a cadre of white men supporters and one African-American male—Frederick Douglass. The esteemed abolitionist had forged a strong working relationship with fellow abolitionists and white women suffragists, including Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Susan B. Anthony. No Black women attended the convention. None were invited.

Although women of color were profoundly absent at Seneca Falls, a greater degree of cultural inclusion was on the horizon. In May 1851, African-American abolitionist Sojourner Truth spoke at a women's rights convention in Akron, Ohio. During her famous speech on the abolition of slavery and the promotion of women's rights, Truth allegedly bared her breast and proclaimed, "Ain't I a woman?"

It was a melodramatic act and statement, but as historian Nell Painter argues, it never happened. Instead, it was a quaint fiction

crafted by convention organizer Frances Dana Gage and other white feminists who depicted Truth to white audiences as a genuine albeit primitive ally in the fight for women's rights. Thus, the 1851 convention marked a modicum of progress, but this progress is tainted by white suffragists' attempts to control Truth's voice.

By the turn of the 20th century, Black suffragists such as Mary Church Terrell represented intersectional feminism at its best. Born to former slaves in Memphis, Tennessee, Terrell earned her bachelor's and master's degrees from Oberlin College and served as president of the National Association of Colored Women. In February 1898, Terrell spoke at the National American Woman Suffrage Association convention in Washington, D.C.

Her speech forced powerful white women attendees to reflect on the compounding oppressions and systemic violence that Black women endured during slavery. She ended on a more optimistic note—praising the sheer grit and intellect of freed women. Terrell's rhetorical style echoed the American ethos of self-made men and women, but she oversimplified the historical reality that the paths to racial and gender equality are long, jagged, and still unwinding.

The history of women's suffrage in America is not nice or neat, because the impact of white supremacy is broad and human nature is messy. Furthermore, a nation built on stolen land from Native Americans and stolen labor from African slaves is flawed from the start. We must constantly acknowledge this truth and engage in an intersectional celebration of women's rights activists and landmark events.

In addition to celebrating the passage of the 19th Amendment, let's celebrate the upcoming birthday of African-American suffragist Mary Church Terrell, who would be 155 on September 23. Let's celebrate the lives and legacies of the true Sojourner Truth, abolitionist and suffragist Harriet Tubman, and Shirley Chisholm—the first Black woman elected to Congress and to seriously run for president.

Let us celebrate and support current-day Black Lives Matter founders and organizers Alicia Garza, Patrisse Cullors, and Opal Tometi, three queer Black women committed to "placing those at the margins closer to the center" of political leadership. Last but not least, let's celebrate the lives of everyday people like my Aunt Lee—a Black woman born and raised in Jim Crow Alabama who sought out a better life in Ohio and has religiously exercised her right to vote for the past 74 years. Let us celebrate these Black women while recognizing that the struggle to vote without obstacles continues.

NEW LOCK AT THE SOO LOCKS

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

Mr. MOOLENAAR. Madam Speaker, the Appropriations Committee has now passed legislation with \$75.3 million in funding for the construction of a new lock at the Soo Locks.

This is the first time in decades the construction of a new lock at the Soo Locks is being funded in legislation.

I have been pushing for this funding with my work on the Appropriations Committee, and I am grateful for the support of our colleagues.

Right now, the lock is 50 years old, and it has survived harsh winters through extraordinary maintenance.

However, if it were to fail for an extended period, it would create a cascading problem for the economy and national security, because iron ore that goes through the locks would have no way to get from Lake Superior to factories across the country.

Also, this is an issue that Democrats, Republicans, and President Trump all agree on.

When President Trump came to Michigan last year, I was joined by Congressman BERGMAN and Congressman MITCHELL. We told the President about the Soo Locks, and he pledged his support. That was backed up in March when the Army Corps of Engineers requested \$75.3 million in its budget for next year.

I appreciate and want to thank President Trump for his leadership on this. That request is funded in legislation now, and I look forward to working with my colleagues to keep this construction moving forward in the years to come.

□ 1800

CELEBRATING ANNIVERSARY OF 19TH AMENDMENT

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

Mrs. TRAHAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the passage of the 19th Amendment 100 years ago today.

It is remarkable to imagine that the fundamental right to vote was only granted to women this recently. If only the suffragettes who sacrificed so much for so long could see the results of their movement, that I would be serving in Congress shoulder to shoulder with 131 women, the most in our Nation's history.

We know that better decisions are made when more women are at the table, from the boardroom to the floor of this historic Chamber.

Women have been blazing the path of social progress in the United States for centuries, marching for civil rights, striking for workers' rights, organizing against gun violence, and speaking out on sexual harassment. Today, we continue to reshape our country, writing new history in the Halls of Congress.

We stand on the shoulders of those who came before us, women like Susan B. Anthony, Shirley Chisholm, Edith Nourse Rogers, and many more, and make sure we do our part to pave the new path for women to follow after us.

Madam Speaker, I am proud and honored to take part in celebrating the anniversary of the 19th Amendment.

CELEBRATING PATRIOTISM OF AMERICAN WOMEN EARNING RIGHT TO VOTE

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

Mr. PALMER. Madam Speaker, almost from the day that I have been elected to Congress, I have looked forward to the opportunity to honor my wife's great-grandmother.

She was able to vote in the 1920 election. Prior to that election, in Boston, they distributed sample ballots. This document that I have with me today has been in my wife's family for almost 100 years. On the back of the document, Miss Abby Mayhew Cushing wrote this note: "November 2, 1920. Cast my first vote for President of these United States."

You can feel the pride and the patriotism in those words that she experienced for the first time. Abby Mayhew Cushing was 67 years old.

With all due respect to my Democrat colleagues, she wrote: "Voted straight Republican ticket. Smashing victory for Harding and Coolidge." Then she added this: "President Harding died very suddenly August 2, 1923, in California. Burial in Marion, Ohio, Friday, August 10."

This is, for the Cushing family, a historic document that celebrates the patriotism of American women earning the right to vote.

NO ONE IS ABOVE THE LAW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, and still I rise, and I do so with the love of my country within my heart, and I do so this evening because I believe that no one is above the law. No one.

We find this to be the case in our great country: If you are a person who exceeds the speed limit, you are breaking the law. If you are caught exceeding the speed limit, there is a price to pay. No one is above the law.

If you are a person who happens to, in the State of Texas, decide that you are going to go through the supermarket and pick and choose certain things that you would like to sample, at some point, if you partake of more than is reasonable, you will be charged with grazing. It is a crime in the State of Texas to graze, to take more than what is reasonable in having a sample of a grape. No one is above the law. People are prosecuted in the State of Texas for grazing.

In the State of Texas, a good many persons have been prosecuted for not causing their children to go to school. Thwarting public attendance in school was a law in the State of Texas. People paid fines for not having their children in school.

The list of laws is too long to ever mention in a statement such as this, but the point is, no one is above the law. There are laws that deal with persons who commit felonies and persons who commit misdemeanors. When you break these laws, you are prosecuted.

You are not allowed to break the law with impunity, and you are not allowed to do it with immunity. No one is above the law.

I believe that this is a part of the very hallmark of our criminal justice system in this great country. We believe that no one is above the law and that no one is beneath the law, meaning that the law should apply equally to all. Every person ought to be treated the same when it comes to the very bedrock principle of whether or not someone is above the law. No one is in this country.

However, we find ourselves with a unique circumstance now. We have the highest office holder in the executive branch, the chief executive officer, if you will, who has refused to cooperate with lawful investigations of the Congress.

He refused to cooperate in this sense. He has said to witnesses they should not appear and give testimony in a lawful investigation. He indicated that subpoenas will not be answered. They were issued pursuant to lawful investigations.

No one is above the law. If you are not above the law, then if you are called upon to testify, you must testify. If you have some document within your possession and there has been a request for it by way of a subpoena, then you have to produce it. No one is above the law.

Well, we currently have a circumstance where the chief executive officer is at odds with the legislative branch. This places the legislative and the executive at odds with each other. They are in a stalemate, if you will.

When this occurs, you have one branch of government refusing to cooperate with lawful requests of another branch, the executive refusing the request of the legislative, then you have a standoff, as I indicated. No one is above the law.

This, in my opinion, creates a constitutional crisis. Now, there are people who would differ with me. But remember this: What they are expressing is what I am expressing, an opinion. This is my opinion. They have their opinion. There is no hard and fast definition for a constitutional crisis.

There are some who would contend that to have a constitutional crisis in this area, the subpoenas that have been issued would have to go to court. They would have to be litigated. At some point, a court might say to the executive branch of the government that it must obey the subpoena issued by Congress, the lawful subpoena.

If the executive officer declines to obey the subpoena, it would be concluded that you have a constitutional crisis because the chief executive officer is not only disobeying Congress, he is disobeying a third branch of the government, the judicial branch, the judiciary. So you would then have a constitutional crisis.

I differ. It is my opinion that you have a constitutional crisis when the