

Except we saw some of the boards that if we are borrowing \$2.5 trillion a year, and I get \$1.7 trillion over 10, so it is about \$170 billion of tax receipts by getting rid of all deductions. This is a Democrat proposal. It is real money, but it is nothing. It is just still almost nothing compared to the scale of the borrowing. Remember, Mr. Speaker, we borrowed \$2 trillion in the last 12 months.

Let's take another proposal here. Raise the FICA cap. Just get rid of the cap. Maybe this is the part of this that we should have a debate over, but don't think it solves all the problems. It is more complicated.

What breaks my heart is I actually think letting the Social Security trust fund run out of money is immoral on all of our parts, but we are terrified to talk about it, Mr. Speaker, because you will lose your election if you do. I am an idiot. I talk about it.

Mr. Speaker, if you get rid of the FICA cap, then, over the 10 years, it produces \$2.18 trillion. It doesn't get you there. I think if you remove the caps and you can keep the current benefit formula, Mr. Speaker, then it takes care of only 19 percent of the shortfall.

We have to decide. We are going to be taxed on every dime with the 15.3 percent FICA tax, and if we are going to give people the same formula of benefits, then we are only covering about 19 percent of the shortfall, but that is one of the big talking points on the left, to raise the cap. Okay, but don't pretend it actually takes care of the problem of saving Social Security.

In 2022, tax revenues were \$1 trillion of prepandemic levels. Now, understand, Mr. Speaker, there is a lot of pandemic spending in this and those things, but do understand, it is \$1 trillion. We went from \$3.7 trillion to \$4.8 trillion, a trillion-dollar growth. It is like 20 percent, 25 percent growth in tax receipts prepandemic to postpandemic, yet somehow we are still burning through it.

Go back to a couple of the other proposals, Mr. Speaker.

How about a 50 percent income tax rate on everyone earning \$200,000 and up? Take everyone \$200,000 and up, and we get a 50 percent Federal income tax. Now, on top of that, put on FICA and put on State and local taxes. We are basically \$1.59 trillion, or 0.45 percent of the economy, in additional taxes.

We are heading toward a time when we are going to be borrowing 7½ percent. That is CBO's number. That is the most conservative number, 7, let's call it 7½ percent, and this does less than half a percent going to 50 percent income tax rate on everyone over \$200,000.

We can't pretend that raising these taxes gets us close to the numbers that are necessary.

I have a couple of more boards, and then I will shut up.

Taxing 100 percent of all income over \$500,000 would balance the budget over

the decade. I can show you a dozen Members who have said those things behind these microphones, that we just need to take those rich people making \$500,000 and up and just tax everything additional. It would raise about 5.1 percent of the economy, assuming we don't slow the economy down.

Remember, Mr. Speaker, these are static scores. They are not dynamic. If we take everyone who makes over one-half a million dollars, fine, take every dime of income, and then pretend the economy does not crash on us and does not slow down. The economy stays the same, and then we get about 5.1 percent of the economy in taxes. We are borrowing 7½, so you closed a bunch of the gap.

It is also fantasy that we didn't just blow up the economy.

Let's do a couple of the other fantasies. Raise corporate income tax from 21 percent to 35 percent. Okay, we get \$1.39 trillion over 10, so we get about another \$130 billion a year.

Did I mention we borrowed \$2 trillion in the last 12 months?

However, we could go to a 35 percent corporate income tax and make us not competitive in the world. Remember, Mr. Speaker, corporate income taxes are just passed to you as the consumer, but it makes us feel better.

We have lists of the different proposals our brothers and sisters on the left have given, and maybe there is a need for fixing parts of the tax code. I believe tax codes are living documents because we have to compete with the rest of the world, which is also always changing, but living in the fantasy world that just raising a handful of these taxes gets us anywhere is just not true.

Just as we have some people on our side say that if we get rid of foreign aid, then we can balance the budget. That is 12 days of borrowing.

We have to have our brothers and sisters on the other side stop pretending that if we just tax rich people more, then we will balance the budget.

It is not true. We all know it is not true.

Do we care so much more about not telling our voters the truth because they might not love us anymore? Guess what, Mr. Speaker? They don't love us anyway.

The math is the math. We have a demographic problem in this country. Take a look at where we are at, Mr. Speaker. Think of that. The Social Security trust fund at the end of last year, the very end of last year, held \$2.7 trillion, and that is gone in, functionally, 9 years. This helps us understand the burn rate.

Seventy-five percent of what goes out in Social Security is functionally what comes in on the FICA tax. The 25 percent is what goes out from the trust fund, and that 25 percent is going to chew up \$2.7 trillion over the next 9 years.

Most of these trust funds are gone by the end of this decade. What do we plan to do?

Mr. Speaker, typically, when I do these, I try to come to the end and talk about what we can do with diabetes and obesity and making our society healthier and the effects that would have on balancing the budget, but I have just grown so weary of doing these presentations to show the crashing of our window of opportunity, the scale of the growth of debt.

Remember, Mr. Speaker, we borrowed \$63,000 per second in the last 12 months, and then we get these idiots who say we can just raise this guy's taxes, and we will be fine.

It may make you feel better, Mr. Speaker. You may not like people to earn money. You are allowed to do that but don't pretend it actually solves the problems.

Complex problems require complex solutions, Mr. Speaker, and I worry this place isn't capable of complexity anymore.

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

SUPREME COURT DECISION ON AFFIRMATIVE ACTION WILL HAVE DEVASTATING EFFECTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 9, 2023, the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. CHERFILUS-McCORMICK) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. CHERFILUS-McCORMICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include any extraneous material on the subject of this Special Order hour.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mrs. CHERFILUS-McCORMICK. Mr. Speaker, it is with great honor that I rise today to coanchor this CBC Special Order hour along with my distinguished colleague, Representative JACKSON.

For the next 60 minutes, members of the CBC have an opportunity to speak directly to the American people on affirmative action, an issue of great importance to the Congressional Black Caucus, Congress, the constituents we represent, and all Americans.

I rise today in the wake of the consequential U.S. Supreme Court decision on affirmative action, which will have devastating ripple effects and exacerbate inequities for years to come.

I am a Congresswoman, but one of my other most important jobs is being a mother to two amazing college students. Supporting our children through their admissions process was a frank reminder of my own personal journey. I remembered the blanket of anxiety I experienced when pondering my options for higher education.

Even with excellent grades, would the pronunciation of my last name work against me?

Would someone see my volunteer work and judge keywords such as Urban League of Broward County or Black student union?

Would I be accepted? Would I be enough?

Last month, SCOTUS delivered a crushing and unnecessary setback to the promise of higher education and its ability to provide economic mobility to communities of color. I could not stop thinking about every high school senior who is now worried that they won't have a fair chance to go to college and who fears they won't have the same shot at the American Dream.

As Americans, we are better than this. We must live up to the ideals of this Nation. We cannot ignore the invisible advantages embedded in our society. The alternative to so-called neutral indicators of merit, like standardized test scores and extracurricular activities, are far from neutral. They are often influenced by unfair and devastating disadvantages that fall along racial lines.

Here is what I know for sure: the grit and grind ingrained in the heart of one who has to push twice as hard for many Black students and minorities who are trying to actually raise the bar for their families and for their communities and who don't have access to legacy networks or rich family members who are donors.

We must fight so that every student, regardless of their race, has an equal opportunity for higher education.

Let me be clear. We will not stand by silently as extremists attempt to turn back the clock on civil rights. We must live up to the ideals of equality in our country. We must have the congressional body and the Supreme Court think about this decision and how it will affect generations to come.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON), my co-anchor.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Honorable Congresswoman SHEILA CHERFILUS-McCORMICK from Florida for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to lend my voice to the chorus of those who are mortified and offended by the recent and misguided Supreme Court decision striking down affirmative action in college admissions.

Today, I stand in unity with the thousands of Black and Brown families I represent in the First Congressional District of Illinois and the millions across this Nation who have personally endured the harsh realities of racism in America and deserve to be respectfully heard on this significant matter.

What the Supreme Court has done flies in the face of what African Americans have been working to achieve in this country for over 250 years.

Black people in America have never asked this country for special treatment, but what we have rightly asked for and demanded is that there be policies put in place that do not intentionally and unrepentantly exclude us

from participating in the benefits of the American Dream.

□ 2015

Affirmative action was not a way for Black people to be given special privileges but was rather a very conservative solution to attempt to atone for the legacy of generational bigotry and systemic injustice.

I dare anybody to justify the logic that would compel someone to believe that giving people who have been excluded from the game an opportunity to get on the field is somehow racist or an affront to White people.

If the game were fair, we wouldn't need affirmative action in America. If the rules were transparent, we would not need affirmative action in America. And if the playing field was even, and everybody was judged by their character and merit, we would not need affirmative action in America.

But when has this ever been the case? And it is not the case today. There has never been a time in this Nation when favoritism didn't tip the scales at the expense of other equally deserving individuals.

You see, this formation of the middle class in the United States is not a tale of self-made success alone, but a story profoundly influenced by government policy.

It is a narrative indelibly marked by historical reality: The U.S. Government, through a combination of Federal programs, played a pivotal role in creating an exclusively White middle class.

Beginning with the Homestead Act, followed by the G.I. Bill, and the provisions of the Federal Housing Administration and VA loans, a triad of Federal programs was established. These programs were instrumental in allowing Whites to extricate themselves from poverty and achieve a modicum of the American Dream. It is crucial to understand that middle class White Americans did not solely pull themselves up by their bootstraps. The G.I. Bill emerged as an historic opportunity for wealth creation, unprecedented in world history.

Homeownership, once an elusive dream for many, became a reachable goal. Car financing expanded its reach. Higher education became a feasible ambition for a broader population.

The government acknowledged that empowering people to be self-reliant is not the same as bestowing unearned advantages. These programs systematically excluded African Americans from reaping the legal benefits that they had rightfully earned through their military service and their ancestors' enslavement. Thus, while these programs shaped a burgeoning White middle class, they simultaneously perpetuated an insidious racial wealth gap.

During our previous Memorial Day commemoration, I stood here and recounted the stark reality of how earlier administrations diligently undermined the legal rights of Black vet-

erans. The number of Black individuals granted land or qualifying for the Homestead Act was woefully low, even though their ancestors were promised 40 acres and a mule—a promise explicitly made, endorsed by the full faith and credit of the United States of America, yet a promise unfulfilled.

While Black Americans descended deeper into poverty, the White middle class began to flourish.

Now the Supreme Court would like us to believe that after 50 years of trying to level the playing field, that somehow miraculously and fundamentally our Nation has been transformed. The Supreme Court would like for us to believe that what took 300 years to destroy has now been completely resurrected in 50 years.

Show me a single instance where reconstruction outpaces destruction. To make matters worse, the Supreme Court used the 14th Amendment, an amendment that was designed to ensure equality, to strike down a Federal program that permitted race as an acceptable consideration for admission opportunities.

Does anyone else perceive the irony?

The very amendment utilized to reach this flawed decision was designed to incorporate race as a lasting constitutional consideration at every level of American life.

How can one justify using a law created to safeguard a certain race as the basis for undermining fundamental aspects of their protection?

But what this decision shows us is that conservative members of the Supreme Court are not strict constructionists, as they would like us to believe. What this decision shows us is that the Supreme Court doesn't actually believe in the furtherance of a meritocracy in America. We know this because while the Court eliminated race as a viable consideration, it did not, however, do anything about legacy admissions.

According to Forbes Magazine, approximately 42 percent of the applicants accepted into Harvard University, our Nation's oldest private institution, founded in 1636, were donor-related applicants, while another 34 percent of the admissions were legacy.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask my colleagues on the other side to explain to me how this qualifies as meritocracy.

Plainly stated, it does not. If you are wealthy, if your family has a legacy of attending a certain school, you will be given favorable attention with respect to the consideration of your application.

What the Supreme Court has told us is that money and nepotism are completely acceptable for choosing who should be educated at the selective enrollment universities.

The Supreme Court would have us believe that racism has ended, and everybody is equal. However, if you are fortunate to come from wealth and your family has a tradition of attending a specific school, you can receive preferential treatment.

This was not a decision based upon precedent. This was not a decision based upon history. Nor was this decision rooted in the current realities of America. Yet, we will not be deterred by this setback. We will not quietly allow the victories of our past to fade into the obscurity of the night or let the spark of our conviction be extinguished.

We refuse to watch helplessly as the new America, the America that Dr. Martin Luther dreamed of and indeed gave his life to birth, becomes threatened.

The scales of justice have tipped in favor of those with privilege for too long. It is high time we redress this imbalance.

Mr. Speaker, I implore my colleagues: Let us rise to the occasion. It is not enough to express outrage; we must challenge it into action. Let us wield the power vested in us by the people to enact legislation that ensures liberty, justice, and equal access to education for all.

This is not an insurmountable task, but a duty we owe to our constituents, and indeed, to the generations to come after us. Let us strive to create an America that truly stands as a beacon of justice and equality, an America that fulfills its promise to all of its citizens, not just a privileged few.

Only then can we truly say that we have honored the legacy of those who fought for equality and justice before us. Only then can we ensure that their struggle was not in vain. Only then can we look into the eyes of our children and promise them a brighter and fairer future. This is about the kind of Nation we want to be and the kind of future we want to leave for those who come after us.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today as both a representative of the people and a humble servant in the enduring journey toward equality, justice, and civil rights.

Today, I stand in this chamber, in the aftermath of the Supreme Court's decision on overturning affirmative action, a fundamental pillar of our relentless pursuit of racial equity.

Over a century ago, on this very day in 1905, an assembly took place near the precipice of Niagara Falls, Ontario. But it wasn't convened to marvel at the natural wonder of Niagara Falls. Instead, it was driven by the pressing issue of civil rights for all, irrespective of skin color.

This assembly was led by none other than W.E.B. Du Bois and the esteemed journalist William Monroe Trotter. The group of more than 50 African American men gathered on the Canadian side of the falls after a white hotel proprietor refused them lodging. Their meeting birthed the Niagara Movement, the precursor to the enduring organization we know today as the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, or the NAACP.

The members of the Niagara Movement developed a Declaration of Principles. This declaration called for "every single right that belongs to a freeborn American, political, civil and social," and they vowed that "until we get these rights we will never cease to protest and assail the ears of America."

Today, the words in the Declaration of Principles resonate with even more urgency in the wake of the Supreme Court's recent decision on affirmative action. Three principles outlined in the declaration particularly underline the issue at hand:

First, Economic Opportunity: The Niagara Movement members decried the denial of equal opportunities, particularly in economic life. They understood as we do today, that systemic discrimination in the economic sphere can amount to a form of modern peonage, crushing the aspirations and potentials of minority communities.

Second, Education: The Niagara Movement championed universal and compulsory common school education, and access to high school training for all, and opposed the monopolization of college training by any class or race. They pushed for federal education aid, particularly in the South, and an increase in public high school facilities. They advocated for trade and technical schools for training artisans, emphasizing the necessity of higher education. These principles echo the aims of affirmative action—to level the playing field, ensuring that every American, regardless of race or class, has access to the same opportunities.

Third, the Courts: The Niagara Movement called for upright judges in courts, the abolition of color-based jury selection, equal punishment, and equal reform efforts for both black and white offenders. Now, we find ourselves in a moment when these principles seem to reverberate with even more urgency, as our Supreme Court appears to have lost its compass with a conservative-leaning and recent scandals of corruption. This decision on affirmative action serves as a sobering reminder of our Nation's ongoing struggle for racial justice and equality, and the urgent need for our institutions to uphold the very principles our Nation was built upon.

Rather than surrender to this setback, we must draw strength from our past and press forward. We must reaffirm our commitment to equality, continue our struggle for justice, and remember that the purpose of affirmative action always has been, and must remain, to mitigate the disadvantages that systemic discrimination imposes on our citizens. The quest for equal opportunities for everyone, regardless of their race, is a battle that we must not abandon.

Indeed, our fight is formidable, and the road to equality can often seem daunting. But as we stand here today, honoring our past, we must remember—we are not the first to undertake this mission, and we certainly won't be the last. The struggle for civil rights, equality, and justice, represents our collective pursuit to form a more perfect union.

Let us find fortitude in our history and the legacy of movements and individuals that fought before us. From the courageous voices of the Niagara Movement and the NAACP to pioneers like W.E.B. DuBois and William Monroe Trotter, we find our inspiration. Armed with their legacy, let's continue their work, imbued with hope and resilience, to ensure our journey toward justice remains unyielding.

Mrs. CHERFILUS-McCORMICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), my colleague from Virginia's Third District.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

I also thank her and the gentleman from Illinois for talking about the importance for opportunity and a recognition of the history of discrimination in the United States.

The Supreme Court has long held that our Nation has a compelling interest in creating racially diverse college campuses.

Holistic college admissions practices that narrowly tailor the use of race as one of many factors in evaluating prospective students are a key to fostering such diversity in a college campus environment.

Such admissions policies not only help the historically underserved students, research confirms that diverse campuses also provide all students with a better quality, well-rounded education.

Last month, the Supreme Court decided, with little regard for precedent, that Harvard's and the University of North Carolina's pursuit of these compelling interests is unconstitutional.

Regrettably, the Supreme Court's decision is a setback in our effort to eliminate invidious disparities in access to higher education and an effort to ensure diverse learning environments for all students.

Now that it is done, it is imperative that we review all other facets of college admissions that research shows may be racially discriminatory and have a disparate impact and determine if they, too, need to be eliminated, given this ruling.

Now, there are admissions factors to take into consideration: Racially inequitable K-12 schooling opportunities, racially biased admissions tests, the legacy admissions that have been mentioned, and other factors that may have a discriminatory impact.

Now, race-conscious affirmative action provides a counterbalance to these discriminatory practices, but since the Court has invalidated that balance, we must now review all current admissions practices to see if they, too, have disparate impact so that we can see whether or not they are in violation of the Equal Protection Clause or Title VI of the Civil Rights Act.

To facilitate that review, we must pass the Equity and Inclusion Enforcement Act. This bill that has been pending for several years would hold federally funded programs, including schools, accountable for providing students with equal access to education by restoring a private right of action for students and parents to bring disparate impact claims under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act.

Because of a Supreme Court's interpretation about 20 years ago, there is no longer a private right of action in Title VI cases. Those cases based on disparate impact must be brought by the Federal Government. So if there is discrimination going on, the Federal Government has to run around the country and find it. If it is going on in your community and you know it, you can't bring that individual case.

Mr. Speaker, Justice Sotomayor said it best in her dissent when she said that: "Ignoring race will not equalize a society that is racially unequal. What was true in the 1860s, and again in 1954, is true today: Equality requires acknowledgment of inequality."

Mrs. CHERFILUS-McCORMICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE), my colleague.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Florida for giving me the opportunity to speak on this issue tonight, and I also thank my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss the U.S. Supreme Court's horrible decision to reject affirmative action in college admissions.

Last month, the Court ruled that affirmative action programs and college admissions violated the Equal Protection Clause of the 14th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, but that ruling opposes decades of Supreme Court decisions that said just the opposite. They said that the use of race as an admissions factor was consistent with the 14th Amendment.

In 1978, the Court said that institutions of higher learning had the right to pursue a diverse student body to advance academic freedom, and they could consider race as a factor to evaluate college applications if it was one of many factors.

In 2003, the Court reaffirmed this ruling because student diversity is a compelling interest in education. In addition, these policies helped counter the historical racism that denied educational opportunities to African Americans and other minorities, and it was working.

In public universities nationwide, minority enrollment increased when race was one factor of admissions. These minority students equaled or exceeded the successes of their White peers in a variety of academic fields when they graduated.

Today, these policies help foster a rich and diverse environment for all Americans in higher education, and they help minority students secure higher paying jobs in STEM fields such as engineering and science.

□ 2030

However, the Supreme Court has decided that this type of equality is bad for America. It wants to reject the fact that race has been a factor in college admissions for decades. Unfortunately, it was used as the only factor to reject candidates and not one of many factors to consider when accepting them.

I am outraged that the Supreme Court has rejected a successful policy that has helped millions of Black and other minority students receive the quality education they deserve.

At one time, they weren't allowed to enter these schools. What was the reason? Was it because of many factors that they could not attend these schools? No. It was one factor—their race.

It is yet another indication of how our country is slowly returning to a time when equal opportunities were not afforded to all Americans. The Court said that race-related admission standards violated the Equal Protection Clause, but where was that Equal Protection Clause during slavery and Jim Crow? Where is that equal protection today in housing, workforce hiring, and voting rights?

Conservative Justices and politicians want to pretend that our country has no racial issues. They are not connected to reality in that thinking.

This decision is yet another roadblock to success for Black Americans in this country, but we have overcome them before, and we will overcome them again. I will continue to fight to help us overcome these roadblocks wherever we find them, and I will not stop until we have racial justice and equality for all Americans in this country.

Mrs. CHERFILUS-McCORMICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOWMAN).

Mr. BOWMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative CHERFILUS-McCORMICK for her leadership and for bringing together the CBC this evening to once again discuss racism in America.

How long are we going to have to have this conversation? It seems like day after day, month after month, year after year, since 1619, we have had to have this conversation in some context.

The Supreme Court's decision, unfortunately, is not surprising because three of our Court Justices were chosen by one of the most, if not the most, racist Presidents in American history, former President Donald Trump. He chose three of the Supreme Court Justices. His slogan is to Make America Great Again, take America back to a time when African Americans did not have the rights that we have fought for and died for throughout American history.

Here we go again. This Supreme Court has now become a Supreme Court that legislates as opposed to a Supreme Court that simply implements the pillars of our Constitution, the same Supreme Court that rolled back *Roe v. Wade* not too long ago, that is now making it easier to carry concealed weapons in Democrat-led States with strong gun laws like New York, the same Supreme Court that says it is okay to turn away LGBTQ customers if you do not want to do work for that particular demographic.

This Supreme Court has gone rogue, and this Supreme Court has lost its legitimacy. Look at the reports: members of the Supreme Court receiving gifts from billionaire donors over the course of their careers, members of the Supreme Court allowing billionaire conservative donors to pay for their children's tuition as they attend private schools.

This is unacceptable. This is unethical. There are members of the Su-

preme Court who should immediately resign or be impeached because of taking these gifts from conservative billionaire donors.

These recent decisions rolling back *Roe v. Wade* and definitely the one as it relates to affirmative action are in alignment with MAGA Republicans and extreme conservative Republicans in our country. Notice the hypocrisy. Notice the disgusting decision to use the 14th Amendment, which was designed to protect the civil rights and citizenship of newly freed slaves. They use that argument to now take away rights from African Americans as it refers to entry into our most prestigious institutions.

This decision is going to prohibit millions of African Americans across this country who are brilliant from receiving the same access and opportunity as their White peers.

I think all of that is captured in this chart behind me when we look at the issue of wealth inequality in America. Look at this chart and the median family wealth gap. The average White family median wealth is \$171,000. Compare that to the average Black family. The median in an average Black family is \$17,409. The average Hispanic family is \$20,920.

It is the consistent attack on Black and Latino communities that contributes to this wealth gap. It is not just the affirmative action decision in terms of the higher education institutions of America. It is also as it relates to employment opportunities, to career opportunities, to private investment in Black and Latino businesses, to the Federal budget, and where our money is allocated toward right here in this body, the United States House of Representatives.

It goes back to the issue of globalization and blue-collar jobs leaving Black and Brown communities as part of a race to the bottom for profit based on low-cost labor in other countries. When those factory jobs left our country and left Black and Latino communities, nothing replaced those jobs. As a matter of fact, I have misspoken. Something did replace those jobs: heroin, the numbers game, and crack cocaine replaced those jobs. Do you know what else replaced those jobs? Law enforcement.

You take away access and opportunity from a jobs perspective, from an economic perspective, from a higher education perspective—also, by the way, because of our support of redlining Black communities, the White middle class in the 1930s and 1940s was able to buy homes at very low interest rates, very low cost, move to the suburbs, out of public housing, and build their wealth. Do you know who was forced to stay in public housing? African Americans and Latinos. Those communities were considered devalued, less valuable because of the race of the people who lived there.

This is historic. This is not just the enslavement of Africans, not just Jim

Crow, not just the Black laws, not just the Homestead Act. This is redlining, the Iran-Contra scandal, and drugs in our community. Now, in 2023, we continue to have these conversations because of the Supreme Court's recent decision.

I am also here to say that to us in the Congressional Black Caucus and to African Americans across this country, these setbacks are only that. They are only setbacks. Each setback makes us stronger, makes us more powerful, makes us more united, and gives us a deeper sense of commitment and self-determination as we work to reclaim our Black sovereignty not just here in America but throughout the African diaspora, in the Caribbean, on the African Continent, and in Central and South America.

We don't die; we multiply. We will continue to multiply exponentially as we weather this storm, grow our enrollment in historically Black colleges—a shout-out to HBCUs for doing the great work that they do so that is going to grow.

We also are going to let our voices be heard as we vote with our feet and go to the polls next year because we have to bring transformational change to the United States of America. We have to build a nation that works for everybody, and right now, we do not have that nation.

I will close with this: The Supreme Court has not only revealed its illegitimacy through receiving gifts from billionaire conservative donors. We have to look at complete Supreme Court reform as it relates to ethics reform and ending lifetime appointments.

We also need to look at the size of the Supreme Court. It is time to expand the Court beyond the nine members. This nine-member Supreme Court has been in place since 1869. America was 30 million people in 1869. It is now 330 million people, over 10 times the size.

There are 7,000 cases presented to the Supreme Court every single year. They hear only 80 of them. They do not have the capacity to respond to the complexity, diversity, and nuance that is American society today.

It is time for democracy reform, and it begins with the Supreme Court. It also begins with the electoral college. It also begins with ending the filibuster. We change all that by voting the right people into office and getting the wrong ones out of office.

Mrs. CHERFILUS-McCORMICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. FOUSHEE).

Mrs. FOUSHEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my esteemed colleague from Florida for her leadership and this opportunity to speak.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues in condemning the Supreme Court's decision to roll back decades of judicial precedents and strike down race-conscious admissions efforts.

Since 1978, the Supreme Court had consistently held that race-based ad-

mission policies in colleges and universities are in the best interest of educational institutions, but this recent radical decision will dismantle efforts to ensure higher education is accessible to all students, further questioning the legitimacy of this politicized Supreme Court, which seems more eager to protect legacy admissions than providing students who are historically disadvantaged with equal opportunity to a quality education.

□ 2045

Diversity makes our Nation stronger, and the repercussions of this decision will be felt for generations.

Members of the Congressional Black Caucus stand united in our fight for a more equitable society, and we will continue to push for equal opportunity admissions for students across this country.

Mrs. CHERFILUS-McCORMICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE), my colleague.

Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Florida for hosting this important topic.

I rise today to call out the corruption and the hypocrisy of this Supreme Court. The affirmative action ruling is a total sham.

Justice Clarence Thomas is good at accepting gifts. One gift he received was the gift of going to Yale Law School, thanks to affirmative action. He said: "God only knows where I would be today" if it were not for affirmative action.

Yet, in this last ruling, he opined that affirmative action was bad for African Americans because if they got into these institutions, they would be unable to thrive.

Elite institutions remain the gateways into government, into big industry, into C-suites. Eight of the nine sitting Justices on this court either attended Yale or Harvard Law School. In fact, three of the Justices on this bench are beneficiaries of affirmative action and have stated it.

Allowing themselves to get into college because of affirmative action, they got on to the bench because of affirmative action. Both Democrat and Republican Presidents considered race when selecting them as nominees for the Supreme Court, appropriately so.

It is about representation. It is about diversity. It is about making sure that all voices are seen and heard. Affirmative action is more than just about admissions. It is also about economic progress. But this ruling has cut generations of students from this critical benefit.

The Court is facing a legitimacy crisis. The Supreme Court is out of step with reality.

In States that have actually banned affirmative action, schools in those States have seen a 20 percent reduction in Black applicants and in Black students. Talk to an admissions counselor. Heck, talk to a biologist, and they will

tell you that homogenous environments do not thrive. They do not survive.

In an orchestra, you need all kinds of musicians playing all kinds of instruments in order to make music.

In movies, you need all kinds of characters to tell a story.

On college campuses, you need a diverse campus, of all kinds of students, to stimulate growth, research, economic development, innovation and survival.

This ruling goes beyond admissions. It is about the hiring of faculty. It is about how companies recruit, hire, and retain, and it is about procurement.

This ruling is divisive. It is hypocritical, and it is out of step with the American people, just like the Supreme Court.

You know what this ruling does? This ruling says to Black students, this ruling says to Black children like yours and like mine, that this Supreme Court doesn't see you and that this Supreme Court doesn't care about you.

But to our students, to our children, to our students and our children who are Black, I am here to tell you on behalf of the Congressional Black Caucus that we see you. We hear you. We are fighting for you, unlike this Supreme Court. We are not going to stop fighting, nor will we stop telling the truth about the history of this country, about this Supreme Court, about this ruling, and about what is ahead.

Color blind is an aspirational state of mind, but it is not yet reality. So let's live in reality and talk about what our students are facing and the hypocrisy that is coming out of this Supreme Court.

Mrs. CHERFILUS-McCORMICK. Mr. Speaker, you have heard from my distinguished colleagues about affirmative action and issues of great importance to the Congressional Black Caucus, our constituents, Congress, and all Americans tonight.

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

Ms. SEWELL. Mr. Speaker, for centuries, African Americans were systematically denied the opportunity to pursue a higher education, build wealth, and achieve financial independence, leaving behind a painful legacy of discrimination that persists to this day.

Let us not forget. It was in 1963—only six decades ago—when Black students were finally allowed to enroll alongside their peers at the University of Alabama.

Almost half of the members serving in this body were alive at that time.

Make no mistake—we have made tremendous progress since then. For the past four decades colleges and universities across this nation have had the freedom to build student bodies that reflect the diversity of our great nation.

With the blessing of the Supreme Court, these schools have used affirmative action policies as a tool to break down educational barriers for students who would otherwise be left behind.

Tragically, two weeks ago, in an extreme reversal, this Republican-controlled Court has

once again chosen to ignore our history and roll back our progress.

By banning affirmative action in college admissions, the Supreme Court has deprived us of a critical tool in our continued fight for equality and justice for all.

Not only is this decision a blatant attack on educational opportunity, it also upends nearly 40 years of precedent, undermining the sacred trust that the American people have placed in the Court.

From voting rights, to reproductive freedom, to educational opportunities, this Court has demonstrated time and time again that it is willing to ignore history, ignore precedent, and ignore common sense in order to strip away our freedoms and roll back our progress.

Mr. Speaker, we know that ignoring our past will not make it go away. In the words of Justice Ketanji Brown Jackson, "deeming race irrelevant in law does not make it so in life."

If we are going to address the injustices of the past, we must be intentional about leveling the playing field and providing opportunities to those who have been left behind.

After all, our entire nation benefits when talented students of diverse backgrounds get a fair shot at success.

Despite this shameful decision, we must not be deterred. Let this decision serve as a reminder that progress is elusive, and every generation must fight to preserve the progress of the past and advance it.

Now is the time to redouble our efforts and to hold this nation accountable to its highest ideals of equality and justice for all.

Until every American can enjoy the full promise of our democracy, our work continues.

Mr. HORSFORD. Mr. Speaker, thank you, Congresswoman SHEILA CHERFILUS-McCORMICK and Congressman JONATHAN JACKSON, for co-chairing tonight's Special Order Hour.

I rise today with my colleagues of the Congressional Black Caucus to address the recent Supreme Court ruling in Students for Fair Admissions v. Harvard and UNC.

The Supreme Court determined in a 6–3 vote that race-based affirmative action programs in college admissions processes violated Title Six of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as well as the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment.

The Supreme Court's decision to strike down decades of precedent set in the Bakke case in 1978, which gave students—regardless of their race or ethnicity—a better chance at equal admissions to our nation's top schools was a needless blow to America's promise of equal and fair opportunity.

We have to be clear on what this decision means for the legacy of the Court and what this decision will mean for race-conscious admissions policies across our country.

By delivering a decision on affirmative action so radical as to deny young people seeking an education equal opportunity in our education system, the Supreme Court has thrown into question its own legitimacy.

By imposing these radical changes to college and university race-based admission policies, the Court has made clear that it does not stand on the side of dismantling barriers to give our young people the opportunity at a better life, which will only stand to benefit the wealthy and well-connected.

Unfortunately, we have seen backlash to progress many times throughout our Nation's

history. During Reconstruction, we had a mere 12 years of Black achievement in policy, politics, the arts and sciences, and education that were followed by 70 years of state-sanctioned Jim Crow.

We didn't stop fighting for equality then and we won't stop now because too much is at stake to allow extremists to turn back the clock on progress or to use Affirmative Action as a cultural wedge issue.

That is why the CBC is proud to work alongside our Tri-Caucus colleagues to make clear that we will not be divided because our Nation's diversity is our greatest strength.

I want to thank my colleagues of the CBC, including Representative BOBBY SCOTT, Ranking Member of the Education and the Workforce Committee for their work on this issue and for being united in making clear that decision does not take the responsibility off of colleges and universities to do all they can to expand access to educational opportunities for students coming from underrepresented communities.

The CBC is calling for colleges and universities to not only work towards diversifying their campuses to more closely reflect America, but also to reevaluate their legacy admissions programs because while the Court went so far as to eliminate race-conscious admissions practices, it did nothing about other determining factors such as legacy status.

In fact, a lawsuit has been filed against Harvard University, saying that the legacy admissions programs that give preferential treatment to the children of wealthy donors and alumni discriminates against students of color who have the academic merit to attend the school.

As such applicants with donor relationships, athletic recruitments, employee relationships, and other special recommendations will continue to receive preferential treatment.

Giving unequal opportunity to an education for legacy admissions starkly contrasts the message we need to send our young people and threatens any progress we have made in providing equal access and diverse learning environments for students across our country.

And while no Nevada institutions of higher education implemented race consideration in admissions, Nevadans of color who want to attend schools out of state, like Harvard, MIT, Georgia Tech, or other schools, will suffer as a result of this decision.

Let me be clear—our students have the merit, academic credentials, knowledge, and drive to succeed at these schools. But we cannot turn a blind eye to the history of our nation that has prioritized wealth and access. At the same time, families of color have battled generations of discrimination and racism that limited their access to quality education and wealth building.

This decision specifically exempted military academies. Why?

Race can be a factor when police stop someone on the streets. Why?

But race cannot be a factor in deciding whether someone can pursue a higher education. Why not?

ADJOURNMENT

Mrs. CHERFILUS-McCORMICK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 50 minutes

p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, July 12, 2023, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

EC-1373. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to the threat from securities investments that finance certain companies of the People's Republic of China that was declared in Executive Order 13959 of November 12, 2020, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 401(c); (90 Stat. 1257) and 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); Public Law 95-223, Sec 204(c); (91 Stat. 1627); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-1374. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Department Notification Number: DDTC 23-002, pursuant to Section 36(c) and (d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-1375. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Department Notification Number: DDTC 23-038, pursuant to Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-1376. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Department Notification Number: DDTC 23-024, pursuant to Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-1377. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Department Notification Number: DDTC 22-035, pursuant to Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-1378. A letter from the Associate General Counsel General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a notification of a discontinuation of service in acting role, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, Sec. 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. McHENRY: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 2622. A bill to amend the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 to codify certain Securities and Exchange Commission no-action letters that exclude brokers and dealers compensated for certain research services from the definition of investment adviser, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 118-134). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. McHENRY: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 1548. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to specify that actions of the Advocate for Small Business Capital Formation are not a collection of information under the Paperwork Reduction Act, with an amendment (Rept. 118-135, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 752. A bill to