

BIPARTISAN INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS IN SAN DIEGO

(Ms. JACOBS of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACOBS of California. Madam Speaker, our constituents sent us here to deliver for them, and the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law is delivering for San Diego.

Recently, the Department of Transportation announced that \$24 million has been allocated to the San Diego International Airport, supporting tourism for our international city and helping our economy recover.

But it is not just the airport. \$4.8 billion in highway funding has been allocated to California already, the first of more than \$29 billion in road and bridge funding coming to our State.

Last week, I visited sites in my district, in El Cerrito, Kensington, and Talmadge, where neighborhood roads were cracked, crumbling, and in need of repair.

I have spoken with constituents, local officials, and small business owners in La Mesa and El Cajon about the importance of transit, walkability, and broadband because this may be the largest infrastructure bill since Eisenhower, but it is also one that is focused on the needs of the 21st century.

Connecting people by roads, transit, and high-speed internet can help us cross divides and expand opportunity. And it makes our society fairer, more sustainable, and more equitable.

PROTECT THE RIGHT TO VOTE

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

Ms. BROWN of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I rise today to join President Biden and my colleagues in Congress in calling for action, long-overdue action, to protect the right to vote.

President Biden delivered a powerful speech this week in Georgia, and I am hopeful that this stiffened the spines of some of those here in the Capitol. I know that I want to live in the America of John Lewis, not Bull Connor, and the America of Dr. King, not George Wallace.

Today, I was proud to vote for the vital legislation to protect the essential right to vote. Now the Senate must act, using all available means.

The filibuster is not a law and it is not in the Constitution. It is a tradition that has been misused throughout history to deny civil and voting rights, and it is being used again today. What is in the Constitution? The right to vote.

Ahead of Dr. Martin Luther King Day, it is time to honor those who came before us to secure the America that we live in today. The eyes of history are upon us. We cannot let this moment pass us by.

INFRASTRUCTURE CREATES JOBS

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

Ms. UNDERWOOD. Madam Speaker, every American deserves the opportunities that a good-paying job makes possible.

Working with the Biden-Harris administration, Democrats in Congress have expanded those opportunities. Thanks to investments like the American Rescue Plan and the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law, job creation is at record levels. The Bipartisan Infrastructure Law will create millions more good-paying, union jobs.

Not only will it rebuild our roads and bridges, but it also invests in infrastructure that will spur economic development in our communities.

Removing lead pipes and guaranteeing clean drinking water for 10 million more Americans will improve community health and help attract new companies that will bring jobs and investments. So will expanding reliable broadband and modernizing regional airports like the DeKalb Taylor Municipal Airport in my district.

Finally, expanding our electric vehicle charging network will give Americans more options when choosing a new car, while accelerating climate action.

I am so proud to work with the Biden-Harris administration to rebuild infrastructure for Illinois families, and we are just getting started.

HONORING THE LIFE OF DR. MARGARET HILL

(Mr. AGUILAR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. AGUILAR. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the extraordinary life of Dr. Margaret Hill, who passed away peacefully last month at the age of 81. She was, for many who knew her, the heartbeat of San Bernardino.

For 50 years, she devoted herself to ensuring all children have access to high-quality education. In 1971, she began as a high school teacher, and would go on to serve as principal, assistant superintendent for San Bernardino County, an adjunct professor and, finally, the last decade, when I have known her more as a school board member for San Bernardino City Unified.

Through all her roles, Dr. Hill never wavered in her devotion to the children of our community. Her warmth, her wisdom, and her kind spirit will be missed, but her legacy lives on in the countless lives that she touched in the classroom and in the community.

It was a privilege to know her, Madam Speaker. May she rest in peace.

COMMUNICATION FROM CHAIR OF COMMITTEE ON ETHICS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. MANNING) laid before the House the fol-

lowing communication from the chair of the Committee on Ethics:

COMMITTEE ON ETHICS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
January 10, 2022.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER PELOSI: On November 4, 2021, the Committee on Ethics (Committee) received notices of two fines imposed upon Representative Andrew Clyde by the Sergeant at Arms pursuant to House Resolution 38 and House Rule II, clause 3(g).

On November 8, 2021, the Committee received notice of a fine imposed upon Representative Clyde by the Sergeant at Arms pursuant to House Resolution 38 and House Rule II, clause 3(g).

On November 9, 2021, the Committee received notice of a fine imposed upon Representative Clyde by the Sergeant at Arms pursuant to House Resolution 38 and House Rule II, clause 3(g).

On November 18, 2021, the Committee received notices of two fines imposed upon Representative Clyde by the Sergeant at Arms pursuant to House Resolution 38 and House Rule II, clause 3(g).

On November 30, 2021, the Committee received notice of a fine imposed upon Representative Clyde by the Sergeant at Arms pursuant to House Resolution 38 and House Rule II, clause 3(g).

On November 30, 2021, the Committee received an appeal from Representative Clyde of the above fines pursuant to House Resolution 38 and House Rule II, clause 3(g). The appeal was received after the Committee adopted its written rules.

A majority of the Committee did not agree to the appeal.

On December 3, 2021, the Committee received notices of three fines imposed upon Representative Clyde by the Sergeant at Arms pursuant to House Resolution 38 and House Rule II, clause 3(g). Representative Clyde did not file appeals with the Committee prior to the expiration of the time period specified in clause 3(g)(3)(B) of House Rule II.

Sincerely,

THEODORE E. DEUTCH,
Chairman.
JACKIE WALORSKI,
Ranking Member.

□ 1245

COMMUNICATION FROM CHAIR OF COMMITTEE ON ETHICS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the chair of the Committee on Ethics:

COMMITTEE ON ETHICS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
January 10, 2022.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER PELOSI: On November 30, 2021, the Committee on Ethics (Committee) received notice of a fine imposed upon Representative Mariannette Miller-Meeks by the Sergeant at Arms pursuant to House Resolution 38 and House Rule II, clause 3(g). Representative Miller-Meeks did not file an appeal with the Committee prior to the expiration of the time period specified in clause 3(g)(3)(B) of House Rule II.

Sincerely,

THEODORE E. DEUTCH,
Chairman.
JACKIE WALORSKI,
Ranking Member.

COMMUNICATION FROM CHAIR OF COMMITTEE ON ETHICS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the chair of the Committee on Ethics:

COMMITTEE ON ETHICS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
January 10, 2022.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker, Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER PELOSI: On November 30, 2021, the Committee on Ethics (Committee) received notice of a fine imposed upon Representative Lauren Boebert by the Sergeant at Arms pursuant to House Resolution 38 and House Rule II, clause 3(g). Representative Boebert did not file an appeal with the Committee prior to the expiration of the time period specified in clause 3(g)(3)(B) of House Rule II.

Sincerely,

THEODORE E. DEUTCH,
Chairman.
JACKIE WALORSKI,
Ranking Member.

COMMUNICATION FROM CHAIR OF COMMITTEE ON ETHICS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the chair of the Committee on Ethics:

COMMITTEE ON ETHICS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
January 10, 2022.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker, Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER PELOSI: On November 30, 2021, the Committee on Ethics (Committee) received notice of a fine imposed upon Representative Marjorie Taylor Greene by the Sergeant at Arms pursuant to House Resolution 38 and House Rule II, clause 3(g). Representative Greene did not file an appeal with the Committee prior to the expiration of the time period specified in clause 3(g)(3)(B) of House Rule II.

On December 3, 2021, the Committee received notice of a fine imposed upon Representative Greene by the Sergeant at Arms pursuant to House Resolution 38 and House Rule II, clause 3(g). Representative Greene did not file an appeal with the Committee prior to the expiration of the time period specified in clause 3(g)(3)(B) of House Rule II.

Sincerely,

JACKIE WALORSKI,
Ranking Member.

THOSE WHO CANNOT REMEMBER HISTORY ARE CONDEMNED TO REPEAT IT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2021, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CLYBURN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of my Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLYBURN. Madam Speaker, I first got interested in and started studying history as an 8-year-old. I grew up in a parsonage where my brothers and I were required, every morning before breakfast, to recite a Bible verse and, every evening before retiring to bed, we had to share with our parents a current event.

We didn't have television. Therefore, in order to carry out that rule, we had to read the newspapers. It was delivered to our home every afternoon. Today, those who are living down in my hometown of Sumter, you get the Sumter Daily Item in the morning. Back then it was an afternoon paper.

It was my interest in the Presidential campaign of Harry Truman that attracted me to politics. Harry Truman ascended to the Presidency from the Vice Presidency. Of course, no one gave him a chance to get elected on his own. He did not have, according to conventional wisdom, what it took, and he was going to be up against this scion, this big-time prosecutor from New York, Thomas Dewey.

In fact, one Chicago newspaper was so assured of the outcome, they didn't bother to wait on the results to write the headlines for their newspapers the day after the election. All of us remember that headline: "Dewey Wins." When the votes were counted, all the votes were counted, Truman had been elected President.

That always intrigued me, this man of limited educational background, a disability, without any of all of the trappings of what would make one a big-time leader. Of course, when Truman left office, he was not very popular with a lot of people. In fact, his popularity was pretty low.

But as we look back on history, and people continue to write about history, they keep upgrading Truman. Most places I see now, he is in the top ten. In my opinion, he is in the top five. I consider myself, to this day, a Truman Democrat.

After studying history, I went on to teach it. I became a firm believer in George Santayana's admonition that those who cannot remember history—of course, he said "the past"—are condemned to repeat it. That is what brings me to this floor today.

It has been a long, long time since I have stayed here on what we call get-away day to address this body during what we call Special Orders.

I listened intently today as we debated the legislation that was a vehicle by which we would send two pieces of legislation: The Freedom to Vote Act, a bill that was proposed by Senator JOE MANCHIN, and the John R. Lewis Voting Rights Advancement Act, a bill that this body approved and sent over to the Senate as H.R. 4. Upon John Lewis' death, I came to this floor and asked and received unanimous consent to change the name of H.R. 4, to rename it in honor of John Lewis, and this body granted unanimous consent for that to happen.

Now, John Lewis and I first met as 19-year-old college students. I was in Orangeburg, South Carolina. He was down in Nashville, Tennessee. We met on the campus of Morehouse College, where the Vice President was on the day before yesterday, I think it was. It was also the weekend when I first met Martin Luther King, Jr.

Now, as is often the case—and we saw quite a bit of it today—a disagreement cropped up between us so-called Young Turks, those of us who were in SNCC, the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee—in fact, this was the second organizational meeting of SNCC—and SCLC, which was being run by Martin Luther King, Jr., Ralph Abernathy, and others.

We asked Dr. King to come and meet with us so we could try to reconcile our differences. Dr. King came and agreed to a 1-hour meeting. That meeting convened at 10 p.m. in the evening. It was not over until 4 a.m. the next morning. I always refer to that evening and that meeting as my Saul-to-Paul transformation. I came out of that meeting a changed man—well, I guess, boy. I have never been the same.

I started reading everything I could about Dr. King. I went back to my campus, and I got his book, his first book, "Stride Toward Freedom," and, of course, all the way down through his last book, "Where Do We Go from Here: Chaos or Community."

I interacted with him several times over the years. After the 1965 Voting Rights Act, one of Dr. King's first trips was to the little town of Kingstree, South Carolina, a rural town in Williamsburg County that is currently in my district. When he came that day, he came to talk to us about all the marches we were having. I was living in Charleston at the time. My late wife and I got in our little Falcon and drove to Kingstree to be a part of that meeting.

Dr. King talked that day about marching. We had marched to integrate lunch counters. We had marched to get off the back of the bus. We had marched for a lot of social things. But he said to us on that day: It is time to march to the ballot boxes. He put a new definition on what marching was all about. I remember that day as if it were yesterday.

In fact, not long ago, the local community decided to have a 50th anniversary celebration of that event and called me and asked would I attend. I told them I would be glad to attend.

□ 1300

Of course, I later got a phone call from a reporter who asked me what I was going to say at this 50th anniversary. I told the reporter, I said: Well, I think I will reminisce a little bit about that day and the speech he gave.

And he says: Well, did you see it on television? How do you know about the speech?

I said: I was there.