



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 166

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JANUARY 28, 2020

No. 18

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BUTTERFIELD).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
January 28, 2020.

I hereby appoint the Honorable G.K. BUTTERFIELD to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2020, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with time equally allocated between the parties and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

QUESTIONS TO THE SENATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. And still I rise, Mr. Speaker, and I rise today because I have a question. I have a question for posterity. I have a question for those who reside and dwell within the Senate. I have a question, but I also have a predicate for the question.

The predicate is this: Knowing what you know, knowing that the National Security Advisor was in the room with the President, knowing that he has in-

dictated that there were concerns within him with reference to the President's dealings with other countries, heads of state, knowing that he took his consternation to the Attorney General of the United States of America, knowing that the Attorney General expressed some concerns as well, knowing what you know, that the National Security Advisor, not just another person in the room but the person who advises the President on concerns with reference to our security, knowing this, how can you possibly thwart efforts to have the National Security Advisor give testimony before the Senate in the impeachment trial?

I have another question. This question is one for eternity.

Knowing that the hands of history are writing your legacy, knowing that future generations, that your grandchildren, that the people who will look to you for leadership will read what the hands of history will record, knowing that history will afford you the opportunity to be on the right side, the right side of history, how can you possibly decide that you will conduct yourself in a trial for the ages such that history will record that you were on the wrong side of history?

My dear friends, this is bigger than you. It is bigger than all of us. This is about the country we love and government we have.

We have a great opportunity to do justice in the Senate, and the only way we can do justice is to have witnesses testify.

I said before that I believe that there would be 51 Senators who would vote to have witnesses. Today, I am absolutely confident that there will be 51 or more Senators who will move to have witnesses present themselves and give testimony. To do otherwise would allow the greatest country in the world to have history record that, when we had the opportunity to stand up for the Constitution, some of us turned our backs and looked the other way.

This is your time, Senate. This is your time, Members of the great deliberative body. I beg that you will do what you must and have witnesses present themselves so that we will have history record that we did the right and just thing.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CARSON of Indiana). Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair, not to a perceived viewing audience.

NAVIGABLE WATERS PROTECTION RULE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, last week, I had the pleasure of joining the Environmental Protection Agency and the Army Corps of Engineers in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, for an event announcing NWP, or the Navigable Waters Protection Rule, a rule that will replace the flawed 2015 WOTUS, Waters of the United States rule.

For decades, there has been confusion and never-ending litigation over WOTUS. During my time as chairman of the House Agriculture Committee's Conservation and Forestry Subcommittee, which included watersheds and oversees environmental policy regarding agriculture, I heard from many farmers and ranchers, landowners, and environmental advocates about just how harmful WOTUS was to their businesses and to their way of life.

WOTUS was a gross overreach and particularly dangerous for the agriculture industry, as vast new areas of farmlands would be subject to the Clean Water Act and costly new permitting mandates for the very first time, even beyond our farms and ranches. Anyone who owned any property, private property rights would be

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H571

regulated. Ninety-nine percent of Pennsylvania was swept under these overreaching WOTUS regulations.

In addition to taking away States' authority to manage water resources, the 2015 WOTUS rule expanded the Clean Water Act far beyond the law's historical limits of navigable waters and the long-held intent of Congress. Instead of providing much-needed clarity to the Clean Water Act, WOTUS created even more confusion.

Thankfully, the negative impact of WOTUS was brought to an end when the Trump administration repealed it this past fall.

I support the Clean Water Act, and I agree that it must be clarified. However, this must be done without undue burdens on farmers, landowners, private property owners, and commercial activities that are already effectively regulated by the States.

Times have been very tough over the past decade for many farmers in rural areas. An average farm income was nearly halved during that period. Regulatory uncertainty—notably, the former WOTUS rule—only made things more difficult.

I am confident, however, that the new Navigable Waters Protection Rule is a step in the right direction and will address many of the regulatory gray areas that WOTUS did not. This new rule clearly defines four commonsense categories of Federal waters that would be regulated, while providing clarity on what is not regulated. This includes ditches, isolated ponds, and prior converted croplands.

The Navigable Waters Protection Rule will still support strong water protections without compromising the rights of States and without unnecessary burdens to the agriculture industry.

With clearly defined State and Federal regulations, our Nation's farmers can continue to focus on what they provide all of us: food, fiber, building materials, and energy that we all rely upon.

HONORING THE GREENSBORO FOUR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleague from North Carolina, Congresswoman ALMA ADAMS, as we introduce a resolution recognizing the significance of the Greensboro Four sit-in protest which took place on February 1, 1960, 60 years ago.

The Greensboro, North Carolina, sit-in was a civil rights protest that commenced when four young African American college students staged a sit-in at the segregated lunch counter of F. W. Woolworth department store in Greensboro. They refused to leave after being denied service only because of their race.

The four young men—Ezell Blair, Jr.; David Richmond; Franklin McCain; and Joseph McNeil—were students from North Carolina A&T College, now known as North Carolina A&T State University. I might add that A&T State University is now the largest HBCU in the country.

Mr. Speaker, I would also mention that Congresswoman ALMA ADAMS is a graduate of A&T State University and served as a college professor across the street at Bennett College for more than 40 years.

The Greensboro Four students were influenced by the unanimous Supreme Court decision in *Brown v. Board of Education*, 1954, wherein the Court ruled that State laws establishing racial segregation in public schools are unconstitutional even if the segregated schools are otherwise equal.

The students were also influenced by the Supreme Court decision in *Keys v. Carolina Coach Company*, 1955, wherein, the Court broke with its historic adherence to the *Plessy v. Ferguson* separate but equal doctrine and interpreted the Interstate Commerce Act as banning the segregation of Black passengers on buses traveling across State lines. The *Keys* case originated at the bus station in Roanoke Rapids, North Carolina, located in the heart of my congressional district.

The *Keys* ruling was announced 6 days prior to Rosa Parks' refusal to move from her seat on a segregated bus in Montgomery. And without question, the Rosa Parks Montgomery bus boycott, lasting 381 days, also inspired the Greensboro Four students.

The students were also inspired to act following the 1955 brutal lynching of Emmett Till after he was accused of offending a White woman in a Mississippi grocery store.

These four college students blazed a trail that ignited a movement to challenge racial segregation in public facilities throughout the segregated South. The sit-in movement soon spread to college towns throughout the South.

The Greensboro Four sit-ins contributed greatly to the civil rights movement and served as a catalyst for the mobilization of college students in the movement, evolving into the formation of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, which was founded in Raleigh, North Carolina, in April 1960. Some of the organizers of SNCC were Congressman JOHN LEWIS, Congressman JIM CLYBURN, and Diane Nash.

Nationwide participation in this new movement included over 700,000 people, including students, clergymen, and unified citizens, both Black and White. Many of the protestors, more than 3,000, were arrested for trespassing, disorderly conduct, or disturbing the peace.

However, the Greensboro Four remained peaceful throughout the 6-month sit-in, and their actions made an immediate and lasting impact, forc-

ing Woolworth's and other establishments to change their discriminatory policies. On July 26, 1960, the Woolworth's lunch counter was finally integrated. Today, the former Woolworth's now houses the International Civil Rights Center and Museum, which features a restored version of the lunch counter where the Greensboro Four sat. Part of the original counter is on display at the Smithsonian National Museum of American History here in Washington.

On Saturday of this week, February 1, the museum will commemorate the 60th anniversary of this historic event at the Greensboro Coliseum. Past award recipients have been numerous. They include Oprah Winfrey; Jesse Jackson, Sr.; President Nelson Mandela; and many, many others.

The award recipients this year will be: President Barack Obama, the Reverend Al Sharpton, Danny Glover, Mrs. Clayola Brown, Reverend Cardes Brown, Dr. Linda Brown, and Mrs. Emma Washington.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution that Ms. ADAMS and I introduce seeks to encourage all of the States to include in their educational curriculum the history and contributions of the Greensboro Four. It is imperative that we learn the lessons from the past and reaffirm that the ethnic and racial diversity of our country enriches our Nation.

We are always stronger together. We must never forget, in all things, to demand justice and equality for all.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the Greensboro Four. I congratulate the International Museum, and I look forward to participating in the great gala they will have this weekend in Greensboro.

NAVIGABLE WATERS PROTECTION RULE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend President Trump for providing much-needed relief and regulatory clarity through the enactment of the Navigable Waters Protection Rule.

Under the Obama administration, in an era rife with government overreach and constricting regulations, our Nation's hardworking farmers were subjected to regulations—specifically, under the Waters of the United States rule—that impeded on their businesses and their livelihoods.

Instead of enacting meaningful environmental protections and returning power back to State, local, and municipal governments, WOTUS put government overreach in the express lane. Farmers were forced to hire expensive attorneys to define which bodies of water on their properties were subject to Federal regulations.

The most concerning part is that bodies of water such as small ponds,