

I remind my colleagues that an average of 100 people die every day from gun violence. Let me restate, it has been almost 500 days since the House passed those bills and the Senate has failed to take it up—almost 500 times 100 a day.

We see the consequences. Not that all of them would have been saved, but some, many, would have. Many have been saved since the original background check legislation passed.

Four years later, 4 years after Pulse, our grief remains raw. But our resolve to end the deadly scourge of gun violence and hatred—discrimination, that it was about, too—remains unwavering.

Strengthened by the memories of those who were lost to gun violence—49 souls here, and so many others—inspired by the spirit of hope that we celebrate during Pride Month, especially this weekend, let us never relent in our mission to end the horror of gun violence once and for all and end discrimination against anyone in our community.

Madam Speaker, I thank and commend Mr. SOTO, and I urge a “yes” vote.

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

I again want to commend Mr. SOTO on this bill.

In closing, it is important to note that the attack that we remember with this legislation was directed against all Americans, not just the patrons of the nightclub that night. The killer made this abundantly and chillingly clear. He declared himself an “Islamic soldier” and declared his allegiance and obedience to the terrorist leader, Abu Bakr al-Baghdadi. This was an attack motivated by hate, hatred against our country, hatred against all that our country stands for.

I think we can take some solace in knowing that Americans today retain their right to defend themselves against such attacks, that such terrorist attacks like this should remind us how important our Second Amendment rights remain today.

We can also take solace from the fact that al-Baghdadi, the inspiration for this terrorist attack, was hunted down and brought to justice in October last year by American Delta Force commandos, as he shielded himself with children, who he killed when he detonated a suicide vest rather than to be taken prisoner.

Madam Speaker, in memory of the 49 Americans killed by this terrorist attack, I ask for an “aye” vote in this House today.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. SOTO. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

We all agree this was an attack motivated by hate, and today, we recognize the 49 angels we lost and the 53 who were injured during the Pulse nightclub shooting.

Vigils occurred across this Nation, across the political spectrum, after

this deadly shooting. I can tell you, on behalf of Congresswoman DEMINGS, Congresswoman MURPHY, myself, and our region, we want to thank everyone for doing that.

We want to thank our colleagues, both Democrats and Republicans, for coming together: Chair GRIJALVA, Ranking Member BISHOP, Mr. McCLINTOCK, Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN, Mr. FITZPATRICK. We appreciate all the work being done in the Senate.

Today, we recognize the memory of these 49 angels across our Nation by making this the Pulse National Memorial.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SOTO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3094, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

—————

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF RULE SUBMITTED BY DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION RELATING TO “BORROWER DEFENSE INSTITUTIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY”—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NEGUSE). Pursuant to the order of the House of June 18, 2020, the unfinished business is the further consideration of the veto message of the President on the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 76) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Education relating to “Borrower Defense Institutional Accountability”.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Will the House, on reconsideration, pass the joint resolution, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

(For veto message, see proceedings of the House of June 1, 2020, at page H2362.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of overriding the President’s veto of H.J. Res. 76, a bipartisan Congressional Review Act resolution that would stop the Department of Education’s harmful borrower defense rule from going into effect.

Mr. Speaker, I first want to recognize the hard work of the gentlewoman from Nevada, Representative SUSIE

LEE, for her tireless efforts in protecting students, particularly student veterans, from predatory schools.

□ 1145

Borrower defense is a valuable tool to provide relief to student borrowers who are defrauded by predatory institutions. Unfortunately, instead of using the Department’s authority to make borrowers whole and give students a second chance at a quality education, it has gone out of its way to prevent victims of fraud from getting relief.

The Department’s rewrite of the borrower defense rule, which is set to go into effect on July 1, will mean that a vast majority of defrauded student borrowers will get virtually no relief. Even in cases where a school clearly violates the law, defrauded victims can still be denied relief under the rule if they can’t show that the school intentionally defrauded them or they can’t file their claim fast enough or they can’t document, according to the flawed Department methodology, exactly how much harm they suffered due to fraud.

Even those student borrowers who do receive partial relief will receive significantly less relief than before. Under Secretary DeVos, the average loan discharge amount for approved borrowers has dropped from about \$11,000 to about \$500, and for many students zero relief will be available even though they can prove massive fraud.

Class actions are not allowed under the rule. Each student must bring an individual case even though the school may have been found to have been guilty of egregious systemic fraud.

Democrats and Republicans came together earlier this year to pass a Congressional Review Act resolution that rejects this rule and prevents the Department of Education from denying borrowers the relief they deserve. A broad coalition, including veterans and military groups, consumer advocates, student advocates, and civil rights groups, called on the President to sign the congressional resolution and protect student borrowers from predatory schools; but, while the President initially indicated support for the resolution, he ultimately chose to veto it.

Today the House has one final opportunity to ensure that defrauded students get the relief they deserve by overriding that veto.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote to override the President’s veto.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX), who is the ranking member, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I thank my colleague from Virginia for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition of H.J. Res. 76, a resolution that would overturn the Education Department’s effort to assist students who

have been defrauded by colleges and universities while also taking necessary precautions to protect taxpayer interests.

Democrats have resorted to political finger-pointing on this issue at every turn. First, Education and Labor Committee Democrats held a hearing at the end of last year to hurl unfounded and personal attacks at Secretary DeVos. Then they passed H.J. Res. 76 shortly after to overturn the Education Department's borrower defense rules; and now, after President Trump has vetoed this resolution, the Democrats still can't take no for an answer and want to override the President's veto.

As we stand here today—yet again—to watch the Democrats' political games unfold, I would like to begin by highlighting real priorities we are letting fall by the wayside as we waste time debating this partisan resolution.

For starters, we should be working on bipartisan solutions to combat the devastating effects of the coronavirus. We should be addressing the concerns of small businesses—the backbone of our economy—and the workers whose livelihoods are being impacted by this crisis.

Or we could address labor union shortcomings, including the widespread and brazen corruption amongst United Auto Worker, UAW, union leadership. We know the UAW senior union leaders engaged in money laundering, tax fraud, bribery, and embezzlement, yet no action has been taken to examine this abuse of power by union bosses.

Unfortunately, Democrats have a long track record of pursuing ideological objectives at the expense of taxpayers, students, and schools. Today is no different, so I would like to spend some time touching upon the advantages of the Trump administration's new rule and providing context on the Obama-era borrower defense rule and its many shortcomings.

The borrower defense rule was first released by the Education Department in 1994. Borrowers rarely used this process over the next 20 years, until 2015, when a large for-profit school closed. During the final stretch of his Presidency, the Obama administration used this school closure as an opportunity to issue new regulations on borrower defense.

The caveat? A potential \$42 billion price tag to be footed by taxpayers that encouraged tens of thousands of borrowers, whether they were harmed or not, to apply to have their loans forgiven. In fact, claim filings for loan forgiveness went from 59 submitted in the first 20 years to roughly 300,000 claims submitted in the last 5 years.

Let me repeat that.

For the first 20 years of the rule, there were 59 claims. Then the Obama administration begins encouraging frivolous appeals, and the appeals jumped to 300,000 and climbing.

This shouldn't come as a surprise. Massive loan forgiveness has long been a Democrat objective, and the Obama

rule was a giant leap toward that goal—one that also ignored the high cost to taxpayers.

Furthermore, the Obama administration's regulations were convoluted, blurring the line between fraud and inadvertent mistakes made by schools. The distinction between the two is important because, if institutions are found to engage in fraud, the Education Department can cause schools to close—despite no intentional wrongdoing—through significant financial penalties.

But don't just take my word for it. Colleges and universities, including historically Black colleges and universities, HBCUs, voiced concerns about the Obama regulation. Postsecondary education leaders believed what President Obama's administration proposed could ruin those colleges and universities that did not have large endowments or significant revenue streams like the Ivy League institutions. The Obama rule could shutter the very institutions designed and dedicated to serving low-income, minority, and first-generation students.

Additionally, The Washington Times pointed out: "Under the Obama rule, students in the coronavirus era who could not attend classes on campus and were forced to take makeshift Zoom classes would have legitimate claims against their schools because the Obama rule does not differentiate between willful misrepresentation and schools' varied responses to the coronavirus. Great for trial lawyers, but bad for students and their schools."

The Obama regulations created more chaos than clarity, and the Trump administration recognized immediately the need to right these wrongs. So, working with the Education Department, President Trump produced a rule with clearer standards for borrower defense and increased transparency for both students and institutions.

The rule, first and foremost, holds all schools accountable. Students who have been lied to and suffered financial harm are entitled to relief and forgiveness.

Let me repeat that. The Trump administration's borrower defense rule delivers relief to students, including veterans, who have been lied to and suffered financial harm.

In fact, the Obama rule undermined the ability of veterans to earn relief if the institution was considered an elite liberal arts institution. In contrast, President Trump's rule makes sure students have the last word no matter what institution they attend.

Democrats will have you believe that the President and Secretary DeVos want to intentionally harm students who have been defrauded by an institution of higher education, and that is simply not the case.

While my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are willing to spend taxpayer money recklessly, President Trump's rule actually reduces the cost of the 2016 Obama-era regulations by

\$11 billion because it helps students go to and complete their education rather than closing schools indiscriminately. This is an \$11 billion savings for American taxpayers during a time when many are struggling to make ends meet.

Additionally, the Trump borrower defense rule holds all institutions, not just for-profit colleges, accountable for misrepresentations instead of picking winners and losers at considerable cost to taxpayers. It ensures due process for all parties; extends the look-back window to qualify for closed school loan discharges from 120 to 180 days so when schools close more students are eligible for forgiveness; and allows for arbitration, which could result in borrowers recovering resources such as cash payments or other expenses not provided by the Education Department.

Furthermore, this rule is the result of more than 2 years of deliberations, public hearings, and negotiations with higher education stakeholders, as well as considering, incorporating, and responding to public comments on this issue.

Thanks to this regulatory reset, all colleges and universities will be held accountable, defrauded students will see relief, and taxpayer dollars will be better protected.

Republicans stand ready to provide relief to students who have been harmed by fraud, and the borrower defense rule issued by the Trump administration delivers on that front.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge a "no" vote on this resolution, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Nevada (Mrs. LEE), who is the sponsor of the resolution and a hard-working member of the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mrs. LEE of Nevada. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge my colleagues to join me in overriding the Presidential veto of H.J. Res. 76.

Last night, we took a historic vote for racial justice, the Justice in Policing Act. Time and again, Congress takes votes, votes like this one that will soon be forgotten in the media, but these are the votes that quietly perpetuate the systemic inequality and racism in our country. That is what this vote today is about.

Communities of color, minority and low-income students, and veterans are preyed upon by predatory for-profit schools. They are manipulated. They are lied to and they are defrauded.

Because we, the Federal Government, did not do enough to prevent that fraud, we established the borrower defense rule as part of the Higher Education Act as a way to give these students a path to justice and relief. But the Department of Education not only rewrote that rule to make justice for our students virtually impossible, it is also failing to hold these predatory schools accountable for their actions.

Time and time again, we tell young students in this country education is

the answer, and they believe us. But that system failed them. The system failed my constituent, Kendrick Harrison, a brave Iraq war veteran, a father, and a Black American.

Kendrick and his family were left homeless after his for-profit school blew through his GI benefits and convinced him to take out \$16,000 in debt right before shutting their doors. He is fighting to this day and working as hard as anyone to get his life back on track.

I promise this story is not an exception. There are over 350,000 students just in recent years who were lied to, manipulated, and defrauded by predatory schools.

So I ask my colleagues: Are you going to stand with these students? Are you going to stand with the system that perpetuates inequality and holds down brave Americans like Kendrick? Are you going to let these for-profit schools wreak havoc on the lives of these students and take advantage of American taxpayers?

Because it is us, American taxpayers, who foot the bill for these bad actor schools because the Department of Education refuses to hold them accountable.

I am ready to take a stand against this broken policy, and I need you to stand with me. Take a stand for the very communities who have been rising up in this country.

These protests over the last several weeks are about police brutality, but they are about so much more. They are about decisions that we make in this body that perpetuate inequality and continue to stack the deck against Black Americans, student veterans, students in poverty, and working people who are just trying to better themselves.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote to override the President's veto. It is time to take a stand.

□ 1200

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON).

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank our education Republican leader for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the veto override of H.J. Res. 76.

The Department of Education first released borrower defense rules in 1994, which were rarely used over the next 20 years. After a large for-profit school closed in 2015, the Obama administration used this opportunity to issue new regulations on borrower defense. These regulations could cost the American taxpayer more than \$40 billion and encourage tens of thousands of borrowers—whether they were harmed or not—to apply to have their loans forgiven. The 2016 Obama regulations created more chaos than clarity and set massive loan forgiveness of a loan, regardless of the cost to taxpayers.

However, in 2019, the Trump administration issued that new borrower de-

fense rule, which takes effect July 1. The new rule creates clear, consistent standards and procedures for borrowers who have suffered financial harm due to a misrepresentation by a school.

Specifically, the rule:

Ensures due process for all parties;

Holds all institutions—not just for-profits—accountable for misrepresentations;

It delivers relief to students, including veterans, who have been lied to and suffered financial harm;

It preserves student choice, including student veterans in institutions that best suit their educational needs;

And it saves taxpayers \$11 billion by incentivizing students to finish their education rather than indiscriminately closing schools.

H.J. Res. 76 would undermine the repeal of the Trump administration's borrower defense rule and go back to Obama regulations that harm students and taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker, for these reasons, I urge my colleagues to oppose this measure.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS), the chair of the Subcommittee on Higher Education and Workforce Investment.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, there are 240,000 defrauded students waiting for student loan relief. Over 40,000 of those students are from my home State of California.

After doing nothing for students who have been defrauded by predatory colleges, the Department has come out with a new borrower defense rule that only makes things worse—in several ways—under the guise of protecting the taxpayer from footing the bill. But we have to remember, our students are taxpayers, too.

This new rule clearly gives preference to the very colleges causing the harm from the borrower defense rule that it was intended to prevent. If a school closes before delivering on its promises to students, they should have automatic discharge of their loans to that institution. Students who have spent years bettering themselves working to get into jobs, sacrificing in the hope of improving financial conditions for their families are being told that they simply don't matter.

Colleges, on the other hand, can use this system to keep taking money and they don't have to deliver what they promise. Our students deserve protection from predatory practices.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution before us today is the first step toward blocking the new fraud borrower defense rule from taking support, and I urge its support.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLER), another great member of the committee.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the attempted veto override of H.J. Res. 76.

When this legislation was advanced through this Chamber in January, the majority sought to turn back the clock on borrower defense leading to dangerous consequences for students, those repaying their loans, and the American taxpayer. The Obama-era rule, which the majority seeks to return us to, in this legislation was marked by regulatory chaos, excessive punishments, and ridiculous costs. The Obama rule provided no clarity and sought to forgive student loans at a massive scale, regardless of the cost to taxpayers or merits of the borrower's case.

Mr. Speaker, most importantly, the Obama-era regulations did not distinguish between deliberate fraud and unintentional errors made by schools, which is critical because the Department can levy substantial financial penalties against institutions found to engage in fraud, which can cause a school to close despite no intentional wrongdoing, thus ending access to alternative avenues for higher education for some current and prospective students.

Estimates put the total cost of the Obama Loan Forgiveness giveaway as high as \$40 billion. That is why in 2019, the Trump administration issued the new Borrower Defense Institutional Accountability Rule. The new rule, which takes effect on July 1, provides regulatory clarity; affords due process to both students and institutions; provides students relief relative to actual harm; holds all institutions accountable for misrepresentation; provides students with more options to continue their education, should their school close; and allows for faster relief by allowing institutional level arbitration. Importantly, the 2019 rule is estimated to save taxpayers \$11 billion from the 2016 Obama-rule baseline.

Mr. Speaker, we simply cannot afford to return to the outdated, costly, and confusing Obama-era rule. I also urge a "no" vote, because with respect to this issue, Congress should stay in its lane.

The Trump administration was rightly using its authority to implement the laws promulgating the new Borrower Defense Institutional Accountability Rule. They did so at a substantial savings to the taxpayer, while protecting student borrowers and holding bad actors accountable.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY), a distinguished member of the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, just a few weeks ago, right before Memorial Day, President Trump very quietly, behind closed doors, vetoed this bill, a bill that protects a borrower defense rule, which was supported by a wide range of veteran service organizations.

For years, young veterans who sought an education after serving their country have been targeted by for-profit, rip-off education factories that swallow up their GI benefits and then pile on new student loans.

Stories abound about men and women who wore the uniform of this country left with crushing debt and worthless degrees that denied them the rewarding careers they were promised. Although many today are entitled to loan forgiveness, the Department of Education, under Secretary Betsy DeVos, has willfully made this process as onerous as possible.

Mr. Speaker, if we listen to the American Legion, the Iraq and Afghan Veterans of America, and the Vietnam Veterans of America, vote to override, and we can restore these victims of fraud and greed some semblance of financial solvency. If we do not override this veto, the share of eligible debt forgiveness will drop from 53 percent to just 3 percent, and we will betray thousands of Americans who stepped up and volunteered to protect our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote “yes” to override.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I find it interesting that my colleague would say the President “very quietly and behind closed doors” vetoed a bill. They issued a statement on it almost immediately, so it wasn’t exactly quietly. Generally, they have to veto a bill at a desk with people present.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my strong opposition to overriding President Trump’s veto.

We can all agree that no student should be intentionally misled and schools engaging in fraudulent misrepresentation must be held accountable. But the Obama-era borrower defense regulations lack clarity, and simply, did not function. The 2016 regulations did not make the critical distinction between fraud and unintentional mistakes made by schools.

Mr. Speaker, under the rule, the Department of Education can impose significant financial penalties on institutions found to engage in fraud. But with no distinction, this can cause a school to have to close despite no intentional wrongdoing, hurting students on their path to a higher education. That is why President Trump took decisive action and created the 2019 borrower defense rule to clear this up.

Mr. Speaker, the Trump administration’s solution delivers relief to students, including veterans, who have been lied to and suffered financial harm. It would also save taxpayers \$11 billion by helping students complete their education, rather than indiscriminately closing schools. The Trump rule will ensure due process for all parties, while also ensuring institutions engaging in fraudulent misrepresentation are held accountable.

Mr. Speaker, when Democrats originally brought forward a resolution to disapprove this new commonsense rule, I voted “no,” and I will vote “no” again today.

I thank President Trump for rightfully using his veto authority, because

we cannot go back to the Obama-era regulations that hurt students and taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this measure today.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI), the chair of the Subcommittee on Civil Rights and Human Services.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.J. Res. 76, the veto override.

The Obama administration wrote the original borrower defense rule to provide defrauded students with the debt relief they are entitled to under the Higher Education Act.

Rather than protect students, however, DeVos rewrote the rule to make it nearly impossible for students who are victimized by deceptive institutions to get the relief they deserve. That is not justice.

Mr. Speaker, five months ago, I urged my colleagues to support the resolution to reverse Secretary DeVos’ harmful new borrower defense rule. I was glad it passed with bipartisan support.

We are here today because the President has chosen to veto the resolution and stand with Secretary DeVos and unscrupulous institutions that cheated students. This is indefensible.

Mr. Speaker, we are in a challenging time for our country, but this should not be hard. Let’s stand with the victims of deception, the students we represent across the country, not with unscrupulous institutions, not with Secretary DeVos, and not with Donald Trump.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join together and override this veto.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DAVID P. ROE).

Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the resolution.

As a ranking member of the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs, I have heard a lot of misinformation about the Department of Education’s borrower defense rule and its effects on student veterans.

Here is the truth: The rule does not limit the rights or benefits provided for veterans in the GI bill or servicemembers who use the Department of Defense’s Tuition Assistance Program, or the TAP program. Any veteran or servicemember who is defrauded by an institution and took out Federal loans, will have the opportunity to have that claim fairly adjudicated, just like any other student would under the rule.

When I was chairman of the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs in 2017, I offered the Forever GI bill to make more veterans eligible to receive a GI bill benefit and make veterans eligible to receive this valuable benefit for life.

Mr. Speaker, 45 years ago, this Army veteran, when he left the Army, used the GI bill. I know how valuable it is, personally, Mr. Speaker. It helped me

and my family tremendously, and that is why we wanted to make this benefit a lifetime benefit.

Mr. Speaker, just a few months ago, this Congress passed two bills to protect student veterans whose GI bill benefits were impacted by the coronavirus pandemic. My record has shown that one of my top priorities is ensuring veterans can receive a quality education, and a large part of that is ensuring that they receive the education they were promised and holding schools accountable for fraud.

Mr. Speaker, the Department’s rule does just that. And it sets up a clear process for borrowers to have their claim adjudicated and hold institutions of all types accountable. This rule is fair to borrowers. It is fair to schools. It is fair to taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker, I support this rule, and I support the President’s veto.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO), a member of the Committee on Education and Labor, but more importantly, chair of the full Committee on Veterans’ Affairs, because so many veterans have been implicated by fraud on these institutions.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, so when the Trump administration and Secretary DeVos approved its new borrower defense to repayment rule late last year, it was clear that they had chosen to pander to the for-profit college industry and cheat thousands of borrowers out of the relief that they deserve.

Predatory for-profit institutions consistently put their profits over students’ education. They make false promises about job prospects, drain Federal resources, and leave millions of students with useless degrees and high student loan debt.

Mr. Speaker, yes, veterans are among that group of people, and that is why major veteran service organizations have come out in favor of this veto override in support of the original legislation. Veterans, women, and minorities are aggressively recruited by these institutions who only see them as a benefit to their bottom line:

ITT Technical Institute, Corinthian Colleges, Dream Center Colleges are just some of the predatory for-profits whose lofty promises turned student dreams into a nightmare. The student borrowers who were defrauded by these schools are desperately seeking relief, but Secretary DeVos is making that task nearly impossible. And that is why this year, both Chambers of Congress passed a bipartisan Congressional Review Act resolution that rejected Secretary DeVos’ harmful rule.

Students, consumer advocates, and student veteran groups spoke out in favor of this CRA and urged President Trump to sign it into law. But the President refused to heed their call, choosing instead to uphold Secretary DeVos’ watered-down rule to put additional burdens on borrowers.

□ 1215

We must override the President's veto. Congress must again stand with student loan borrowers and stop the Trump administration's attack on America's students and his attempts to rig the rule in favor of Secretary DeVos' cronies. More than 200,000 student borrowers are still waiting for relief.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SMUCKER).

Mr. SMUCKER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to today's attempt to override the President's veto.

I think all of us agree that it is important to offer borrowers a process to discharge loans when they have been defrauded by a school, and that is what the rule, crafted with significant stakeholder input, offers. That was the original intent of the borrower defense process when it was enacted in 1995.

However, in 2016, as we have heard, the Obama administration used this process to advance an ideological loan forgiveness scheme, and it worked as they intended. We went from fewer than 60 claims over 20 years to nearly 330,000 claims in 4 years, which would cost the hardworking taxpayers, if you had to pay this price, \$40 billion. And they will have to pay that price.

Now, I don't need to go into reasons why that 2016 Obama rule was flawed. Instead, I will highlight some of the improvements made under the new rule.

This rule strengthens protections for borrowers from fraud and applies the same accountability metrics to all institutions across the board.

The rule provides due process for students and institutions but, rightfully, gives students the last word. The rule keeps the standard of evidence the same as the one used by the Obama administration, by the way, and thanks to stakeholder feedback, the rule does not require borrowers to prove intent.

Another point, this new rule will only apply to new claims for loans taken out after July 1.

I do want to thank Secretary DeVos and all of the hardworking individuals at the Department of Education for working through the caseload under the Obama standard. Your hard work of processing more than 5,000 cases per week for borrowers seeking relief has not gone unnoticed.

A vote against this veto override is a vote in favor of creating a system that is fairer for students and taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this resolution.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. ADAMS), the chair of the Workforce Protections Subcommittee and also chair of the HBCU Caucus.

Ms. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this measure to override the President's veto and to stand up for our Nation's 20 million college students.

Secretary DeVos' rule would harm tens of thousands of college students and would allow bad actors to continue some of the worst practices, such as forcing students to sign pre-arbitration agreements that limit their rights. We cannot allow predatory institutions to steal the dream of a college degree from any child.

It is shameful that in his veto message, President Trump used historically Black colleges and universities, HBCUs, as cover for his pro-fraud, anti-student agenda.

Now, let's be clear. No HBCU has ever been implicated in a borrower defense claim, and no HBCU has voiced support for Secretary DeVos' rule. That is fake news.

It is time that President Trump and Secretary DeVos began standing up for North Carolinians seeking opportunity instead of lying down to our Nation's worst institutions. And if they won't do it, Congress will.

It is a fundamental right. Du Bois told us: "Of all of the civil rights for which the world has struggled and fought . . . the right to learn is . . . the most fundamental."

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BYRNE).

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to overriding President Trump's veto of H.J. Res. 76.

Everyone in this Chamber can agree that schools that commit fraud and take advantage of students must be held accountable. However, returning to the 2016 borrower defense rule put in place by the Obama administration is not the answer.

Put simply, the Obama-era rule sends millions of taxpayer dollars to those who were not harmed by their university. Under the Obama-era rule, the standard to define fraud was placed so low that the Department of Education saw about 300,000 relief applications in just 5 years. Compare that to the just 59 applications in the previous 20 years the borrower defense process has been in place.

Understanding this problem, the Trump administration released an updated borrower defense rule in 2019 to prevent fraud, ensure taxpayer dollars are spent responsibly, and cut the regulatory red tape that has made it difficult for students and educational institutions to understand the old rule.

The new rule also ensures that due process, a founding principle of our Nation, is in place for both students and institutions.

The cost of allowing the Obama rule to stand is great, over 40 billion taxpayer dollars. Thankfully, the changes made by the Trump administration will save taxpayers billions while still ensuring that students are protected from fraud.

The Trump administration rule applies relief where it is needed, unlike the overly broad Obama-era rule. This should be something both parties can support.

Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that students who are defrauded by educational institutions deserve debt relief, but the Obama-era rule is not the answer.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" and sustain the President's veto.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL), a distinguished member of the Committee on Education and Labor.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Speaker, the American people do not support Betsy DeVos.

We don't support her radical attempts to privatize education.

We don't support her corrupt efforts to take coronavirus relief away from public schools so that it can be sent to private ones.

We don't support her hateful, transphobic agenda or her attacks on survivors of sexual assault.

And we do not support her putting predatory, for-profit colleges over those they cheated with a rule that would force the most vulnerable students who were robbed to repay 97 percent of what they borrowed. That is why Congress passed H.J. Res. 76, with bipartisan support.

But just as Vice President PENCE had to save Betsy DeVos' Senate confirmation, President Trump is trying to save her dangerous rule against our bipartisan bill.

So I urge my colleagues to override this veto, and, once again, let's make clear that the people's House stands on the side of the people and not Betsy DeVos.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. WATKINS).

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this costly resolution that would allow more fraud, waste, and abuse.

No one condones fraud, especially when it is perpetrated by an institute of higher learning. Every student who is financially defrauded is entitled to relief and forgiveness, period. But we should make sure that we are helping those who have been defrauded. It is our job to do due diligence for the American taxpayer.

The Trump administration has made this a priority, unlike the Obama administration. They used the rule to forgive as many student loans as they could. They would even target institutions they didn't like. That is partisan. It is costly to the taxpayer, and it is harmful to the student. That is why I support Secretary DeVos and President Trump. Their borrower defense rule takes taxpayers into account.

After seeing the enormous price tag of \$42 billion that the Obama rule created, President Trump and Secretary DeVos acted swiftly to take that burden off the backs of the taxpayers. I thank the President and Secretary DeVos.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman

from Pennsylvania (Ms. WILD), a distinguished member of the Committee on Education and Labor.

Ms. WILD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.J. Res. 76.

Students defrauded by predatory, for-profit colleges can be left with crushing debt, useless degrees, and none of the job opportunities they were promised.

Secretary DeVos could provide immediate relief to students who were defrauded. Instead, she has halted student loan relief and written a new rule under which defrauded borrowers could be denied debt relief, even when predatory colleges clearly violated the law.

Earlier this year, bipartisan majorities in the House and the Senate voted together to reject that rule, but President Trump has vetoed our legislation—yet another of his actions that will hurt students and taxpayers.

More than 7,000 Pennsylvanians are suffering while their applications for financial relief are sitting in limbo at the Department of Education. If Congress does not override the President's veto, student borrowers will be harmed, and predatory colleges will receive another giveaway.

I am proud to stand with students and to vote to override the President's veto of H.J. Res. 76.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. GUTHRIE).

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, yet again, to urge my colleagues to vote "no" on today's vote to override the President's veto of H.J. Res. 76.

It is unconscionable that any institution of higher education would engage in fraudulent misrepresentation to prey on student loan borrowers, particularly veterans who are able to qualify for GI benefits to attend schools.

President Trump's commonsense rule would help students who were defrauded and suffered financial harm by any school, giving them the opportunity to individually make their case, ensuring due process for all parties. It would also save taxpayers \$11 billion, compared to President Obama's last-minute, one-size-fits-all rule that did not hold schools accountable.

As a member of the Education and Labor Committee and the former chairman of the Higher Education Subcommittee, I strongly urge my colleagues to vote "no" today.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. HARDER), a distinguished member of the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. HARDER of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to encourage my colleagues to vote to protect my constituents who were scammed by for-profit colleges.

Both the House and the Senate took bipartisan votes to protect these students, but the President overruled our votes, siding with Secretary DeVos and her billionaire donors.

This issue hits home for me. I met a woman named Artemisa, who attended a corrupt college in my district. She studied to be a nurse and graduated with \$40,000 in debt, but no one would hire her. She is still paying off that debt to this day.

And it is not just Artemisa. Thousands of students at scam colleges across the country have similar stories. And if Secretary DeVos' new plan isn't stopped, these student borrowers may never get the justice they deserve.

That is not what we do in this country.

If Secretary DeVos is concerned about cost, she should talk to her billionaire friends in the corrupt college industry. The criminals should not be putting the financial burden on the victims of this fraud.

I encourage everyone to vote to overturn the President's veto.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS), the chair of the Committee on Financial Services.

□ 1230

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman SCOTT for yielding to me on this important issue.

I rise to override the President's veto of H.J. Res. 76, which undoes a Secretary DeVos rule that would make it nearly impossible for veterans and student borrowers defrauded by their schools to obtain financial relief.

Congress voted, on a bipartisan basis, to reject Secretary DeVos' borrower defense rule, which only cancels 3 percent of the student loans resulting from school misconduct, keeping 97 percent of our veterans and student borrowers drowning in debt they only incurred due to fraud and from which they may never recover.

If Secretary DeVos' efforts to prioritize profit over education are allowed to stand, then the for-profit industry will continue to do what it always has: exploit veterans, student borrowers, and those trying to better their lives and support their families by obtaining an education.

This is a fight with which I am deeply familiar. This Congress, the House Financial Services Committee held two hearings examining the student loan crisis and approved three bills that will provide strong student borrower protections, including for those harmed by for-profit colleges. And during this COVID-19 crisis, I have fought to provide up to \$10,000 of relief for private student loan borrowers, and I continue to fight to protect student loan borrowers who should not have to deal with debt collections, negative credit reporting, late fees, and penalties while dealing with this pandemic.

With over 200,000 pending borrower defense applications for loan relief, these students desperately need and deserve our help.

I urge my colleagues to support veterans and student borrowers by overriding the President's veto of H.J. Res. 76.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), the chair of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I rise to support this override.

Predatory for-profit colleges scam students and taxpayers out of millions of dollars. Predatory for-profit colleges account for 9 percent of students in postsecondary education but 33 percent of defaults.

To help students, the Department of Education under the Obama administration created a streamlined resolution process under the borrower defense to repayment provision of the Higher Education Act. Now, Secretary DeVos is breaking the process.

I will tell you what her goal is. It is to aid the perpetrators, not to help the victims. Under her new rule, borrowers lose out. They lose out if they cannot prove the school intentionally defrauded them, if they cannot file their claim fast enough, or if they cannot document their exact financial harm.

As a result, as little as 3 percent of eligible debt will be forgiven now. What little relief there is now will likely be shouldered by taxpayers, not the schools committing the fraud.

Stopping the Secretary as we are pushing to do has wide support: 20 State attorneys general and nearly 60 advocacy groups for students, civil rights, and education. The American Legion has said: "Deception against our veterans and servicemembers has been a lucrative scam for unscrupulous actors."

So I say to my Republican colleagues who want to support the military: Support this override.

And to those of us who want to fight for racial and economic justice: Support this override.

In 2018, we wrote to the Secretary, alarmed about how this rule could hurt students of color: "Ninety-five percent of Black students attending a for-profit college took out student loans, and a staggering 75 percent of Black students who did not complete their programs defaulted."

We must act now for veterans, for students of color, for borrowers across this country. In Connecticut, 1,100 defrauded students are waiting to be made whole. They need this override, not that cruel policy. Vote to override.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, before I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island, I would like to remind

our colleagues that just yesterday a Federal court ruled that the Department of Education must provide full relief for 7,200 defrauded Massachusetts student borrowers who attended Corinthian Colleges. Unfortunately, there are still borrowers around the country still waiting for relief.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE), a member of the House Judiciary Committee.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I rise in strong support of the resolution to override the President's veto.

In 2016, the Obama administration issued the borrower defense rule in order to provide relief to student borrowers defrauded by predatory for-profit institutions, which promised an education and credentials to pursue a career only to find these credentials did not have the value they were promised.

In the aftermath of the collapse of institutions like Corinthian Colleges and ITT Technical Institute, the Obama administration sought to provide relief to those students left out in the cold.

The borrower defense rule provided a path to relief to those students who sought to receive an education but were instead left with nothing but debt and few paths forward.

Sadly and predictably, the Trump administration ended these protections and implemented a rule making it harder to obtain relief, siding with predatory for-profit institutions rather than the victims—the students and veterans—of these wrongdoers.

According to the Institute for College Access and Success, the number of students eligible to seek debt relief or loan forgiveness will drop from 53 percent of borrowers under the Obama-era rule to just 3 percent under the Trump rule.

In response, Congress, in a bipartisan way, came together to reject the administration's rule change, rejecting efforts to leave defrauded students out in the cold. The President vetoed this relief. Now, Congress must once again stand on the side of those who sought to obtain a higher education and provide a better life for their lives and family.

I urge adoption of the override resolution.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PORTER), a member of the Financial Services and Oversight and Reform Committees.

Ms. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Under the Higher Education Act, students who are defrauded by private predatory colleges are entitled to relief on their loans. The prior administration created a streamlined process to help defrauded borrowers access relief and move forward with their lives.

Secretary DeVos tried to strip those protections away, but we fought back.

Some of my Republican colleagues in the House and Senate voted with us to overturn Secretary Betsy DeVos' new rule. We came together to defend students and to stand up against fraud, waste, and abuse.

But President Trump vetoed this important resolution. Instead of standing with students and taxpayers, President Trump stood with corrupt private colleges and Secretary DeVos.

Today, I ask my Republican friends: Do you want to stand with our country's students, with the future of our workforce and our communities, or do you want to betray them to please the President? I think the choice is clear, and I hope you do, too.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, could you advise how much time is remaining on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia has 9 minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from North Carolina has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Iowa (Ms. FINKENAUER).

Ms. FINKENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution in overriding the President's veto.

I want to talk about two Iowans who tried taking a step forward but were knocked two steps back by a for-profit school looking for an easy buck and taking advantage of the hopes and dreams of my constituents.

Julie, a mother from Iowa, was looking to boost her career, and Jeff, an Army reservist and construction manager, was trying to continue his education.

They bought into ITT Technical Institute's promises, worked hard for new career opportunities, and took out loans to do it. Both had their lives turned upside down when ITT Technical Institute suddenly closed.

A 2016 Federal rule forgave loans for folks like Julie and Jeff, who were obviously taken advantage of.

Unfortunately, this administration decided to roll back the commonsense rule, weakening protections for borrowers.

In our State, there are more than 1,000 borrowers who were taken advantage of and who are still waiting for their cases to be resolved.

We must stand with them and override the President's veto of this resolution.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. TLAIB), a member of the Financial Services Committee and Oversight and Reform Committee.

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

In January of this year, I stood here to speak against this administration's continued attack on our students. Five

months later, Secretary DeVos, with the support of this administration, continues to work on behalf of predatory for-profit institutions rather than the students they lied to that they scammed.

Instead of ensuring that students who were cheated out of their future by these fraudulent institutions receive debt relief, Secretary DeVos is fighting to ensure that these institutions are never held accountable.

Both Democratic and Republican Members alike agreed that if you were defrauded by one of these colleges, then your Federal student loan should be forgiven. We must stop this administration's relentless efforts to protect the pockets of predatory corporations at the expense of our students. I am proud to support this veto override.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, contrary to the Democrats' claims that we have heard today, the Trump administration and Republicans in the House are committed to providing relief to students who have been truly harmed by fraudulent practices.

The Obama administration's borrower defense rule, though, was extremely difficult to administer. It left students and institutions confused, encouraged massive and unnecessary loan forgiveness, and created a hefty bill for taxpayers. Anyone who believes it was a streamlined process, I will show you some swampland in New Mexico.

President Trump acted quickly to protect borrowers and taxpayers better. The 2019 borrower defense rule clarified standards and made a process more accessible.

If Democrats overturn the President's veto, we will be left with the convoluted Obama rule. Under the rules associated with today's legislation, there can be no revisions made even to improve or clarify the Obama rule.

We want all schools to serve students well. In particular, we want veterans and their education benefits protected. In this administration, they will be.

Mr. Speaker, I have worked hard all my life to help people get a good education and have a better life. I would not be supporting the overturn of this rule if that was not the direction in which we were going. The Education Department's borrower defense rule protects all student borrowers, including veterans; holds higher education institutions accountable; and saves taxpayers \$11 billion.

Unfortunately, Democrats will stop at nothing to tear down meaningful reforms ushered in under President Trump's leadership, even if it comes at the expense of our Nation's students.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot about \$11 billion. Let me tell you exactly what that is. That is \$11 billion

that students who have been defrauded will now have to pay if this resolution fails.

According to the fraud formula from the Department of Education, even those who can prove fraud can expect relief, on average, to go from about 50 percent of their debt down to 3 percent of their debt. Many, because of that formula, will get absolutely nothing.

□ 1245

Mr. Speaker, now is the time that we have a choice. We can give relief to students, especially veterans who have been defrauded by predatory colleges, or make them pay student loans even though they received a worthless educational experience.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to side with the students and vote “yes” on this resolution.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Will the House, on reconsideration, pass the joint resolution, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding.

Under the Constitution, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 238, nays 173, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 120]

YEAS—238

Adams	Cunningham	Horn, Kendra S.
Aguilar	Dauids (KS)	Horsford
Allred	Davis (CA)	Houlahan
Axne	Davis, Danny K.	Hoyer
Barragán	Davis, Rodney	Huffman
Bass	Dean	Jackson Lee
Beatty	DeFazio	Jayapal
Bera	DeGette	Jeffries
Beyer	DeLauro	Johnson (GA)
Bishop (GA)	DelBene	Johnson (TX)
Blumenauer	Delgado	Kaptur
Blunt Rochester	Demings	Katko
Bonamici	DeSaulnier	Keating
Boyle, Brendan	Deutch	Kelly (IL)
F.	Dingell	Kennedy
Brindisi	Doggett	Khanna
Brown (MD)	Doyle, Michael	Kildee
Brownley (CA)	F.	Kilmer
Bustos	Engel	Kim
Butterfield	Escobar	Kind
Carbajal	Eshoo	Kirkpatrick
Cárdenas	Españat	Krishnamoorthi
Carson (IN)	Evans	Kuster (NH)
Cartwright	Finkenauer	Lamb
Case	Fitzpatrick	Langevin
Casten (IL)	Fletcher	Larsen (WA)
Castor (FL)	Foster	Larson (CT)
Castro (TX)	Frankel	Lawrence
Chu, Judy	Fudge	Lawson (FL)
Cicilline	Gabbard	Lee (CA)
Cisneros	Gallego	Lee (NV)
Clark (MA)	Garamendi	Levin (CA)
Clarke (NY)	Garcia (IL)	Levin (MI)
Clay	Garcia (TX)	Lewis
Cleaver	Golden	Lieu, Ted
Clyburn	Gomez	Lipinski
Cohen	Gonzalez (TX)	Loeb sack
Connolly	Gottheimer	Lofgren
Cooper	Green, Al (TX)	Lowenthal
Correa	Grijalva	Lowe y
Costa	Haaland	Lujan
Courtney	Harder (CA)	Luria
Cox (CA)	Hastings	Lynch
Craig	Hayes	Malinowski
Crist	Heck	Maloney,
Crow	Higgins (NY)	Carolyn B.
Cuellar	Himes	Maloney, Sean

Matsui	Porter	Spanberger	Gallagher	Rogers (AL)	Walorski
McAdams	Pressley	Speier	King (IA)	Rooney (FL)	Westerman
McBath	Price (NC)	Stanton	Marchant	Sensenbrenner	
McCollum	Quigley	Stevens	Mullin	Spano	
McEachin	Raskin	Suo zzi			
McGovern	Rice (NY)	Swalwell (CA)			
McNeerney	Richmond	Takano			
Meeks	Rose (NY)	Thompson (CA)			
Meng	Rouda	Thompson (MS)			
Mfume	Roybal-Allard	Titus			
Moore	Ruiz	Tlaib			
Morelle	Ruppersberger	Tonko			
Moulton	Rush	Torres (CA)			
Mucarsel-Powell	Ryan	Torres Small			
Murphy (FL)	Sánchez	(NM)			
Nadler	Sarbanes	Trahan			
Napolitano	Scanlon	Trone			
Neal	Schakowsky	Underwood			
Neguse	Schiff	Van Drew			
Norcross	Schneider	Vargas			
O'Halleran	Schrader	Veasey			
Ocasio-Cortez	Schrier	Vela			
Omar	Scott (VA)	Velázquez			
Pallone	Scott, David	Visclosky			
Panetta	Serrano	Wasserman			
Pappas	Sewell (AL)	Schultz			
Pascarell	Shalala	Waters			
Payne	Sherman	Watson Coleman			
Perlmutter	Sherrill	Welch			
Peters	Sires	Wexton			
Peterson	Slotkin	Wild			
Phillips	Smith (NJ)	Wilson (FL)			
Pingree	Smith (WA)	Yarmuth			
Pocan	Soto	Young			

NAYS—173

Aderholt	Graves (LA)	Olson
Allen	Graves (MO)	Palazzo
Amash	Green (TN)	Palmer
Amodei	Griffith	Pence
Armstrong	Grothman	Perry
Arrington	Guest	Posey
Bacon	Guthrie	Reed
Baird	Hagedorn	Reschenthaler
Balderson	Harris	Rice (SC)
Banks	Hartzler	Riggleman
Bergman	Hern, Kevin	Roby
Biggs	Herrera Beutler	Rodgers (WA)
Bilirakis	Hice (GA)	Roe, David P.
Bishop (NC)	Higgins (LA)	Rogers (KY)
Bost	Hill (AR)	Rose, John W.
Brady	Holding	Rouzer
Brooks (AL)	Hollingsworth	Roy
Buchanan	Hudson	Rutherford
Buck	Huizenga	Scalise
Bucshon	Hurd (TX)	Schweikert
Budd	Johnson (LA)	Scott, Austin
Burchett	Johnson (OH)	Shimkus
Burgess	Johnson (SD)	Simpson
Byrne	Jordan	Smith (MO)
Calvert	Joyce (OH)	Smith (NE)
Carter (GA)	Joyce (PA)	Smucker
Chabot	Keller	Staubert
Cheney	Kelly (MS)	Stefanik
Cline	Kelly (PA)	Steil
Cloud	King (NY)	Steube
Cole	Kinzinger	Stewart
Collins (GA)	Kustoff (TN)	Stivers
Comer	LaHood	Taylor
Conaway	LaMalfa	Thompson (PA)
Cook	Lamborn	Thornberry
Crawford	Latta	Tiffany
Crenshaw	Lesko	Timmons
Davidson (OH)	Long	Tipton
DesJarlais	Loudermilk	Turner
Diaz-Balart	Lucas	Upton
Dunn	Luetkemeyer	Wagner
Estes	Marshall	Walberg
Ferguson	Massie	Walden
Fleischmann	Mast	Walker
Flores	McCarthy	Waltz
Fortenberry	McCaul	Watkins
Foxx (NC)	McClintock	Weber (TX)
Fulcher	McHenry	Webster (FL)
Gaetz	McKinley	Wenstrup
Garcia (CA)	Meuser	Williams
Gianforte	Miller	Wilson (SC)
Gibbs	Mitchell	Wittman
Gohmert	Moolenaar	Womack
Gonzalez (OH)	Mooney (WV)	Woodall
Gooden	Murphy (NC)	Wright
Gosar	Newhouse	Yoho
Granger	Norman	Zeldin
Graves (GA)	Nunes	

NOT VOTING—19

Abraham	Bishop (UT)	Curtis
Babin	Brooks (IN)	Duncan
Barr	Carter (TX)	Emmer

Gallagher	Rogers (AL)	Walorski
King (IA)	Rooney (FL)	Westerman
Marchant	Sensenbrenner	
Mullin	Spano	

□ 1327

Mr. WRIGHT changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mrs. LEE of Nevada, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. LEE of California, and Mr. YOUNG changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So (two-thirds not being in the affirmative) the veto of the President was sustained and the joint resolution was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have “nay” on rollcall No. 120.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 965, 116TH CONGRESS

Axne (Raskin)	Kirkpatrick	Payne
Cárdenas	(Gallego)	(Wasserman)
(Gomez)	Langevin	Schultz
DeSaulnier	(Lynch)	Pingree (Kuster
(Matsui)	Lawson (FL)	(NH)
	(Evans)	Sánchez (Roybal-
Deutch (Rice	Lewis (Kildee)	Allard)
(NY)	Lieu, Ted (Beyer)	Serrano (Meng)
Engel (Titus)	Lipinski (Cooper)	Speier (Scanlon)
Frankel (Kuster	Lofgren (Boyle,	Watson Coleman
(NH)	Brendan F.)	(Pallone)
Garamendi	Lowenthal	Welch
(Boyle,	(Beyer)	(McGovern)
Brendan F.)	Lowey (Meng)	Wilson (FL)
Johnson (TX)	Moore (Beyer)	(Hayes)
(Jeffries)	Napolitano	
Khanna (Gomez)	(Correa)	

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The veto message and the joint resolution are referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

The Clerk will notify the Senate of the action of the House.

WASHINGTON, D.C. ADMISSION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HIMES). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to recommit on the bill (H.R. 51) to provide for the admission of the State of Washington, D.C. into the Union, offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLER), 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 the motion to recommit.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 182, nays 227, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 121]

YEAS—182

Aderholt	Brindisi	Collins (GA)
Allen	Brooks (AL)	Comer
Amodei	Buck	Conaway
Armstrong	Bucshon	Cook
Arrington	Budd	Craig
Bacon	Burchett	Crawford
Baird	Burgess	Crenshaw
Balderson	Byrne	Cunningham
Banks	Calvert	Davis, Rodney
Bergman	Carter (GA)	DesJarlais
Biggs	Chabot	Diaz-Balart
Bilirakis	Cheney	Dunn
Bishop (NC)	Cline	Estes
Bost	Cloud	Ferguson
Brady	Cole	Fitzpatrick