

Two years ago, Glenda, who is Latinx, was fired after reporting racial discrimination. Unknown to her, buried in the fine print of the employment agreement she signed along with other onboarding documents when she was first hired was a forced arbitration clause, so Glenda had no choice but to go into forced arbitration proceedings.

But as the article notes, "Instead of the simple and fair process that arbitration promises to be, Perez saw her claim dismissed without so much as a hearing, only to learn later that her apparently independent arbitrator was so friendly with the attorney representing Cigna that the arbitrator invited him to his 50th birthday party."

To no surprise, the arbitrator sided with Glenda's employer, Cigna.

When her husband, Peter, complained about the unfairness of the process and how the arbitrator truly was not independent, guess what? He too was fired.

Now Glenda and Peter are struggling to support themselves and their three children and trying to fight their wrongful termination in court.

No worker should ever have to go through what Glenda and Peter have endured. This is why I support ending forced arbitration by voting for the FAIR Act.

Madam Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues who care about justice, who care about fairness, to support the FAIR Act.

Ms. SPEIER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY) for her comments on this Special Order. As she said at the end, she is one of the loudest voices to make sure there is justice in this country.

Madam Speaker, we could tell many more stories tonight, but I am going to close now by thanking all of my colleagues from the Democratic Women's Caucus for sharing the stories of women and men who are hurt by forced arbitration and demonstrating the human impact of this corrupt and abusive practice.

We are eager to have the House of Representatives take a vote on the FAIR Act on the House floor because survivors deserve their day in court and workers deserve dignified and respectful workplaces.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind Members to avoid referencing occupants of the gallery.

MODERNIZING SANCTIONS TO COMBAT TERRORISM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 116-61)

The SPEAKER pro tempore 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:

Pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 *et seq.*), the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1601 *et seq.*), the United Nations Participation Act of 1945 (22 U.S.C. 287c), and section 301 of title 3, United States Code, and in view of multiple United Nations Security Council resolutions, including Resolution 1373 of September 28, 2001, Resolution 1526 of January 30, 2004, Resolution 1988 of June 17, 2011, Resolution 1989 of June 17, 2011, Resolution 2253 of December 17, 2015, Resolution 2255 of December 21, 2015, Resolution 2368 of July 20, 2017, and Resolution 2462 of March 28, 2019, I hereby report that I have issued an Executive Order (the "order") modernizing sanctions to combat terrorism.

I have determined that it is necessary to consolidate and enhance sanctions to combat acts of terrorism and threats of terrorism by foreign terrorists, acts that are recognized and condemned in the above-referenced United Nations Security Council resolutions. I have terminated the national emergency declared in Executive Order 12947 of January 23, 1995, and revoked Executive Order 12947, as amended by Executive Order 13099 of August 20, 1998. The order builds upon the initial steps taken in Executive Order 12947 and takes additional steps to deal with the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13224 of September 23, 2001, with respect to the continuing and immediate threat of grave acts of terrorism and threats of terrorism committed by foreign terrorists, which include acts of terrorism that threaten the Middle East peace process.

I am enclosing a copy of the order I have issued.

DONALD J. TRUMP.
THE WHITE HOUSE, September 9, 2019.

SUPPORT D.C. 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, I come to the floor this afternoon because of the importance of a coming date. It will be known as a historic date in the Congress of the United States, Thursday, September 19, which is the day that, prerequisite to coming to the floor, the Committee on Oversight and Reform will hold the first hearing on D.C. statehood, H.R. 51, in 26 years. That will be a historic hearing.

This is not an informational hearing to let us know about statehood. It is a jurisdictional hearing, the prerequisite to going to the House floor.

The residents of the District of Columbia, who are number one—mark that fact—number one in taxes paid to support the Government of the United States, do not have full rights, the same rights, as other Americans.

Yes, I can come to the House floor to speak any time I want to, and yes, with

Democrats in power, I have reclaimed the Committee of the Whole vote, which means that when the committee is gathered here in the House voting on at least some matters, I get to vote. But, Madam Speaker, on final votes, I cannot vote, even though, as you have heard, the people I represent contribute more Federal taxes than any people in the United States, more per capita than New York and California and Florida. You name the State, you will be talking about a State where, per capita, its residents contribute less to support the very government that is ours and theirs than the people of the District of Columbia.

So, yes, I have introduced the D.C. statehood bill.

Let me predict right now that that bill will pass. It has virtually enough cosponsors to pass. Most bills come to this House floor without many cosponsors, and yet we know they will pass. Well, when you have almost enough cosponsors to pass the bill, Madam Speaker, I say to my good friends who are not on the bill, this is the time to get on the bill so that they will be part of history. I do believe this bill will, in fact, pass the House of Representatives.

There has already been a forecast that that will happen. That forecast was in H.R. 1, which has already passed the House. Every Democratic Member voted for H.R. 1.

H.R. 1 contains findings for D.C. statehood. It found that District residents pay the highest taxes per capita, that residents of your Nation's Capital have fulfilled all the obligations of statehood, fighting in all of the Nation's wars, including the war that gave rise to the United States of America itself.

It found that there were no historical, constitutional, financial, or economic reasons why the 700,000 residents of your Nation's Capital should not become part of a state.

These are findings in H.R. 1 that every Democrat has already voted for. These were findings for statehood for the District of Columbia.

It found that the District is in one of the strongest fiscal positions in the United States: a \$14.6 billion budget, a surplus of \$2.8 billion, total personal income higher than that of seven States, per capita personal consumption expenditures higher than those of any State, and total personal consumption expenditures greater than those of seven States.

We are not talking about an entity not worthy of statehood. The qualifications are clear, and there are qualifications to become a state.

How do you become a state? You get voted a state by a majority vote in this House. It is hard to become a state, but those qualifications have been met.

Let us compare the District of Columbia to States that are already States. Let's take two States of the Union, Vermont and Wyoming. I begrudge them nothing, except to say

they have voting Members of the House and the Senate, yet they don't have as many residents as the District of Columbia. This graph goes only to 600,000. Now, we are at 700,000 D.C. residents.

Moreover, it should be said that there are seven States in the Union about the same size, less than a million voters, yet they have two Senators and a voting Member of the House.

There just is no reason to deny that same right to the residents of your Nation's Capital.

The authorities that indicate that our bill is constitutional are the ones we always look to, to find out whether a bill is constitutional. Congressional Research Service has found that H.R. 51 is constitutional. The American Civil Liberties Union, the foremost authority on constitutional rights, has done a study and has found that H.R. 51 is constitutional. Importantly, Viet Dinh, a conservative legal scholar who served as the highest ranking Justice Department official in the George W. Bush administration, because he was Assistant Attorney General for Legal Policy, Viet Dinh has done a study and found that H.R. 51 is constitutional.

Do note that 51, that has real meaning, because the District would become the 51st state.

The findings mean that this House has already voted for H.R. 51 because it has voted for all the findings that are necessary for the District to become a state.

There is a Senate version of H.R. 1, but the Senate version doesn't have all the many propositions that H.R. 1 has.

H.R. 1, yes, has findings saying essentially that the District should be the 51st state, but H.R. 1 has a lot of other things in it. H.R. 1 says that to enhance democracy—and that is what it is, it is an omnibus democracy-enhancing bill. That is why our findings for D.C. statehood are in that bill, but it has things in it, like it wants paper ballots to protect the infrastructure, which sometimes goes down if there is, for example, a cyberattack; it has donor disclosure requirements; expanding early voting; no gerrymandering; the President and Vice President would have to disclose their tax returns.

□ 1645

Those are seen as democracy enhancing, and I fully endorse them. But compare that to the findings endorsing statehood, which would mean that 700,000 American citizens would have the same rights as every other citizen, and you will see why H.R. 1 is very important to the District of Columbia and why we predict that H.R. 51, the D.C. statehood bill, will pass the Congress, the House of Representatives.

I do want to stress the full qualifications, and one of the most important is service in the Armed Forces. Not only do the residents of the District of Columbia pay the highest taxes per capita in the United States—Federal taxes—but the residents of the Nation's Capital have served in every war, including

the war that gave rise to the Nation itself.

This is a particularly poignant poster because it shows the major wars, the World War wars. And notice what the losses have been of residents of the Nation's Capital who fought and died for their country without the same rights as others in their country:

World War I, 635 casualties from the District, more than from three States; The Korean war, more casualties than from eight States;

World War II, more casualties than from four States;

And, of course, Vietnam, more casualties than from 10 States.

The casualties of war perhaps speak loudest to our struggle for equality. There is a war memorial, the only war memorial on The Mall, and it is there because the District lost so many men, and it didn't have home rule at all.

What is home rule? Home rule is simply a government with a legislature and an executive.

The District was ruled from this place, from the Capitol. So to commemorate our war dead after World War I, the Congress placed a pristine, beautiful monument, the only monument to a single jurisdiction you will find on The Mall.

People sometimes go there to get married. They go there because it is beautiful and not terribly elaborate.

It is called the D.C. War Memorial. There are 400 or so names of men and women who died in World War I actually carved out in that memorial. That is why our service in the armed services is so important to bring before the House today.

There is something that I think the average person also doesn't know. This was a segregated city, and Congress did not allow it to denounce and get rid of racial segregation. Buses and streetcars weren't segregated, but public accommodations were segregated.

And yet, during the very years of segregation, we have some very distinguished members of the Armed Forces who were African Americans who stand out, still, in American history:

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

The first African American Air Force general, this is in the entire country, born and raised in the District of Columbia;

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

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

What a history of distinguished citizens, particularly these citizens who served so illustriously in our Armed Forces, reaching the highest ranks but, nevertheless, who came home with fewer rights or far fewer rights than any other Americans.

If there is to be a statehood provision that, as I have predicted, will become law in this House and make its way to

the Senate, will there still be a Capital?

I should indicate some of the issues that may occur to the average citizen.

Yes, because our bill preserves Federal control over the national capital area, and that is the Federal enclave. That is right here. That is where the so-called Federal complex, the Federal monuments, the Federal buildings, The National Mall, all that Federal jurisdiction is maintained.

The 51st State gives the District control only over the neighborhoods where the residents and the businesses are to be found. So there is not much that is upset or will appear very different, frankly, when visitors come to what is now known as Washington, D.C.

By the way, it will still be called Washington, D.C., but D.C. will stand for Douglass Commonwealth.

Where did D.C. get that notion? That notion comes from Frederick Douglass' own home here in the District of Columbia, that icon of American history.

It should be noted that, while he is remembered foremost for his work against slavery in the United States, he was a very energetic proponent of full equality for all the residents of the District of Columbia.

To this day, we have been able, through a bill I got passed in this House, to have a statue of Frederick Douglass. We are the only city—that is what we are at the moment—that has a statue.

Each State has two statues. We expect to get another statue, although I won't say that until it is announced formally, but then we will be the only non-State to have two statues.

The statue of Frederick Douglass can be seen right here in the Capitol, and it acknowledges that it was contributed by the residents of the District of Columbia.

Now, as ardent as we have been in pursuing statehood, we are determined to get full equality any way we can. So I have simultaneously introduced a bill that uses another strategy, and that is because the District doesn't even have full, what we call, home rule to make sure, at the very same time that we are pursuing statehood—because it will take us a little more time to get through the Senate—that we pursue a strategy that would enhance our home rule so that we would get many of the same authorities that would come through our statehood bill.

Those are on a dual track, and let me indicate what some of them are.

For example, every bill that the D.C. Council passes has to come over here. It is never touched. So it has to lie over here for 30 days. What nonsense is that? One of the home rule bills to enhance home rule would simply get rid of that.

You don't need to be a State to have a local prosecutor. Why is the U.S. attorney for the District of Columbia, the street crimes here in the District of Columbia, appointed by the President of the United States? Virtually all of

her jurisdiction is on police crime here in the District of Columbia. She should be appointed by the Mayor of the District of Columbia. At the same time we are going for statehood, we will have a bill on this floor for a local prosecutor.

We will have a bill allowing the Mayor to deploy the National Guard. We see what is happening with climate change, and every jurisdiction is on the lookout to prepare itself for whatever may come. The D.C. National Guard would be our last refuge.

Unlike the Guard in the States and even in the territories, the District's Mayor or chief executive has no authority to call out the National Guard if there is a hurricane or if there is a flood, so she has got to somehow find her way up the chain of command to the President to say: "Please, Mr. President, can I call out my own National Guard?"

The National Guard of the District of Columbia helps us in a multitude of ways; but in the way that could count most, there would be a delay because the District doesn't have the authority to call out its own National Guard. We want that even before statehood. We want that now.

We don't have control over our local courts. These courts don't have anything to do with the Federal Government. That authority should be with the D.C. Council.

There are many more. But to point out the ridiculous nature of not, in fact, having even rights that Americans take for granted—leave aside, if you will, the right to vote on this House floor, the right to Senate representation—but matters about which Congress knows nothing and wants to know nothing, like a local prosecutor, like the right to deploy members of the National Guard, you can see why I am on dual tracks.

One is statehood, which is absolute and pure equality with other Americans, but, in the meantime, we are unwilling to pass up what we could get incrementally, and that is simply control over all of our local matters, or as many of them as we can.

□ 1700

There are many reasons why D.C. statehood is ripe. Denying statehood to the Nation's Capital is a violation of international law, and that has been noted.

Our country, in 1977—that is before I came to Congress—signed what is called the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The Human Rights Committee of the United Nations has twice indicated that the United States, by denying the residents of its Nation's Capital equal rights with other parts of the country, is in violation of international law.

The Human Rights Committee of the United Nations, said that the United Nations "... remains concerned that the residents of the District of Columbia do not enjoy full representation in Congress, a restriction which does not

seem to be compatible with article 25 of the covenant."

That is the article we signed in 1977. And, thus, we have been found in violation of international law.

Madam Speaker, may I inquire how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from the District of Columbia has 6 minutes remaining.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, we are very pleased at the large number—now over 100 organizations—that have endorsed D.C. statehood. That is important to us because they themselves have millions of constituents.

One of our greatest problems has been nationalizing this issue. In fact, the residents are frustrated that people come to the Nation's Capital and they think that the residents of their capital have the same rights they have. We simply don't have a national pulpit every day that informs them.

So these 100-plus national organizations spreading the word, cascading it, is very important to us. I am not going to name all 100, but to give you an idea of how broad their constituency is, they include people like Common Cause, the National Active and Retired Federal Employees Association, the Sierra Club, People for the American Way, and the International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers.

There are unions there. There are good government organizations there. There are organizations of every kind, and that is one of the reasons that we are sure this bill is ultimately going to pass the Senate, as well.

We draw to the attention of the House that democracy has always been an aspiration of our country. Look at who we are. When our country was created, only White men could vote. It took 132 years for White women to be able to vote. They had to sit down in the streets. They had to go to the old Lorton prison, the prison for the District of Columbia. They chained themselves to the White House gates.

If you want to know why we are undaunted when we see that half the population had to go through much that we have experienced and finally attain the vote, we cannot afford to be pessimistic. But we remind those who come to this floor and say how proud they are of what a democracy we are; that H.R. 1 has democracy-enhancing provisions because we are not a democracy yet.

The worst blow to democracy is that the Nation's Capital does not have full democracy because it does not have the same rights, including full voting rights in the Congress itself.

The Framers understood that they were creating an imperfect democracy. Remember, our Constitution is a set of compromises. They had to get the Constitution done. They had to abide by three-fifths of a man. That was the compromise for not counting the Black slaves. There were many who signed the bill who opposed that in every way, but when you have a democracy with

as many different factions as ours did then, and have now, those are the compromises you make. You will be faulted only if, over time, you do not correct those inadequacies.

I am grateful that we had barely come into session—we have been in session now only since January with Democrats in control of the House—that the Speaker issued a very powerful statement endorsing statehood; that our Majority Leader STENY HOYER has endorsed the bill. And, yes, I believe that we are coming to the end of an era, an era for 218 years where the residents of our Nation's Capital have been second-class citizens.

That is a term normally applied to African Americans, but every citizen of the United States will tell you second-class citizen knew no color. It meant every resident of the District of Columbia.

We are closing this era in the House of Representatives during the 116th Congress. I am predicting, based on the number of cosponsors, that this bill will pass the House.

It will be a historic day. It will buoy this bill to the other side of this House so that the District becomes the 51st State of the United States.

I yield back the balance of my time.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Cheryl L. Johnson, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 831. An act to direct the Secretary of Transportation to request nominations for and make determinations regarding roads to be designated under the national scenic byways program, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 7 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, September 11, 2019, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

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, for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that H.R. 241, the Bank Service Company Examination Coordination Act of 2019, would have no significant effect on direct spending or revenues, and therefore, the budgetary effects of such bill are estimated as zero.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows: