United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 165 WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, MAY 17, 2019 *No. 83*

Senate

The Senate was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Monday, May 20, 2019, at 3 p.m.

House of Representatives

FRIDAY, MAY 17, 2019

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer:

We give You thanks, O God, for giving us another day.

We ask Your blessing this day upon the Members of the people's House. May their labors be graced by Your gifts of wisdom, patience, and charity, that truth and righteousness might prevail in all their proceedings.

We take special note, at the end of National Peace Officers Memorial Week, of the 126 peace officers who have died this past year in the line of duty. We ask that You grant them eternal rest for having paid the ultimate price in protecting us.

Give their families consolation in mourning their loss. May they be assured that we, as a Nation, hold them in our hearts and understand that we will always be indebted to them.

May all that is done within the people's House this day be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House her approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. EVANS. Madam Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. EVANS. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentlewoman from Georgia (Mrs. MCBATH) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mrs. MCBATH led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to five requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

BLACK MOTHERS SUFFER IN SILENCE

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

Mrs. MCBATH. Madam Speaker, Black women are three to four times more likely to die from pregnancy-related complications, and this disparity persists across socioeconomic and educational levels.

I recently heard the story of a constituent in my district. Her name is Phiffer. After a failed emergency surgery, she was confined to bedrest 20 weeks into her pregnancy, but her doctor failed to address her mental health.

At 30 weeks, she gave birth to a beautiful baby boy. But for a year after, she struggled with mental health.

She said: ''I know my story is unremarkable.''

Unremarkable. Unremarkable because mothers are suffering in silence. Black mothers are suffering in silence daily.

I am proud to be a founding member of the Black Maternal Health Caucus because we need to address this crisis. I look forward to working with my colleagues to make sure that women like Phiffer receive the proper care that they need and deserve.

HONORING STUART SLIGH, SR.

(Mr. CARTER of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. Stuart Sligh, Sr., for winning the Savannah Morning News Unsung Hero Award for 2019.

Presented annually at the Best of Preps banquet in the First Congressional District of Georgia, the award honors individuals who unassumingly

offer their time and resources to local high school sports teams so they can perform at the highest level possible.

This year's recipient, Mr. Sligh, Sr., founded the Stuart Sligh Jr. Memorial Foundation in honor of his 16-year-old son, a standout athlete at Savannah Country Day School in both baseball and football who tragically passed away in a car accident.

Raising money in Stu Sligh's memory, the foundation has contributed over $50,000 to school athletics across the Savannah area, as well as other organizations in the State, like the YMCA.

The donations have gone toward purchasing pitching machines for baseball teams, new jerseys for football teams, and much more.

I thank Mr. Sligh for his work in our community and congratulate him on winning the 2019 Unsung Hero Award.

LGBTQ AMERICANS DESERVE THE EQUALITY ACT

(Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, the LGBTQ community cannot wait any longer for their full rights and equal protection to be guaranteed across this country.

We must pass H.R. 5, the Equality Act.

Only 29 States have laws explicitly barring discrimination based on sexual orientation in employment, housing, and public accommodations. Only 20 States have these protections for gender identity. That is unacceptable.

Being able to be your true self should not depend on where you live. Your protections and equal rights should not depend on where you live.

All LGBTQ Americans deserve nothing less than full rights and equal protection under the law, and that is exactly what the Equality Act will do.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on this historic civil rights bill to guarantee full equality for all. It will be on the floor later.

CELEBRATING ARMED FORCES DAY

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, tomorrow, May 18, our Nation celebrates Armed Forces Day.

Recognized the third Saturday in May since President Truman, Armed Forces Day is a time for us to pay special tribute to the brave men and women serving in all areas of the military.

It is also a time to educate the public on the impacts that our servicemembers have on communities across the country.

As the proud father of a soldier, I am endlessly grateful for the selfless actions of our servicemembers and their devotion to country.

Our servicemen and -women serve throughout the world as a beacon of light, carrying with them our values of liberty and justice. This service is often done on foreign lands and away from family and friends, but their willingness to defeat any threat that seeks to harm American values and interests never wavers.

Madam Speaker, with this day, we hope to show our appreciation so those honored are aware of how much we think of them and their sacrifices.

BUY CERTIFIED AMERICAN-GROWN FLOWERS

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

Mr. CARBAJAL. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the importance of buying American-grown flowers.

Whether it is celebrating a wedding or graduation, or sending condolences, flowers have been used to mark significant occasions for thousands of years.

I have seen the value this industry adds to our economy and communities during my visits with our hardworking central coast farmers and workers. The cut flower industry generates thousands of jobs and produces $1.2 billion in economic activity each year through flower farmers, distributors, and florists.

California grows an astonishing 75 percent of American-grown flowers, yet only a fraction of the flowers sold across the country were grown here. That must change.

This week, Senator FEINSTEIN and I introduced a resolution to designate July as American Grown Flower Month and to encourage consumers to buy flowers with the ''Certified American Grown'' label.

By passing H.R. 379, we will honor the beauty this industry brings to our homes year-round and help keep our American-grown flower industry prosperous.

I urge my colleagues to join us in this effort.

MOURNING THE PASSING OF STEVE YOUNG

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

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Madam Speaker, I rise today with a heavy heart, as the city of Kennewick and the greater Tri-Cities community mourns the loss of Councilman and former Mayor Steve Young.

Steve held the distinction as the second longest-serving mayor in the long history of the city of Kennewick, serving the people for nearly a decade in that role. But his service went far beyond those years.

Outside of his continued service as a councilman, Steve's footprint stretched far and wide, across not only the city of Kennewick and the Tri-Cities but the entire State of Washington.

His vision, his advocacy, and his passion for serving the community will continue on through the many contributions he provided for the Tri-Cities.

The long list of community organizations, nonprofits, and local and State boards on which Steve served rightly demonstrate just how passionate he was about serving his community.

My deepest condolences go out to Steve's wife, Anita. My thoughts and prayers go out to her and the entire Young family.

May my friend rest in peace. We will miss him.

VOTE FOR EQUALITY

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

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Madam Speaker, a mile from my district sits The Stonewall Inn, the site where, five decades ago, Americans took to the streets to fight back against hate and launch the modern movement for LGBT rights.

In a few hours, this House will pay homage to that struggle as we vote on historic legislation to protect the fundamental rights of millions of Americans.

The Equality Act will extend anti-discrimination protections to LGBTQ Americans. Sadly, from education to housing to credit, in so many areas, discrimination based on sexual orientation or identity remains legal. That is wrong, and this bill will, at long last, change that.

Madam Speaker, this is an issue of moral character. It speaks to who we are as a Nation.

For us individually, this vote speaks to who we are not just as legislators but as human beings. I implore all my colleagues to do what you know is right in your heart.

Vote for equality. Vote for respect, kindness, and love. Vote to end bigotry and discrimination.

Vote ''yes'' on the Equality Act.

COMBATING BDS AND ANTI-SEMITISM

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

Mrs. WALORSKI. Madam Speaker, I rise today to stand with America's friend and ally Israel against a rising tide of anti-Semitism and the dangerous Boycott, Divestment, Sanctions movement, or BDS movement.

BDS is a form of economic warfare aimed at marginalizing the world's only Jewish state. This radical agenda rejects Israel's right to self-defense and seeks to destroy its economy.

The House must stand with Israel and pass H.R. 336, the Strengthening America's Security in the Middle East

Act. This commonsense bill would combat the BDS movement by supporting State and local governments that choose not to contract with companies that discriminate against Israel.

It already passed the Senate with strong bipartisan support. Sadly, Speaker PELOSI refuses to allow a vote.

I am a proud cosponsor of H.R. 336. This week, I signed a discharge petition to ensure it gets a vote on the House floor.

Madam Speaker, Republicans and Democrats must send a strong signal against anti-Semitism and the anti-Israel BDS movement. We need a vote on H.R. 336.

□ 0915

LET AMERICANS BE FREE TO BE THEMSELVES

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

Mr. EVANS. Madam Speaker, the new House Democratic majority has passed several important bills, including bills to protect Americans' healthcare. One of those important bills coming up is the Equality Act.

First as a State legislator and now as a Member of Congress, I have supported the equal rights for LGBTQ people for over 20-plus years.

Today, in much of America, LGBTQ people can get married on Sunday and fired on Monday. Our fellow Americans should not have to fear losing a job or an apartment simply because of who they are.

I am proud that this House will pass the Equality Act today. I urge the Senate to join us in passing this bill. Let fellow Americans be free to be themselves, free from discrimination; and from sea to shining sea, let freedom ring.

COMMENDING THE FEDERAL RAILROAD ADMINISTRATION

(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Speaker, I rise to commend the Federal Railroad Administration and the Trump administration for putting a stop to the wasteful Federal spending on California's high-speed rail boondoggle. This will save nearly $1 billion that can be used for anything else to help Americans' transportation system.

At a time when tax increases on every mile you drive are being contemplated ostensibly for our highway needs, how can we keep wasting dollars on a project that ''has repeatedly failed to comply with the terms of the 2010 agreement and has failed to make reasonable progress''?

It is no longer even a high-speed train project nor does it even connect San Francisco to L.A. but, instead, terminates in an almond orchard somewhere north of Bakersfield.

It has tripled in price since 2008, when put in front of the California voters, and is still at least $70 billion short of the $100 billion tripled price or more. That $70 billion will not be coming from this Congress.

Let's channel these hard-earned tax dollars into highways people need, want, and can actually use, or water storage, or just about anything else.

EQUALITY ACT

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 377, I call up the bill (H.R. 5) to prohibit discrimination on the basis of sex, gender identity, and sexual orientation, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. CRAIG). Pursuant to House Resolution 377, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary, printed in the bill, is adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 5

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Equality Act''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND PURPOSE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) Discrimination can occur on the basis of the sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, or pregnancy, childbirth, or a related medical condition of an individual, as well as because of sex-based stereotypes. Each of these factors alone can serve as the basis for discrimination, and each is a form of sex discrimination.

(2) A single instance of discrimination may have more than one basis. For example, discrimination against a married same-sex couple could be based on the sex stereotype that marriage should only be between heterosexual couples, the sexual orientation of the two individuals in the couple, or both. Discrimination against a pregnant lesbian could be based on her sex, her sexual orientation, her pregnancy, or on the basis of multiple factors.

(3) Lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer (referred to as ''LGBTQ'') people commonly experience discrimination in securing access to public accommodations—including restaurants, senior centers, stores, places of or establishments that provide entertainment, health care facilities, shelters, government offices, youth service providers including adoption and foster care providers, and transportation. Forms of discrimination include the exclusion and denial of entry, unequal or unfair treatment, harassment, and violence. This discrimination prevents the full participation of LGBTQ people in society and disrupts the free flow of commerce.

(4) Women also have faced discrimination in many establishments such as stores and restaurants, and places or establishments that provide other goods or services, such as entertainment or transportation, including sexual harassment, differential pricing for substantially similar products and services, and denial of services because they are pregnant or breastfeeding.

(5) Many employers already and continue to take proactive steps, beyond those required by some States and localities, to ensure they are fostering positive and respectful cultures for all employees. Many places of public accommodation also recognize the economic imperative to offer goods and services to as many consumers as possible.

(6) Regular and ongoing discrimination against LGBTQ people, as well as women, in accessing public accommodations contributes to negative social and economic outcomes, and in the case of public accommodations operated by State and local governments, abridges individuals' constitutional rights.

(7) The discredited practice known as ''conversion therapy'' is a form of discrimination that harms LGBTQ people by undermining individuals sense of self worth, increasing suicide ideation and substance abuse, exacerbating family conflict, and contributing to second class status.

(8) Both LGBTQ people and women face widespread discrimination in employment and various services, including by entities that receive Federal financial assistance. Such discrimination—

(A) is particularly troubling and inappropriate for programs and services funded wholly or in part by the Federal Government;

(B) undermines national progress toward equal treatment regardless of sex, sexual orientation, or gender identity; and

(C) is inconsistent with the constitutional principle of equal protection under the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

(9) Federal courts have widely recognized that, in enacting the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Congress validly invoked its powers under the Fourteenth Amendment to provide a full range of remedies in response to persistent, widespread, and pervasive discrimination by both private and government actors.

(10) Discrimination by State and local governments on the basis of sexual orientation or gender identity in employment, housing, and public accommodations, and in programs and activities receiving Federal financial assistance, violates the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States. In many circumstances, such discrimination also violates other constitutional rights such as those of liberty and privacy under the due process clause of the Fourteenth Amendment.

(11) Individuals who are LGBTQ, or are perceived to be LGBTQ, have been subjected to a history and pattern of persistent, widespread, and pervasive discrimination on the bases of sexual orientation and gender identity by both private sector and Federal, State, and local government actors, including in employment, housing, and public accommodations, and in programs and activities receiving Federal financial assistance. An explicit and comprehensive national solution is needed to address such discrimination, which has sometimes resulted in violence or death, including the full range of remedies available under the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

(12) Numerous provisions of Federal law expressly prohibit discrimination on the basis of sex, and Federal agencies and courts have correctly interpreted these prohibitions on sex discrimination to include discrimination based on sexual orientation, gender identity, and sex stereotypes. In particular, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission correctly interpreted title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 in Macy v. Holder, Baldwin v. Foxx, and Lusardi v. McHugh.

(13) The absence of explicit prohibitions of discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation and gender identity under Federal statutory law has created uncertainty for employers and other entities covered by Federal nondiscrimination laws and caused unnecessary hardships for LGBTQ individuals.

(14) LGBTQ people often face discrimination when seeking to rent or purchase housing, as well as in every other aspect of obtaining and maintaining housing. LGBTQ people in same-

sex relationships are often discriminated against when two names associated with one gender appear on a housing application, and transgender people often encounter discrimination when credit checks or inquiries reveal a former name.

(15) National surveys, including a study commissioned by the Department of Housing and Urban Development, show that housing discrimination against LGBTQ people is very prevalent. For instance, when same-sex couples inquire about housing that is available for rent, they are less likely to receive positive responses from landlords. A national matched-pair testing investigation found that nearly one-half of same-sex couples face adverse, differential treatment when seeking elder housing. According to other studies, transgender people have half the homeownership rate of non-transgender people and about 1 in 5 transgender people experience homelessness.

(16) As a result of the absence of explicit prohibitions against discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation and gender identity, credit applicants who are LGBTQ, or perceived to be LGBTQ, have unequal opportunities to establish credit. LGBTQ people can experience being denied a mortgage, credit card, student loan, or many other types of credit simply because of their sexual orientation or gender identity.

(17) Numerous studies demonstrate that LGBTQ people, especially transgender people and women, are economically disadvantaged and at a higher risk for poverty compared with other groups of people. For example, older women in same-sex couples have twice the poverty rate of older different-sex couples.

(18) The right to an impartial jury of one's peers and the reciprocal right to jury service are fundamental to the free and democratic system of justice in the United States and are based in the Bill of Rights. There is, however, an unfortunate and long-documented history in the United States of attorneys discriminating against LGBTQ individuals, or those perceived to be LGBTQ, in jury selection. Failure to bar peremptory challenges based on the actual or perceived sexual orientation or gender identity of an individual not only erodes a fundamental right, duty, and obligation of being a citizen of the United States, but also unfairly creates a second class of citizenship for LGBTQ victims, witnesses, plaintiffs, and defendants.

(19) Numerous studies document the shortage of qualified and available homes for the 437,000 youth in the child welfare system and the negative outcomes for the many youth who live in group care as opposed to a loving home or who age out without a permanent family. Although same-sex couples are 7 times more likely to foster or adopt than their different-sex counterparts, many child placing agencies refuse to serve same-sex couples and LGBTQ individuals. This has resulted in a reduction of the pool of qualified and available homes for youth in the child welfare system who need placement on a temporary or permanent basis. Barring discrimination in foster care and adoption will increase the number of homes available to foster children waiting for foster and adoptive families.

(20) LGBTQ youth are overrepresented in the foster care system by at least a factor of two and report twice the rate of poor treatment while in care compared to their non-LGBTQ counterparts. LGBTQ youth in foster care have a higher average number of placements, higher likelihood of living in a group home, and higher rates of hospitalization for emotional reasons and juvenile justice involvement than their non-LGBTQ peers because of the high level of bias and discrimination that they face and the difficulty of finding affirming foster placements. Further, due to their physical distance from friends and family, traumatic experiences, and potentially unstable living situations, all youth involved with child welfare are at risk for being targeted by traffickers seeking to exploit children. Barring discrimination in child welfare services will ensure improved treatment and outcomes for LGBTQ foster children.

(b) PURPOSE.—It is the purpose of this Act to expand as well as clarify, confirm and create greater consistency in the protections and remedies against discrimination on the basis of all covered characteristics and to provide guidance and notice to individuals, organizations, corporations, and agencies regarding their obligations under the law.

SEC. 3. PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS.

(a) PROHIBITION ON DISCRIMINATION OR SEGREGATION IN PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS.—Section 201 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000a) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by inserting ''sex (including sexual orientation and gender identity),'' before ''or national origin''; and

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (3), by striking ''stadium'' and all that follows and inserting ''stadium or other place of or establishment that provides exhibition, entertainment, recreation, exercise, amusement, public gathering, or public display;'';

(B) by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (6); and

(C) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following:

''(4) any establishment that provides a good, service, or program, including a store, shopping center, online retailer or service provider, salon, bank, gas station, food bank, service or care center, shelter, travel agency, or funeral parlor, or establishment that provides health care, accounting, or legal services;

''(5) any train service, bus service, car service, taxi service, airline service, station, depot, or other place of or establishment that provides transportation service; and''.

(b) PROHIBITION ON DISCRIMINATION OR SEGREGATION UNDER LAW.—Section 202 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 2000a–1) is amended by inserting ''sex (including sexual orientation and gender identity),'' before ''or national origin''.

(c) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Title II of such Act (42 U.S.C. 2000a et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 208. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

''A reference in this title to an establishment—

''(1) shall be construed to include an individual whose operations affect commerce and who is a provider of a good, service, or program; and

''(2) shall not be construed to be limited to a physical facility or place.''.

SEC. 4. DESEGREGATION OF PUBLIC FACILITIES.

Section 301(a) of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000b(a)) is amended by inserting ''sex (including sexual orientation and gender identity),'' before ''or national origin''.

SEC. 5. DESEGREGATION OF PUBLIC EDUCATION.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—Section 401(b) of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000c(b)) is amended by inserting ''(including sexual orientation and gender identity),'' before ''or national origin''.

(b) CIVIL ACTIONS BY THE ATTORNEY GENERAL.—Section 407 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 2000c–6) is amended, in subsection (a)(2), by inserting ''(including sexual orientation and gender identity),'' before ''or national origin''.

(c) CLASSIFICATION AND ASSIGNMENT.—Section 410 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 2000c–9) is amended by inserting ''(including sexual orientation and gender identity),'' before ''or national origin''.

SEC. 6. FEDERAL FUNDING.

Section 601 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000d) is amended by inserting ''sex (including sexual orientation and gender identity),'' before ''or national origin,''.

SEC. 7. EMPLOYMENT.

(a) RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.—Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 is amended by inserting after section 701 (42 U.S.C. 2000e) the following:

''SEC. 701A. RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.

''Section 1106 shall apply to this title except that for purposes of that application, a reference in that section to an 'unlawful practice' shall be considered to be a reference to an 'unlawful employment practice'.''.

(b) UNLAWFUL EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES.—Section 703 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e–2) is amended—

(1) in the section header, by striking ''SEX,'' and inserting ''SEX (INCLUDING SEXUAL ORIENTATION AND GENDER IDENTITY),'';

(2) except in subsection (e), by striking ''sex,'' each place it appears and inserting ''sex (including sexual orientation and gender identity),''; and

(3) in subsection (e)(1), by striking ''enterprise,'' and inserting ''enterprise, if, in a situation in which sex is a bona fide occupational qualification, individuals are recognized as qualified in accordance with their gender identity,''.

(c) OTHER UNLAWFUL EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES.—Section 704(b) of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e–3(b)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''sex,'' the first place it appears and inserting ''sex (including sexual orientation and gender identity),''; and

(2) by striking ''employment.'' and inserting ''employment, if, in a situation in which sex is a bona fide occupational qualification, individuals are recognized as qualified in accordance with their gender identity.''.

(d) CLAIMS.—Section 706(g)(2)(A) of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (2000e–5(g)(2)(A)) is amended by striking ''sex,'' and inserting ''sex (including sexual orientation and gender identity),''.

(e) EMPLOYMENT BY FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.—Section 717 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e–16) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking ''sex,'' and inserting ''sex (including sexual orientation and gender identity),''; and

(2) in subsection (c), by striking ''sex'' and inserting ''sex (including sexual orientation and gender identity),''.

(f) GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEE RIGHTS ACT OF 1991.—The Government Employee Rights Act of 1991 (42 U.S.C. 2000e–16a et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 301(b), by striking ''sex,'' and inserting ''sex (including sexual orientation and gender identity),'';

(2) in section 302(a)(1), by striking ''sex,'' and inserting ''sex (including sexual orientation and gender identity),''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 305. RULES OF CONSTRUCTION AND CLAIMS.

''Sections 1101(b), 1106, and 1107 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 shall apply to this title except that for purposes of that application, a reference in that section 1106 to 'race, color, religion, sex (including sexual orientation and gender identity), or national origin' shall be considered to be a reference to 'race, color, religion, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, national origin, age, or disability'.''.

(g) CONGRESSIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY ACT OF 1995.—The Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1301 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 201(a)(1) (2 U.S.C. 1311(a)(1)) by inserting ''(including sexual orientation and gender identity),'' before ''or national origin,''; and

(2) by adding at the end of title II (42 U.S.C. 1311 et seq.) the following:

''SEC. 208. RULES OF CONSTRUCTION AND CLAIMS.

''Sections 1101(b), 1106, and 1107 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 shall apply to section 201 (and remedial provisions of this Act related to section 201) except that for purposes of that application, a reference in that section 1106 to 'race, color, religion, sex (including sexual orientation and gender identity), or national origin' shall be considered to be a reference to 'race, color, religion, sex (including sexual orientation and gender identity), national origin, age, or disability'.''.

(h) CIVIL SERVICE REFORM ACT OF 1978.—Chapter 23 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in section 2301(b)(2), by striking ''sex,'' and inserting ''sex (including sexual orientation and gender identity),'';

(2) in section 2302—

(A) in subsection (b)(1)(A), by inserting ''(including sexual orientation and gender identity),'' before ''or national origin,''; and

(B) in subsection (d)(1), by inserting ''(including sexual orientation and gender identity),'' before ''or national origin;''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 2307. RULES OF CONSTRUCTION AND CLAIMS.

''Sections 1101(b), 1106, and 1107 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 shall apply to this chapter (and remedial provisions of this title related to this chapter) except that for purposes of that application, a reference in that section 1106 to 'race, color, religion, sex (including sexual orientation and gender identity), or national origin' shall be considered to be a reference to 'race, color, religion, sex (including sexual orientation and gender identity), national origin, age, a handicapping condition, marital status, or political affiliation'.''.

SEC. 8. INTERVENTION.

Section 902 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000h–2) is amended by inserting ''(including sexual orientation and gender identity),'' before ''or national origin,''.

SEC. 9. MISCELLANEOUS.

Title XI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 is amended—

(1) by redesignating sections 1101 through 1104 (42 U.S.C. 2000h et seq.) and sections 1105 and 1106 (42 U.S.C. 2000h–5, 2000h–6) as sections 1102 through 1105 and sections 1108 and 1109, respectively;

(2) by inserting after the title heading the following:

''SEC. 1101. DEFINITIONS AND RULES.

''(a) DEFINITIONS.—In titles II, III, IV, VI, VII, and IX (referred to individually in sections 1106 and 1107 as a 'covered title'):

''(1) RACE; COLOR; RELIGION; SEX; SEXUAL ORIENTATION; GENDER IDENTITY; NATIONAL ORIGIN.—The term 'race', 'color', 'religion', 'sex' (including 'sexual orientation' and 'gender identity'), or 'national origin', used with respect to an individual, includes—

''(A) the race, color, religion, sex (including sexual orientation and gender identity), or national origin, respectively, of another person with whom the individual is associated or has been associated; and

''(B) a perception or belief, even if inaccurate, concerning the race, color, religion, sex (including sexual orientation and gender identity), or national origin, respectively, of the individual.

''(2) GENDER IDENTITY.—The term 'gender identity' means the gender-related identity, appearance, mannerisms, or other gender-related characteristics of an individual, regardless of the individual's designated sex at birth.

''(3) INCLUDING.—The term 'including' means including, but not limited to, consistent with the term's standard meaning in Federal law.

''(4) SEX.—The term 'sex' includes—

''(A) a sex stereotype;

''(B) pregnancy, childbirth, or a related medical condition;

''(C) sexual orientation or gender identity; and

''(D) sex characteristics, including intersex traits.

''(5) SEXUAL ORIENTATION.—The term 'sexual orientation' means homosexuality, heterosexuality, or bisexuality.

''(b) RULES.—In a covered title referred to in subsection (a)—

''(1) (with respect to sex) pregnancy, childbirth, or a related medical condition shall not receive less favorable treatment than other physical conditions; and

''(2) (with respect to gender identity) an individual shall not be denied access to a shared facility, including a restroom, a locker room, and a dressing room, that is in accordance with the individual's gender identity.''; and

(3) by inserting after section 1105 the following:

''SEC. 1106. RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.

''(a) SEX.—Nothing in section 1101 or the provisions of a covered title incorporating a term defined or a rule specified in that section shall be construed—

''(1) to limit the protection against an unlawful practice on the basis of pregnancy, childbirth, or a related medical condition provided by section 701(k); or

''(2) to limit the protection against an unlawful practice on the basis of sex available under any provision of Federal law other than that covered title, prohibiting a practice on the basis of sex.

''(b) CLAIMS AND REMEDIES NOT PRECLUDED.—Nothing in section 1101 or a covered title shall be construed to limit the claims or remedies available to any individual for an unlawful practice on the basis of race, color, religion, sex (including sexual orientation and gender identity), or national origin including claims brought pursuant to section 1979 or 1980 of the Revised Statutes (42 U.S.C. 1983, 1985) or any other law, including a Federal law amended by the Equality Act, regulation, or policy.

''(c) NO NEGATIVE INFERENCE.—Nothing in section 1101 or a covered title shall be construed to support any inference that any Federal law prohibiting a practice on the basis of sex does not prohibit discrimination on the basis of pregnancy, childbirth, or a related medical condition, sexual orientation, gender identity, or a sex stereotype.

''SEC. 1107. CLAIMS.

''The Religious Freedom Restoration Act of 1993 (42 U.S.C. 2000bb et seq.) shall not provide a claim concerning, or a defense to a claim under, a covered title, or provide a basis for challenging the application or enforcement of a covered title.''.

SEC. 10. HOUSING.

(a) FAIR HOUSING ACT.—The Fair Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 3601 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 802 (42 U.S.C. 3602), by adding at the end the following:

''(p) 'Gender identity', 'sex', and 'sexual orientation' have the meanings given those terms in section 1101(a) of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

''(q) 'Race', 'color', 'religion', 'sex' (including 'sexual orientation' and 'gender identity'), 'handicap', 'familial status', or 'national origin', used with respect to an individual, includes—

''(1) the race, color, religion, sex (including sexual orientation and gender identity), handicap, familial status, or national origin, respectively, of another person with whom the individual is associated or has been associated; and

''(2) a perception or belief, even if inaccurate, concerning the race, color, religion, sex (including sexual orientation and gender identity), handicap, familial status, or national origin, respectively, of the individual.'';

(2) in section 804, by inserting ''(including sexual orientation and gender identity),'' after ''sex,'' each place that term appears;

(3) in section 805, by inserting ''(including sexual orientation and gender identity),'' after ''sex,'' each place that term appears;

(4) in section 806, by inserting ''(including sexual orientation and gender identity),'' after ''sex,'';

(5) in section 808(e)(6), by inserting ''(including sexual orientation and gender identity),'' after ''sex,''; and

(6) by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 821. RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.

''Sections 1101(b) and 1106 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 shall apply to this title and section 901, except that for purposes of that application, a reference in that section 1101(b) or 1106 to a 'covered title' shall be considered a reference to 'this title and section 901'.

''SEC. 822. CLAIMS.

''Section 1107 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 shall apply to this title and section 901, except that for purposes of that application, a reference in that section 1107 to a 'covered title' shall be considered a reference to 'this title and section 901'.''.

(b) PREVENTION OF INTIMIDATION IN FAIR HOUSING CASES.—Section 901 of the Civil Rights Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3631) is amended by inserting ''(including sexual orientation (as such term is defined in section 802 of this Act) and gender identity (as such term is defined in section 802 of this Act)),'' after ''sex,'' each place that term appears.

SEC. 11. EQUAL CREDIT OPPORTUNITY.

(a) PROHIBITED DISCRIMINATION.—Section 701(a)(1) of the Equal Credit Opportunity Act (15 U.S.C. 1691(a)(1)) is amended by inserting ''(including sexual orientation and gender identity),'' after ''sex''.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—Section 702 of the Equal Credit Opportunity Act (15 U.S.C. 1691a) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (f) and (g) as subsections (h) and (i), respectively;

(2) by inserting after subsection (e) the following:

''(f) The terms 'gender identity', 'sex', and 'sexual orientation' have the meanings given those terms in section 1101(a) of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

''(g) The term 'race', 'color', 'religion', 'national origin', 'sex' (including 'sexual orientation' and 'gender identity'), 'marital status', or 'age', used with respect to an individual, includes—

''(1) the race, color, religion, national origin, sex (including sexual orientation and gender identity), marital status, or age, respectively, of another person with whom the individual is associated or has been associated; and

''(2) a perception or belief, even if inaccurate, concerning the race, color, religion, national origin, sex (including sexual orientation and gender identity), marital status, or age, respectively, of the individual.''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(j) Sections 1101(b) and 1106 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 shall apply to this title, except that for purposes of that application—

''(1) a reference in those sections to a 'covered title' shall be considered a reference to 'this title'; and

''(2) paragraph (1) of such section 1101(b) shall apply with respect to all aspects of a credit transaction.''.

(c) RELATION TO STATE LAWS.—Section 705(a) of the Equal Credit Opportunity Act (15 U.S.C. 1691d(a)) is amended by inserting ''(including sexual orientation and gender identity),'' after ''sex''.

(d) CIVIL LIABILITY.—Section 706 of the Equal Credit Opportunity Act (15 U.S.C. 1691e) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(l) Section 1107 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 shall apply to this title, except that for purposes of that application, a reference in that section to a 'covered title' shall be considered a reference to 'this title'.''.

SEC. 12. JURIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 121 of title 28, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in section 1862, by inserting ''(including sexual orientation and gender identity),'' after ''sex,'';

(2) in section 1867(e), in the second sentence, by inserting ''(including sexual orientation and gender identity),'' after ''sex,'';

(3) in section 1869—

(A) in subsection (j), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(B) in subsection (k), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(l) 'gender identity', 'sex', and 'sexual orientation' have the meanings given such terms

under section 1101(a) of the Civil Rights Act of 1964; and

''(m) 'race', 'color', 'religion', 'sex' (including 'sexual orientation' and 'gender identity'), 'economic status', or 'national origin', used with respect to an individual, includes—

''(1) the race, color, religion, sex (including sexual orientation and gender identity), economic status, or national origin, respectively, of another person with whom the individual is associated or has been associated; and

''(2) a perception or belief, even if inaccurate, concerning the race, color, religion, sex (including sexual orientation and gender identity), economic status, or national origin, respectively, of the individual.''; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

''§ 1879. Rules of construction and claims

''Sections 1101(b), 1106, and 1107 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 shall apply to this chapter, except that for purposes of that application, a reference in those sections to a 'covered title' shall be considered a reference to 'this chapter'.''.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 121 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''1879. Rules of construction and claims.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill, as amended, shall be debatable for 90 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) each will control 45 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on H.R. 5.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 5, the Equality Act, which amends the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and other core civil rights statutes to explicitly prohibit discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation and gender identity. The bill would also strengthen nondiscrimination protections for women and others.

Today is a historic day: the first time a comprehensive LGBTQ civil rights bill has come to the floor of the House. This long overdue legislation will provide millions of LGBTQ Americans protections from being denied medical care, fired from their jobs, or thrown out of their homes simply because of who they are.

Much of the history of the United States has been about expanding the definition of who is understood to be included when the Declaration of Independence says, ''all men are created equal.''

When these words were first written, that phrase did not include Black and Latino men; it did not include Native Americans; it did not include women; and it certainly did not include LGBTQ individuals.

At this moment, we have an opportunity to continue our march towards justice, to enshrine in our Nation's laws protections for marginalized communities to ensure that everyone can fully participate in key areas of life and to provide them recourse in the face of discrimination.

Despite what opponents to the bill may say, we know these protections can work. We know that our existing Federal nondiscrimination laws have helped millions of Americans.

We know that protections for sexual orientation and gender identity have worked in more than 20 States and that, in these places, women still have rights, religious freedom is still protected, parents are still involved in their children's healthcare, and doctors are still free to exercise their professional medical judgment. Transgender individuals play sports, and sometimes they win and sometimes they lose, just like everyone else.

But the ability to have a job, to receive medical care, or to rent a home should not depend on who someone is or where they happen to live. We cannot accept the situation where anyone in this country can get married on Sunday and legally be fired on Monday because of who they love.

For decades, the LGBTQ community has been coming to Congress to tell us their stories. We have heard of transgender women being fired from their jobs, lesbian couples being kicked out of their homes, and gay men being denied medical care. It is time we stop asking them to come to the Capitol just to defend their existence.

The question before us is not whether the LGBTQ community faces outrageous and immoral discrimination, for the record shows that it clearly does. The question is whether we, as Congress, are willing to take action to do something about it. The answer goes straight to the heart of who we want to be as a country, and today, that answer must be a resounding and unequivocal ''yes.''

To the thousands of LGBTQ people who have shared their stories, I say: Thank you for your bravery. Thank you for reliving your trauma to help build the case for this legislation—to build the case for expanding freedom in this country.

We hear you; we see you; we believe you. And we will continue fighting for you.

I thank the gentleman from Rhode Island (Representative CICILLINE) for his tireless leadership in introducing this bill and helping to shepherd it through the legislative process.

I urge my colleagues to support this landmark legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, there are some fundamental principles that we all ought to be able to agree on: Don't hurt other people; respect the right of doctors to do no harm; respect the right of parents to protect their children.

Now, the bill before us today could have affirmed the right of every adult to declare their own gender consistent with these principles. Unfortunately, it violates these principles in the most fundamental ways. And this isn't speculation. Many States have already adopted similar laws, so we can see, firsthand, the result of them.

This bill harms people in so many ways: destroying safe spaces for women, undermining women-owned businesses, intimidating the free exercise of conscience. But let me concentrate on one aspect, the destructive impact it has on women's sports.

Wherever these laws are imposed, biological males have begun to dominate women's competitions. Listen to 16-year-old Selina Soule of Connecticut. She tells the story of qualifying for the prestigious Middletown Invite.

She says this: ''Eight of us lined up at the starting line . . . but when six of us were only about three-quarters into the race, two girls were already across the finish line. . . . What just happened? Two boys identifying as girls happened. Fair is no longer the norm. The chance to advance, the chance to win has been all over for us. . . . I missed the chance to compete in the New England Championship this past season because of this.''

And she goes on to say: ''The CAAC won't listen to my voice, but I hope Congress will. . . . H.R. 5 will endanger women and girls of all ages by opening up every sports team in the country to any male who self-identifies as female. This policy will take away our medals, records, scholarships, and dreams.''

And we know this will happen because it already has. And we know it is the intent of the bill because Congressman STEUBE offered an amendment: ''Nothing in this act may be construed to require a biological female to face competition from a biological male in any sporting event.'' The Democrats voted it down on a party-line vote.

Sorry, Selina, but if you are looking for fairness from this majority, you have come to the wrong place.

Now, this bill could have protected the professional judgment of doctors, but it doesn't. At our hearing on May 1, Mr. CICILLINE said: ''What H.R. 5 does is to ensure that transgender people, including young people, are not denied care because of their gender identity.''

Well, what is care for gender identity? Cross-sex hormones, puberty blockers, and surgery. Refuse to provide it on the self-diagnosis of a child and you have just broken the law.

Indeed, Johns Hopkins University, which pioneered sex reassignment surgery, stopped the practice because they saw the long-term harm it did to their patients.

And we know that is the intent of the bill as well, because I offered an amendment: ''Nothing in this act shall

be construed to require healthcare providers to affirm the self-professed gender identity of a minor,'' and the Democrats voted it down on a straight party-line vote.

Listen to one anguished parent, Elaine, tell her story. She says: ''Let me explain to you how this works. If you take your child to a clinic to seek help, affirmative care means the . . . professionals must accept a child's professed gender identity. . . . Under 'conversion therapy' bans, questioning a child's professed gender identity is now illegal. So, if a little boy is 5 years old and believes he is the opposite sex, affirmative care means going along with his beliefs. Parents are encouraged to refer to him as their 'daughter' and let him choose a feminine name. Teachers are told to let him use the girls bathroom at school. Therapists will reassure parents that social transition is harmless and reversible. Is it really harmless to tell a child who still believes in the tooth fairy that he is of the opposite sex? . . . If a 10-year-old girl is uncomfortable with her developing body and suddenly insists she is a boy, affirmative care means blocking this girl's puberty with powerful drugs.''

And we know this will happen because it already has. And we know this is the intent of the bill because Congressman MIKE JOHNSON offered an amendment: ''Nothing in this act or any amendment made by this act may be construed to deny a parent's right to be involved in their minor child's medical care.'' And the Democrats voted that amendment down on a party-line vote.

Elaine goes on to say: ''I am speaking out because I love my daughter. And it is because of her that I know what I have told you is true. She has been a victim of 'gender affirming' medical procedures, and I was powerless to stop doctors from harming her.''

I am sorry, Elaine. The House majority doesn't care, and it isn't listening. This is the brave new world that House Democrats propose under the name, ''equality.''

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE), the sponsor of this legislation.

Mr. CICILLINE. Madam Speaker, I rise to support H.R. 5, the Equality Act.

I have to stop for a second and take in this momentous occasion, for I have the honor of being on the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives, speaking in favor of a bill that I have worked on for the past 5 years that will finally give full legal equality to the LGBTQ community here in America. This is truly historic.

I want to thank Chairman NADLER, who has been an unwavering ally in support of LGBTQ rights throughout his career, and thank Speaker PELOSI, Leader HOYER, and our whip, JAMES CLYBURN, who have all showed tremendous leadership in helping to get this bill to the floor.

I want to acknowledge and thank my LGBTQ Equality Caucus co-chairs, who have shown extraordinary leadership, not just in blazing a trail for future LGBTQ leaders, but in being friends and partners in this fight to get where we are today.

I also want to thank our colleagues in the Senate for their extraordinary leadership. And, most importantly, we wouldn't be here today without the determined efforts of the advocates and allies in the civil rights and LGBTQ rights community who banded together to fight for the common values of dignity and equality under the law.

Throughout my life, I have seen, firsthand, the struggles that many in my community have faced in achieving the American Dream. The right to live freely, without fear of persecution or discrimination, is one many in the LGBTQ community felt was an impossibility for so long.

The fact that we are here today about to vote on this legislation, which has the bipartisan support of 241 Members of the House is, in and of itself, an achievement. It was not easy to get here.

It was only 4 short years ago that the Supreme Court struck down the Defense of Marriage Act, finally allowing members of the LGBTQ community to marry in every State.

Don't Ask, Don't Tell was the law of the land until 6 years ago, and today, the Trump administration is forcing the men and women in our Armed Forces back into the closet and taking steps to target the LGBTQ community in a variety of ways.

The forces working against progress are strong, but together, we are stronger. We have made great strides in fighting for LGBTQ rights under the law, but make no mistake, there are many people in this country, including in this administration, who are actively working to undermine our hard-fought gains.

□ 0930

That is why it is so significant that we have such strong and diverse support for the Equality Act.

And I don't just mean 241 bipartisan cosponsors in the House. Look at the 47 bipartisan sponsors in the Senate, the more than 200 businesses in every State in the country who have endorsed the bill, and the dozens of associations, advocacy groups, civil rights groups, and faith groups that back it.

The Equality Act has the support of a majority of the American people in every State. Let that sink in. In every single State in the country, the American people think it is time to protect the LGBTQ community.

There is nothing more central to the idea of America, nothing that has contributed more to the exceptionalism of our country and the prosperity of America than the guarantee of equal protection of the law for every single American.

They support this bill all across this country because it makes sense, it is common sense. It adds sexual orientation and gender identity as protected classes through existing civil rights law, ensuring that the LGBTQ community enjoys the same protections as everyone else, nothing more and nothing less.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Rhode Island an additional 1 minute.

Mr. CICILLINE. Madam Speaker, I want to take a moment to talk about what the Equality Act doesn't do. There has been a lot of misinformation about this bill floating around, and I want to ensure that my colleagues and the American people understand the facts.

The Equality Act doesn't force priests or other clergy to perform same sex marriages or any other religious ceremony against their beliefs.

It doesn't eliminate women's colleges, fraternities, or sororities, or other nondiscriminatory sex-segregated program.

The Equality Act doesn't prevent parents from having control of their children's medical decisions or force doctors to provide treatment against their best judgment or religious beliefs.

And the Equality Act doesn't eliminate women's sports.

The Equality Act doesn't force churches to act as public accommodations or eliminate the ability of religious institutions to accept Federal money.

Here is what the Equality Act does. It ensures that every child of an LGBTQ parent will not be turned away from the pediatrician's office.

It ensures that transgender teenagers can attend school without fear for their safety.

And it ensures that LGBTQ employees can't get married on Saturday, post pictures on social media on Sunday, and they get fired on Monday.

The Equality Act is quite literally a life-saving bill that addresses some of the fundamental inequalities that still exist in the American legal system.

The time is now. The moment is here. Future generations will look back on this day as the moment where our elected leaders showed what side of history they are on.

We are on the right side of history. Let's pass the Equality Act today with overwhelming bipartisan support.

Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the additional time.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. LESKO).

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 5.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 5, the so-called Equality Act, should really be called the ''Forfeiting Women's Rights Act.''

According to multiple experts, lawyers, and organizations, H.R. 5 would indeed prohibit, in all circumstances, under penalty of Federal law, any acknowledgement of the reality of biological sex; would allow anyone at any time to declare that he or she identifies as the opposite sex, without any medical or psychological diagnosis.

It would erase women and girls' rights by requiring facilities, such as schools, churches, dormitories, domestic violence shelters, homeless shelters, to allow biological males who identify as women in women's bathrooms, women's and girls' shelters, women's and girls' showers, and in women's locker rooms.

This will indeed violate women's privacy and can ultimately violate their safety.

The danger to women when biological men seek to claim female identity should seem obvious, but it is being ignored by proponents of this bill.

H.R. 5 puts women at risk by promoting a Federal law that would overrule any restriction on gender identity claims and abolish the protections of biological sex-specific practices and spaces.

H.R. 5 will eliminate women and girls' sports by requiring that men and boys be allowed to compete in women's and girls' sports. This is already happening.

H.R. 5 will also require doctors to provide sex change surgeries and sex change hormones to adolescents without parental consent and without a medical or psychological diagnosis. This could permanently sterilize young girls.

H.R. 5 denies constitutional religious protections by totally eliminating the bipartisan Religious Freedom Restoration Act, which was supported by so many Democrats back then, and this is being done for the first time ever since the act was passed.

Congress should only pass laws that protect women, not threaten, silence, or abandon them.

In fact, H.R. 5 puts everything that women have worked so hard to gain, opportunities and protections, at risk.

I believe that in our society, laws should seek to protect the safety and privacy of every woman and girl.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman from Arizona an additional 30 seconds.

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, this bill actually does the opposite.

H.R. 5 prioritizes the rights of some Americans over the rights of others. This is not equality. This is far from it.

Madam Speaker, I speak before you now willing and desiring to work with any and all of my colleagues on policies that will truly promote women's rights and equality. However, this bill, unfortunately, does neither.

Madam Speaker, with that, I urge opposition of this bill.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), the chair of the Education and Labor Committee.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, today is a historic day. Sixty-five years ago today, the Supreme Court ruled in Brown v. Board of Education that racially segregated schools were inherently unequal and, therefore, unconstitutional.

Today is also a historic day for the LGBTQ community, because today the House of Representatives will pass the Equality Act.

Over the last decade, we have made progress in securing rights for the LGBT community, including marriage equality and the repeal of Don't Ask, Don't Tell. However, many legal barriers still remain.

Only a handful of States have explicit laws barring discrimination based on sexual orientation in employment, housing, and public accommodations, and even fewer have protections for gender identity.

The inconsistent patchwork of State laws leaves many people vulnerable to discrimination at work, at school, and in many other parts of their daily lives.

As chairman, I was proud to hold a hearing on this important civil rights legislation in the Committee on Education and Labor. Witnesses testified that all too many Americans are experiencing discrimination in their everyday lives, especially the workplace, and even in the educational system, where many of them are experiencing discrimination, even in elementary school. This is not acceptable.

This bill also ensures that the Religious Freedom Restoration Act, the RFRA, cannot be used as a free pass to discriminate.

RFRA was originally enacted as a shield to serve as a safeguard for religious freedom, but recently it has been used as a sword to cut down the civil rights of too many individuals.

Freedom from discrimination is a core American value.

Madam Speaker, passage of this bill is long overdue. We must affirm that all Americans are equally protected from discrimination under the law. I, therefore, urge all of my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX).

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding and for his tireless work exposing the deep flaws in this bill.

Madam Speaker, I rise as the leader of the Republicans on the Education and Labor Committee, which should have had an opportunity to consider this legislation fully, considering its vast implications for educational institutions and employers.

We did not have that opportunity. Instead, we had a single subcommittee hearing.

As a fierce advocate for the Education and Labor Committee, I would never deem any subcommittee unimportant, but it was the subcommittee with the smallest membership.

On top of that, somehow the decision was made to bring this bill to the floor under a closed rule with no amendments. So, I commend my colleagues on the Judiciary Committee for their work on behalf of all of us.

This bill may have ''equality'' in its title, but it does not serve all people.

Its mandates for specific accommodations in shared facilities puts job creators, particularly those in small businesses, schools, and other community-serving facilities on the hook for Washington's half-baked ideas.

Its vague and circular definitions of gender identity will lead only to uncertainty, litigation, and harm to individuals and organizations that will be forced to comply with a law the authors don't even seem to understand.

This is a classic example of passing something now and figuring out what it actually means later.

We have been here before. If the Devil is in the details, we are in for a lot of devilish surprises.

This is no small price for some greater good, as the bill's proponents have argued.

Opening schools and workplaces to expanded liability based on, as the bill states, a ''perception or belief, even if inaccurate,'' of suspected discrimination.

Madam Speaker, I am going to repeat those words, because they are so unbelievable: ''a perception or belief, even if inaccurate,'' of suspected discrimination.

How can we write legislation like this? It would have untold chilling effects on hiring, career advancement, and one could easily see discourse in the classroom.

Where the bill is alarmingly clear, however, is in its meticulous and intentional destruction of religious freedom protections.

American employers and educators have grown accustomed to clumsy and misguided mandates coming down from Washington shrouded in good intentions. Other laws under the jurisdiction of the Education and Labor Committee are littered with them, but this time something is different.

The provision in H.R. 5 that guts the Religious Freedom Restoration Act of 1993 is clear in its intent. This bill is a brazen attempt to replace timeless, inherent religious liberties with the identity politics of the moment.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle could have been given the benefit of the doubt on the rest of this bill.

Careless and shortsighted legislation is what they have done best for many years, but this fevered grasping, this hysterical clawing at individual Americans who hold personal religious convictions, represents a major departure from where the debate in this Chamber has been before.

I sincerely hope it is temporary, for the sake of this body, and more importantly, for the sake of the people we represent.

I hope this bill, which faces certain failure in the Senate, will be remembered as a failed experiment in oppressive legislating and not the first-time move in a new, sustained attack on religious freedom.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN), the co-chair of the Equality Caucus.

Mr. POCAN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding.

Madam Speaker, this is not about a red herring about men wanting to play in women's sports. Please.

This is about people like my husband, Phil, and I. We have been married for almost 13 years. We are a pretty boring married couple, probably not all that different than most people in Congress.

We try to sleep in a little on the weekends, we sometimes argue over what to watch on TV, and we cherish the limited time we have with our friends and family.

And we are really lucky, because we live in Wisconsin, the first State in the Nation to pass a gay and lesbian civil rights bill back in 1982, and it was signed by a Republican Governor, but that is not true for a majority of America.

If we pass the Equality Act, people like Phil and I can be free to love who we love, and we can live where we want to live, and we can work where we want to work without being fired or evicted simply because of who we are or who we love.

That is pretty simple, pretty normal, pretty American.

Today, we here in Congress can protect our LGBTQ constituents who want to live a life like Phil and mine, like yours, free of unfair prejudice and discrimination.

Madam Speaker, I hope that Members will do the right thing today and join me in supporting the Equality Act.

□ 0945

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS), the ranking member of the Judiciary Committee, control the remainder of my time.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for being here today and covering for us.

Madam Speaker, again, we have talked about this: The Democrats in this bill are pushing something quickly. We have talked about this many times and sometimes I just want to talk about this because I feel that, however well-intentioned the bill is, it is not coming under full scrutiny. After considering only four members in the committee and rejecting each of them, including three that simply added rules of construction, the chairman requested the House consider this bill under a closed rule, and his request was granted. Now, we can disagree about policy, but it is hard to argue this bill wouldn't have been improved by full debate about what the bill says in consideration of as many amendments as possible.

Americans can all agree that everyone deserves to be treated with respect. No one should be mistreated by his employers, coworkers, or, frankly, anyone else. However, when lawmakers propose amendments to Federal law, we must avoid doing more harm than good. We also must not pass legislation that could harm children; set back the rights of women they have fought so hard to obtain; and erase the gains made possible by other Federal civil rights laws, such as Title IX. H.R. 5 does all these things. This bill would do much more harm than good in many ways, and the people who would bear it the most would be the women and children who would get the brunt of the damage.

Again, we can have disagreements on what we believe this to be, but without a full vetting on the possibilities, all the nice language today about what it would or would not do and what it is supposed to do gets under the scrutiny of what the law actually says. That is the part that I have the most problem with, not the intent, not the desire, that is something we fight about—and we do—and the goodness, I never question. It is how you go about it.

I made this statement on this floor before, Madam Speaker, what makes you feel good does not often heal you. And today may make us feel good, but in the end probably will not do what we intend it to do. And that is a concern, especially with the way this bill has come to the floor.

I know this has been a consideration. We considered female sports in which, last year, two male athletes won the top two spots in a Connecticut girls class S indoor track meet. One of those female athletes finished eighth and missed an opportunity to compete in front of college coaches by two places. In her words, ''We all know the outcome of the race before it even starts; it's demoralizing.'' Allowing men to compete against women in women's sports isn't demoralizing because female athletes like Selina aren't talented, it is demoralizing because it makes their talent irrelevant.

I don't say this. This is not DOUG COLLINS' opinion. This is also the opinion of tennis great, Martina Navratilova, who explained the threat H.R. 5 poses to women's sports: ''Unless you want to completely remake what women's sports mean, there can be no blanket inclusion rule. There is nothing stereotypical about this—it's about fairness and it's about science.'' And that came after she made initial comments, went back after being criticized for them, reviewed it, looked at everything, and then came back with that statement. She basically, again, doubled down and agreed on what she was saying. And she is one not to back away from those needing equality.

If H.R. 5 becomes law, others will be asking, What did we do at this moment when we had a chance to look at a bill that maybe we could look at and fix or make it better, but we didn't?

Never before in American history has a political party tried so dramatically to rewrite the Federal civil rights laws to include an undefined, self-referential, ideologically driven term called ''gender identity'' in the U.S. Code, applicable to literally any entity that receives Federal assistance, including elementary schools, colleges, and healthcare centers nationwide. H.R. 5 would make self-reporting of gender identity a protected class under Federal law and require doctors and educators to blindly follow the self-reporting of adolescents and young adults. Healthcare protocols and even state law would be no defense, as they would be superseded by this Federal law under the Supremacy Clause of the Constitution. I know this has been debated and characterized from my friends across the aisle as not true, but a plain reading of the text says it is true, and this is something we have to deal with.

We heard proponents of H.R. 5 call people who oppose it as either ignorant, bigoted, oppressive, or hateful. I will not make similar characterizations across the aisle of my friends. I believe we have a genuine disagreement here. That is what this House floor is for, but, unfortunately, it is a closed rule today and has been relatively closed in the process up until this point.

Madam Speaker, I implore my colleagues to listen to the stories of stakeholders everywhere, including the transgender girls and boys this bill is meant to help. We may be hurting them by allowing doctors to prescribe hormones and perform major surgeries on adolescents without parental consent or involvement. In fact, H.R. 5 would actually compel doctors to medicalize children without even consulting their parents. Families of transgender children are begging Congress to listen to them.

But, also, H.R. 5 endangers the First Amendment rights of every single American. Because the bill makes no provision for sincerely-held religious belief, it would criminalize the fundamental tenets of major world religions, including Christianity, Islam, and Judaism. Biological sex is a scientific reality, yet H.R. 5 would target faith traditions that acknowledge it as such and want to live their lives accordingly.

Today, we must listen to all Americans, including the LGBTQ community, and recognize many within the community have also raised concerns about this legislation. H.R. 5, in the words of the Women's Liberation Front leader, nullifies ''women and girls as a coherent legal category, worthy of civil rights protection.'' It would endanger millions of American women and undermine fundamental American rights to faith in both religion and science, and actively put children at risk by medicalizing them in harmful and permanent ways without parental involvement.

Madam Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to join me in opposing this bill, which is being rushed to the floor without Members having an opportunity to vote on amendments and I believe carefully considering what is being put before them.

Again, Madam Speaker, think about what we are asking here. For the first time, something was raised in our committee hearing that said: Do you think people would commit fraud by doing all these changes and going through medical procedures and everything, that they would do that just to simply commit fraud? Let me remind you, Madam Speaker, and to anyone listening this morning, this bill does not require any of that. It requires nothing except a self-admonishment or knowledge that I am what I say I am today. That is all this bill requires.

So many of us are just asking: Is there a better way to do this? Is there a better way to look at this? Probably not. But this way, this is not right and is being rushed.

Again, as I started with today, I will sort of end as well, sometimes what makes you feel good—and I understand the majority's desire to bring this forward and to a fulfill a promise, I get it—but, in the end, is it also going to do what you want it to do in the long-run? Or are there going to be unintended consequences that we don't want to acknowledge today in our rush to do something we promised? Sometimes it is better to back up and make sure it is right before we can fulfill a promise.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY).

Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I rise to support the Equality Act. I will not repeat the many eloquent things my colleagues have said about the importance of the proposed legislation, though I will thank the gentleman from New York and from Rhode Island for their leadership and others. Nor will I refute the many foolish and false things said on the other side.

This is landmark and essential civil rights protection for those who now don't have it. It is no more, it is no less than others enjoy. It respects the First Amendment and the exercise of religion in exactly the same way as we do now for every other civil rights context. It puts the law on the side of those who continue to face invidious discrimination based not on their character, but on who they are.

Many others have said this better than I will, but, Madam Speaker, I do want to speak to one group of my colleagues: those who know this is a good bill and, yet today, will vote no. To those colleagues, I ask you to consider the score.

In this Chamber, we are all familiar with scores. A score is what some powerful group usually threatens us with when they fear we will vote for something because we believe it is the right thing to do. It often works that way. We believe a vote is right, but don't vote that way, they say, or we will score it against you. That is how Washington scores.

But, history scores differently. Conscience has its own rules. Decency sees something beyond such agendas. History records the good. Conscience aligns with what is right. Decency endures the unfair attacks and protects what truly matters.

This is a good and simple bill of extraordinary historical importance. It sits high above our daily considerations. Each of us in our careers will be lucky if we come to this floor on a single day when history is made, on a day when, by our vote, we can count ourselves among those who have cared for and who have nurtured the original promise embedded in our founding documents.

Others have done much more than we will do today or any day: on the battlefield, or in Seneca Falls, or on the Edmund Pettus Bridge, or simply in their daily dignified decisions to love their neighbors as themselves.

Madam Speaker, I know my colleagues are good and decent people. Let conscience guide us to the right, and, please, support this bill.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BYRNE).

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 5. As many of my colleagues have stated, there are a number of very troubling issues with this legislation. In my mind, perhaps none is more troubling than the bill's explicit carveout from the Religious Freedom Restoration Act, also known as RFRA.

Under the First Amendment, Americans are blessed with the freedom of religion. This is much more than the freedom of worship. Not only do Americans have the right to worship as they see fit, their faith is not confined to what happens inside their place of worship. They have the right to practice their religion every day as they see fit.

For many years, there was a strong, bipartisan agreement that protecting this right was of the utmost importance. In the Civil Rights Act of 1964, religious protections enjoyed bipartisan support. Likewise, RFRA was heralded as an historic, bipartisan achievement.

In the wake of the Supreme Court's 1990 decision in Employment Division v. Smith, which rolled back longstanding constitutional protections for religious liberty, the Congress came together and restored broad protections for religious freedom under RFRA.

RFRA was introduced by then-Representative CHUCK SCHUMER and Senator Ted Kennedy. It passed unanimously in the House and by a vote of 97–3 in the Senate, and it was signed into law by President Clinton.

For nearly two decades, RFRA has been the hallmark of protecting the religious freedom of Americans against the weight of a powerful Federal Government. Contrary to what some of its recent opponents claim, RFRA is not an automatic opt out of any law for people of faith. Instead, RFRA provides a commonsense balancing test between religious belief and government action.

First, an individual challenging the government must show that they have a sincerely held belief that is being substantially burdened by the government—that is, there is a real matter of faith actually being affected by the government's actions. If the individual successfully shows that, they do not automatically win their claim.

The government may then show that it has a compelling interest—that is, a good reason—to interfere with the individual's religious rights and that the interference is the least restrictive means to accomplish the government's goals—that is, the government doesn't have a better alternative.

This test provides fairness for both sides. Unfortunately, today, the House proposes to break this historic protection and say that RFRA will not apply to the Equality Act. It is clear why they have done this.

Without RFRA, it is less likely that faith-based charities and organizations will be able to uphold the faith of their organization when it runs counter to evolving norms on human sexuality.

Without RFRA, it is less likely that Christian colleges and universities will be able to teach and uphold a biblical understanding of marriage and human sexuality.

Without RFRA, it is less likely that parents in public schools will be able to opt their children out of mandated education that teaches human sexuality contrary to their family's religious faith.

Unfortunately, the modern Democratic Party has decided that mandating its beliefs on everyone is more important than upholding the rights of people of faith and those who possess contrary beliefs.

Madam Speaker, that is truly radical and deeply troubling. It is unprecedented. It is contrary to the values and foundational freedoms of this country.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to reject this legislation. Protecting the rights of some cannot come

at the high cost of stripping away the rights of others, particularly when it comes to protecting religious liberty.

□ 1000

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), a senior member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much, and I thank Mr. CICILLINE.

Let me refute the suggestion that this is a bill that was rushed to the floor. This is a work that has been germinating for 5 years plus, and many of us have watched and been engaged in meetings and collaboration to ensure that the bill would reflect all of what America is about.

I want to speak to my religious friends—that is, all of us claim a religion of some form—and I want to say to them that religious liberty is not dead, but it is alive.

This bill focuses on saving lives; it focuses on understanding what it means to be transgender and denied the right to serve in the United States military. It stands up for African American transgender women who have been killed in the South, in the region that I live in; and it stands up for the person who knocked on the door and could not get housing because of their status.

And so I would ask my friends who are Mormon, Seventh Day Adventists, Catholic, Jewish, Muslim, and other religions: How would you feel if you knocked on a door and you could not get in, if they had no place for you at the inn?

So I am well-aware of the Restorative Act, dealing with religion, passed in 1993, but I am also aware of the Supreme Court case, the Hodges case in 2015, which said: ''They ask for equal dignity in the eyes of the law. The Constitution grants them that right.''

That is what this bill is doing, and the Constitution will protect those who are involved in the religious practices. As it has indicated: ''We the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union.''

And then you go to the Bill of Rights, and it has as Amendment Number I: ''Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.''

The Constitution will be alongside of the Equality Act, and we will be able to have fair housing and civil rights, and we will be able to deal with this issue.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POCAN). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much for the time.

It will allow, with this Constitution alongside of the Equality Act, the idea that the Civil Rights Act stands for those in the LGBTQ community, the Civil Rights Act in title VI and title II and title VII; and they will stand alongside of the ACLU and the NAACP and the Urban League and LULAC and all of the civil rights groups.

They will stand alongside those of us who have been fighting for fair housing time after time so that, when we knock on the door, no matter who you are in this country, you will have the Constitution and the Equality Act.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my friends and others in the religious community to support the Equality Act.

Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of the Committee on the Judiciary and an original cosponsor, I rise in strong support of H.R. 5, the ''Equality Act of 2019.''

Let me thank my colleague on the Judiciary Committee, Congressman DAVID CICILLINE of Rhode Island, for introducing this landmark legislation and his tireless efforts in making this day a reality.

Mr. Speaker, our nation's long but inexorable march towards equality reaches another milestone today.

For as long as our national charters have been in existence, we have endeavored to ask ourselves: what do we mean when we say ''We the People?''

How expansive do we hold our pledge that all are entitled to the blessings of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

To be certain our nation has come a long way, but as we debate this critical bill, I am reminded of the Supreme Court's decision in *Obergefell* v. *Hodges*, 576 U.S. ___ 135 S.Ct. 2584 (2015), and its powerful conclusion explaining the profound power of love and marriage, and the desire to be seen as equal in the eyes of the law:

> No union is more profound than marriage, for it embodies the highest ideals of love, fidelity, devotion, sacrifice, and family. In forming a marital union, two people become something greater than once they were. As some of the petitioners in these cases demonstrate, marriage embodies a love that may endure even past death. It would misunderstand these men and women to say they disrespect the idea of marriage. Their plea is that they do respect it, respect it so deeply that they seek to find its fulfillment for themselves. Their hope is not to be condemned to live in loneliness, excluded from one of civilization's oldest institutions. They ask for equal dignity in the eyes of the law. The Constitution grants them that right.

Despite significant legal advances over the past several years, including marriage equality, LGBTQ Americans remain vulnerable to discrimination on a daily basis and too often have little recourse.

The Equality Act has the bipartisan support of Members of Congress, with nearly 240 cosponsors, as well as the strong support of the business community, and most important, the overwhelming support of the American people.

More than 70 percent of Americans support the Equality Act.

This has been a long journey; the first Equality Act was introduced nearly 45 years ago.

It is long past time to secure the civil rights of LGBTQ people across the country and accord them full membership in the American family.

With the Trump Administration rolling back protections at the federal level and anti-equality opponents continuing to push discriminatory bills at the state level, LGBTQ people cannot wait another year for affirmation that they are worthy of the dignity of their peers and deserving of equal protection of the laws.

Today, too many LGTBQ Americans in too many places remain too vulnerable to discrimination on a daily basis with too little legal recourse.

Fifty percent of the national LGBTQ community live in states where, though they may have the right to marry, they have no explicit non-discrimination protections in other areas of daily life.

The Equality Act extends the full anti-discrimination protections of the landmark Civil Rights Act of 1964 and other key pillars of fairness and justice in our country to LGBTQ Americans.

Sexual orientation and gender identity deserve full civil rights protections, not just in the workplace, but in every place: in education, housing, credit, jury service, public facilities, and public accommodations.

Today, there are only 21 states that have explicit laws barring discrimination based on sexual orientation in employment, housing, and public accommodations, and only 20 states have such protections for gender identity.

In most states, a same-sex couple can get married on Saturday, then be legally denied service at a restaurant on Sunday, and be fired from their jobs on Monday, and evicted from their apartment on Tuesday.

Mr. Speaker, let me take a moment to discuss in more detail several of the important elements of the Equality Act.

The Equality Act amends existing federal civil rights laws to explicitly prohibit discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation and gender identity in education, employment, housing, credit, Federal jury service, public accommodations, and the use of Federal funds.

It does so by adding sex in some places where it had not previously been protected, and clarifying that sex includes sexual orientation and gender identity.

Specifically, the H.R. 5, the ''Equality Act of 2019'' amends:

1. Title II of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to provide basic protections against discrimination in public accommodations by adding sex, including sexual orientation and gender identity;

2. Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to provide basic protections against discrimination by recipients of federal financial assistance by adding sex, including sexual orientation, and gender identity;

3. Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Civil Service Reform Act of 1978, the Government Employee Rights Act of 1991, and the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 to make explicit protections against workplace discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation or gender identity;

4. The Fair Housing Act of 1968 to make protections against housing discrimination based on sexual orientation or gender identity explicit;

5. The Equal Credit Opportunity Act to make protections against credit discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity explicit; and

6. The Jury Selections and Services Act to make protections against discrimination in federal jury service based on sexual orientation or gender identity explicit.

RELIGIOUS EXEMPTIONS

The march towards equality has been long and has awoken passions passion from many quarters for various reasons.

Well-intentioned people from all walks of life have had difficulty as progress washes over the debate surrounding protections for same sex individuals.

At times, the debate has seen input from members of the faith community, who strive to reconcile their love for all of God's sons and daughters, with the script of their sacred text.

I understand this tension, but I have carefully studied the text and am confident that passage of the Equality Act will not adversely affect any person's freedom of worship of the free exercise of their faith.

The Equality Act adds sexual orientation and gender identity to federal civil rights law and sex where it is missing.

But the same statutory exemptions that are already in place in the Civil Rights Act and the Fair Housing Act will remain in place after enactment and the guarantees of the United States Constitution remain untouched.

The U.S. Constitution provides ample protections for religious freedom and nothing in this bill would, or could, infringe upon the protections afforded by the Constitution, as the principal sponsor of the bill, Congressman CICILLINE, confirmed during a colloquy we held during the markup of the bill in the Judiciary Committee.

Specifically, the provisions relating to Title VI of the Civil Rights Act (federal funding) include the original exemptions for discrimination based on religion.

Religious organizations (not just houses of worship) are free to limit participation in a wide array of activities and services to only members of their faith.

This same exemption applies to public accommodations.

Houses of worship could be considered a place of public accommodation only if they offer their space or services for commercial public use.

This does not include religious services.

Nothing in this bill alters the ability of houses of worship or religious leaders to practice or carry out their faith.

No member of the clergy will ever be compelled to perform a religious ceremony that conflicts with their beliefs, including marrying same-sex couples.

The DOJ Title VI Manual and relevant and relevant case law clearly provide that a religious organization that is not ''principally engaged'' in providing social services is only bound by nondiscrimination requirements related to the program for which they receive funding if that funding is targeted in order to provide a specific program or service, i.e. disaster relief, rather than to the entity ''as a whole.''

Nothing in the Equality Act changes that rule.

There is a longstanding ministerial exemption in federal civil rights law that exempts religious organizations from complying with employment nondiscrimination provisions for ministers, rabbis and any other person who is ''carrying out the faith''.

The Equality Act does not alter that exemption in any way.

The Equality Act does not repeal the Religious Freedom Restoration Act (RFRA).

The Equality Act clarifies that RFRA cannot be used to defend discrimination in public settings or with federal funds.

The Equality Act does not alter or amend the RFRA standard for any other kinds of claims.

Federal civil rights laws and the United States Constitution provide many exemptions for religious organizations.

It bears stating again that the statutory exemptions that are already in place in the Civil Rights Act and the Fair Housing Act will remain in place and the United States Constitution remains untouched.

Courts have long-rejected religious claims as a reason to deny civil rights protections, including those based on race and sex, and the same analysis applies to all other protected characteristics.

Specifically, religious belief did not exempt restaurants or hotels from complying with the civil rights laws passed in the 1960s and cannot do so today.

RFRA explicitly contemplates that Congress would exempt certain laws from its application.

The clarifying language in the Equality Act is necessary to ensure that courts do not misinterpret the intended interaction between RFRA and our civil rights laws.

RFRA will still be available to address burdens on religious beliefs and practices in other contexts.

And any individual or organization that is concerned that their religious beliefs or practices are being unjustly burdened retains the ability to bring a claim under the First Amendment.

The time has come to extend the full blessings of equality and the majesty of the law's protection to all of our brothers and sisters, including those in the LGBTQ community.

Mr. Speaker, it been said that ''the moral arc of the universe is long but bends toward justice.''

Today, with passage by this House of H.R. 5, the Equality Act, we bend that arc even more in the direction of justice.

I am proud to be an original cosponsor of this life-changing and life-affirming legislation and urge all members to stand on the right of history and vote for its passage.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SPANO).

Mr. SPANO. Mr. Speaker, I happen to be a Christian, and I am grateful. I am grateful to have been born in a nation where my beliefs and those of every other American are legally protected by our Constitution.

It is no coincidence that the very First Amendment to the Constitution guarantees religious liberty. Our Nation was settled by men and women from all over the world with divergent beliefs and conviction. We were Catholics, Puritans, Lutherans, Jews, Baptists, Hindus, Anglicans, Quakers, and Muslims.

This rich and diverse cultural melting pot was the soil in which the guarantees of the First Amendment were planted, sprouted, and grew very strong. And over these last 230 years, the freedom of Americans to worship and believe as their conscience and their God dictates has become deeply and firmly rooted in our Nations's heritage, laws, and jurisprudence. But although deeply rooted, I fear we have forgotten and neglected its fundamental importance.

The First Amendment was adopted long ago, but freedom—freedom—is always a new idea. Coretta Scott King wisely said: ''Freedom is never really won. You earn it and win it in every generation.''

H.R. 5 is bad for freedom. You see, it would immediately expose churches, religious schools, and universities and faith-based organizations to legal liability for simply following their earnest beliefs. It would essentially allow the government to place its hard and unyielding fist inside the church walls to force compliance with the convictions and dictates of the State instead of the church.

H.R. 5 is bad for freedom. It would force small businesses, small business owners all across this country to provide services or products to the public that may violate their deeply held, faith-based convictions, again, allowing the State to essentially impose from above, top down, its own moral codes and rules in place of those of the individual.

H.R. 5 is bad for freedom. It is a large leap backward for parental rights, pitting physicians against parents, the genuine religious convictions of parents when their child seeks life-altering, irreversible sex reassignment treatment before that child has even developed physically or emotionally, once again, government inserting its rigid fist and iron will, this time, directly into the family unit.

H.R. 5 is bad for freedom. It would, in one fell swoop, deliver a crushing blow to the base of the tree of religious liberty, the tree that has grown strong and provided shade and protection for many for so long.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, anybody who says that this bill would dictate to the churches what they may preach or practice doesn't know what he is talking about.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES), the chair of the Democratic Caucus and a senior member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished chair, and I thank my good friend, DAVID CICILLINE, for his extraordinary leadership on this incredibly important legislation.

The words, ''We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal,'' were eloquent in their articulation but incomplete in their application.

As the legendary Barbara Jordan once observed, those words did not originally apply to African Americans; they did not apply to people of color; they did not apply to Native Americans; they did not apply to women; they did not apply to members of the LGBT community.

We have come a long way here in the United States of America, but we still have work to do.

If you truly believe in liberty and justice for all, support the Equality Act.

If you truly believe in equal protection under the law, support the Equality Act.

If you truly believe that everybody is created equal and that we are all God's children, then support the Equality Act.

Love does not discriminate, and neither should the law, regardless of sexual orientation and regardless of gender identity. It is time to support the Equality Act, and let's continue our Nation's long, necessary, and majestic march toward a more perfect Union.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. COMER).

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today representing a district in which school sports are at the heart of community gatherings.

In Kentucky, basketball is a way of life. In my district, students practice their whole life to have the chance to attain athletic scholarship opportunities from universities they would otherwise be unable to attend. These students go on to accomplish great things and give back to their communities because of the scholarships they gain from athletic competition.

This legislation would essentially subvert the purpose of gender divisions in these competitions by allowing biological males who identify as female to compete against girls in the same division. We have already seen instances where young women were denied scholarship opportunities because biological males competed in the same category with them and placed higher on the podium in track competitions.

A bill with a name like the Equality Act sounds like a bill that in some way advocates for all people. That is what we strive for in this country: equality before the law. That is why, over the more than two centuries this country has existed, we have, thankfully, updated our laws to right wrongs and bring us closer to treating all people with the dignity they deserve.

But as I look at H.R. 5, I am deeply troubled, and I believe most Americans would be deeply troubled by what is really there.

I serve as ranking member for the Civil Rights and Human Services Subcommittee for the Committee on Education and Labor. In our subcommittee, we held a hearing on the Equality Act, and what became abundantly clear was that this legislation would alter Federal nondiscrimination law in ways that would have unintended effects we cannot know today.

This bill is following in the tradition of others we have seen so far throughout this Congress: a clever name, an allegedly noble purpose, but a vehicle for serious, harmful consequences.

Equality and freedom must coexist. H.R. 5 totally redefines one and delivers a serious blow to the other.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN), a distinguished member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to strike a bipartisan note and invoke a Republican President who made America truly great, Abraham Lincoln, who served in this body and spoke of government of the people, by the people, and for the people—all the people.

In 1964, our predecessors in the House stood here and voted 333–85 to pass the Civil Rights Act of 1964. The vast majority of Democrats and the vast majority of Republicans voted for it, and we changed America by bringing down the walls of racial and ethnic discrimination in employment, housing, public accommodations, and education.

Our predecessors rejected the familiar hysterical arguments that equal rights for African Americans in restaurants and hotels and at lunch counters meant discrimination against the religious rights of the owners of the restaurants and the motels and lunch counters, which is precisely the argument that was made back in that day.

Today, we legislate equal rights under the exact same act for millions of Americans in the LGBT community. This is a triumphant and glorious moment for the House of Representatives and for the United States of America.

But our friends who now occupy the seats of Lincoln's party tell us that children will be able to get surgery without their parents' consent. This is false, and this is propaganda.

Every State in the Union requires parental consent before their minor children get surgery, and nothing in this act will affect any of the States' laws in any way with respect to parental consent.

Let's honor Abraham Lincoln. Let's honor the best traditions of the United States of America. Let's bring down the walls of discrimination against all Americans. Let's pass the Equality Act.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER).

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 5, a deceptively named bill that is anything but equalizing. In fact, this bill legalizes discrimination, government-imposed, top-down discrimination against those with time-honored views of marriage and gender.

This bill should be renamed the ''Inequality Act,'' as its policies at the State level have already been used to eliminate safe spaces for women, irreparably harm children, trample parental rights, undermine the free exercise of religion, and dismantle female athletics.

As a mother, teacher, and former track coach, I am deeply concerned about the implications of this bill on and off the playing field.

Title 9 of the Civil Rights Act, the provision guaranteeing girls the same educational opportunities as boys and which launched competitive female sports into the arena, is rendered irrelevant and outdated under the Inequality Act.

□ 1015

Under H.R. 5, high school female athletes will miss competitive opportunities because boys take home the medals.

Selina from Connecticut trained hard, set goals, and persevered, but she couldn't overcome the biological advantage men have over women when two biological boys who identify as female outpaced her in a recent girls' track meet.

On average, there is a 10 to 12 percent performance gap between elite males and elite females in athletics. The gap is smaller between elite females and nonelite males but still insurmountable. It is no surprise that men are taking home the gold in women's sports.

In future Olympics, it would only take three biological males who identify as female to prevent the best female athletes from reaching the medal stand and eight to keep them off the track entirely.

If we continue down this track, how long will it be before nations recruit men identifying as female to out-medal other countries and ultimately uproot the ancient tradition of the Olympics?

To put in this perspective, Olympic, world, and U.S. champion Tori Bowie's 100-meter lifetime best time was beaten 15,000 times by men and boys. In another case, Olympic, world, and U.S. champion Allyson Felix's 400-meter lifetime best was outperformed more than 15,000 times by males.

In case after case, men identifying as women are outcompeting, outrunning, outfighting, and outcycling women. Welcome to the brave new world of women's sports under H.R. 5.

The importance of Title IX is found not just on the field. As Duke law professor Coleman testified before the House Judiciary Committee, ''Tens of thousands of girls and women are now eligible for college scholarships, ensuring educational opportunities that for many wouldn't be realistic otherwise.''

Unfortunately, H.R. 5 erases these educational opportunities, further disenfranchising women. Women-only scholarships would be a thing of the past if this bill passes.

Mr. Speaker, either we want a level playing field for American women or we don't.

I remind my colleagues that next week marks the centennial anniversary of this Chamber's historic passage of the 19th Amendment granting women the right to vote. It is an honor and a privilege for me to stand here on this House floor 100 years later celebrating this milestone.

I find it eerily ironic that today many of my colleagues will exercise their 19th Amendment right to turn back the clock on women and girls across this country.

A vote for this bill is a vote against women. Members from both sides of the aisle, especially those who claim to be pro-women and pro-child, need to stop this devastating legislation. The future of our girls' rights, privacy, protection, and athletic potential depends on it.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. GARCIA), a distinguished member of the Judiciary Committee.

Ms. GARCIA of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in full support of H.R. 5, the Equality Act. We have made much progress in recent years, but the reality is that many still face discrimination because of who they are and whom they love.

As has been well-documented during the legislative record for H.R. 5, there are currently no Federal protections for LGBTQ people in the United States. So let's refocus on what this bill is really about.

In 30 States, LGBTQ people can be fired, refused housing, or denied services simply because of who they are. The Equality Act would greatly extend civil rights for this community, providing protections across key areas of life, including employment, housing, credit, and jury duty.

In Texas, that means having explicit protections for LGBTQ people for the first time in our history. Updating Federal law will tear down barriers to prosperity and lead to better outcomes for our families, neighbors, and loved ones.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. GARCIA of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this legislation will benefit nearly 1 million LGBTQ Texans and countless other Americans.

Finally, in Texas, when we say y'all, we will mean all.

Mr. Speaker, I want to add that as a woman and as a Catholic, I know I am not forfeiting any of my rights, not my women's rights or my religious rights. We need to go back and make sure that we pass this bill because for once, when we say justice for all at the end of our pledge, it should mean justice for all.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT).

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the efforts of my friends across the aisle who believe that they are acting on behalf of equality. I realize that they believe that their way of approaching things includes much more wisdom than that of Moses, who is the only great lawgiver depicted in this Chamber with a full face rather than a side view.

I would only submit we are not wiser at this time than Moses. I have heard comments from my friends, including my friend the former law professor saying he was impressed with the ability of the courts to sort out these civil rights issues.

But as my friend Justice Scalia once told me: If you guys are going to screw up legislation over in Congress, don't come running to us all the time because you don't know how to make laws that are fair.

That is what we have here. In an effort borne out of the best intentions, we want to help the feelings of people who are gender confused or just suffering gender dysphoria, the opposite of euphoria. We don't want to hurt their feelings.

We are told that 25 percent of all women will suffer sexual assault. The literature is clear that women suffer post-traumatic stress disorder after sexual assault at three to four times the rate that soldiers do, and that they are traumatized and retriggered by being in a confined space like a dressing room or a restroom when a biological man comes into that private area.

We are going to say to those women: You know what? You have just got to get over your trauma because for the less than 1 percent who though a biological man but think they may be a woman, so they are confused genderwise, we don't want to hurt their feelings. So you are just going to have to get over your trauma.

This is what is going on here. If you look at the battered women shelters around this country, who pays for most of those? It sure appears to me, for the ones I see, they are Christian, Salvation Army, Catholic. I have been told by many of these folks: We are just barely surviving financially. This will force us to change our accommodations, and we will go out of business.

We believe, as Christians, that Moses had it right on males and females. Although there are people wiser in their own eyes than Moses and Jesus, who said exactly verbatim what Moses did, if an orthodox synagogue says, ''You know what? We think men should be rabbis,'' but they don't hire the biological woman who says, ''I feel like I am a man today,'' then they can be sued. But this bill gives not only the claimant the ability to sue but also allows the Attorney General to come in with the full force of the United States Government and destroy that synagogue or that Christian organization.

I know there are people here who think, ''I do a whole lot more good than these Christian organizations,'' but do you really?

This is borne out of good intentions, but it is going to be so destructive to common sense and to people, to women who have been hurt. As we heard in our committee from the second woman to get a scholarship under Title IX, you are going to destroy women's scholarships.

She had a chart there. The three top times for the 400-meter in the Olympics of 2016, she said there are thousands of men who have better times. I know my friends said in the hearing, ''Gee, we know that men would never act like a woman just to get a massive amount of money and scholarships.''

I don't want to hear the majority say later, ''Wow, we really didn't think that would happen.'' It is already happening.

If we are going to preserve the gains made by women under Title IX, this needs to fail and not become the law. To preserve what we have already done in the way of gains for women, I urge a ''no'' vote.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the distinguished Speaker of the House.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I am so proud that the gentleman is in the Chair, as well as others who will preside in the course of this historic debate today, ANGIE CRAIG being one of them.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee for giving us this opportunity today to expand freedom in America.

I commend Congressman CICILLINE for his extraordinary leadership, his courage, and his persistence in introducing this legislation that is so important to our country, and doing so with the support of the Congressional Black Caucus. To see him standing there with the rest of us, honored to join Congressman JOHN LEWIS on the day of announcement a while back, a year and a half, 2 years ago, and now in the majority for us to have the privilege to bring this legislation to the floor, I thank Congressman CICILLINE for being a champion of equality in our country.

Again, I salute the Congressional Black Caucus, JOHN LEWIS, and so many others, including Mr. CLEAVER, who will speak later today.

It is a deeply powerful moment to be on this floor to talk about this important legislation. What I would like to do is take the opportunity in the time that I will use to salute the countless activists, advocates, outside organizers, and mobilizers who have courageously demanded the full fairness and justice that are the rights of all Americans.

On this floor, many of us, including Mr. HOYER, we all go way back when we sparred for funding for HIV and AIDS. We were successful not only because of our inside maneuvering but because of the outside mobilization.

We were successful in passing fully inclusive hate crime legislation. Barney Frank led the way for us inside, but the outside groups were mobilizing, mobilizing, mobilizing.

Under the leadership of President Barack Obama—and we salute him for it—we were able in the Congress in the majority to pass the repeal of Don't Ask, Don't Tell, to put that into the dustbin of history. It was successful because of the activism of our outside groups and advocates.

Then, of course, the horrible Defense of Marriage Act, I don't know what marriages they were defending, but the

Defense of Marriage Act that was proposed by some of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, the Supreme Court gave us that answer about justice in our country.

Then there was the ending of the hateful ban on transgender military service.

For this Congress, this has been the scene where we have fought the fight on legislation, fought the fight to present the case in the court of public opinion and to bolster the case in the Supreme Court.

On this monumental day, my thoughts are with Phyllis Lyon and the late Del Martin, who shared their lives together for decades. They were mentors for civic engagement to many of us in San Francisco for decades. Some of that civic engagement related to LGBTQ rights. They were an inspiration, as I say, to many of us.

People say to me, ''It is easy for you to be for some of these things because you are from San Francisco. People are so tolerant there.'' I say, ''Tolerant? That is a condescending word to me. This is not about tolerance. This is about respect of the LGBTQ community. This is about taking pride.''

That is what we do today. For Phyllis and Del and other older LGBTQ couples, LGBTQ workers striving to provide for their families, for the young people, the LGBTQ youth, this is a transformative moment.

Fifty years after LGBTQ Americans took to the streets outside of New York's Stonewall Inn to fight against harassment and hate, we take pride in the progress we have forged together.

Our Founders, in their great wisdom, wrote in our beautiful preamble of the blessings of liberty, which were to be the birthright of all Americans.

□ 1030

To bring our Nation closer to the founding promise of liberty and justice for all, we today pass the Equality Act and finally fully end discrimination against LGBTQ Americans. LGBTQ people deserve full civil rights protection in the workforce and in every place, in education, housing, credit, jury duty service, and public accommodations. No one should be forced to lose his or her job, their home, or to live in fear because of who they are and whom they love.

This is personal. It is not just about policy. It is about people. Earlier this year I received a letter from a trans woman living in San Francisco who has faced threats, stalking, and harassment because of who she is.

She says in her communication:

> The fear is very much there. All I want to do is live my life like anyone else. Please keep seeing me.

Today and for all days, we say to all of our friends: We see you, we support you, and we stand with you with pride.

We look forward to a swift, strong, successful, and, hopefully, strongly bipartisan bill today for equality. This is not just an act of Congress that we are taking for the LGBTQ progress to the community. This is progress for America.

Mr. Speaker, I urge an ''aye'' vote.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEUBE).

Mr. STEUBE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 5.

To begin, I would like to echo the comments of my colleagues and express my deep concern for the grave consequences this bill would have for religious freedom. This bill would deny religious organizations their religious liberty rights guaranteed under the Religious Freedom Restoration Act of 1993 and force many religious institutions to go against their beliefs or risk being in violation of the law. As a nation we cannot turn our back on our religious liberties.

Now, while the religious freedom aspects of this legislation are by far the most egregious, there is also another area of serious concern—the effects of the legislation on female athletes at all levels of sporting competition across our country.

Twice during the consideration of this bill, I have offered an amendment to ensure that our daughters are provided an equal playing field in sports for generations to come and that female athletes are not competing against male athletes for athletic scholarships and title IX funding. And twice partisan politics have stopped this commonsense proposal from being added to this bill.

This provision would have simply guaranteed that biological women are not forced to compete against biological men at all levels of athletic competition. Science has proven time and time again that there is a significant performance difference between biological males and females from puberty onward.

From percentage of lean muscle, to heart size, to body fat, to joint angles, the bodies of men and women are distinctly unique and produce a vast difference in performance ability when it comes to certain activities. In fact, there is an average 10- to 12-percent performance gap between elite biological male and female athletes.

These differences are largely due to the large influx of testosterone males receive during puberty. Science is very clear here—there is no doubt that testosterone is the reason that biological men, as a group, perform better than women in sports. That is why both men and women dope with androgens that are high in testosterone.

On average, in elite biological male athletes, there is 30 times more testosterone present, leading to physical characteristics that almost guarantee a higher rate of success in sporting events. But don't take my word for it.

Here are examples: CeCe Telfer, a biological male, won three titles in the Northeast-10 Championships for women's track and received the Most Outstanding Track Athlete award.

Fallon Fox, a biological male, shattered female fighter Tamikka Brents' eye socket and gave her a concussion. Brents said she never felt so overpowered in her life.

Gabrielle Ludwig, a 50-year-old, 6-foot-8-inch, 230-pound biological male led the Mission College women's basketball team to a national championship with the most rebounds.

The list goes on and on. I, for one, don't think it is fair or equal to make young, biological women compete against biological males. This bill claims to fight for equality, but it seems to be far from equal for the young, female athletes across our country.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote against this bill.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. STANTON), who is a distinguished member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 5, the Equality Act. I want to thank my friend and fellow recovering mayor, Congressman CICILLINE, for his strong and unwavering leadership on this historic civil rights legislation.

When it comes to equality, there is no doubt that we have come a long way. But following the landmark Supreme Court ruling that legalized gay marriage in all 50 States, the hard truth is that discrimination based on sexual orientation is still permitted under the law.

LGBTQ individuals face this reality every day—that they may receive different, unfair treatment in employment, housing, public accommodations, public education, and more. We are better than that. We are a nation that believes all are created equal, that this truth is self-evident.

I rise today in fervent support of the Equality Act because everyone should be treated equally no matter who they are, whom they love, or how they express themselves. Whether you are in Phoenix or Philadelphia, Mesa or Montgomery, you deserve to be seen, to be heard, and to be welcomed.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. MCADAMS).

Mr. MCADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask Mr. CICILLINE if he will engage with me for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mr. CICILLINE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCADAMS. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. CICILLINE. Yes, I would be happy to engage my colleague from Utah.

Mr. MCADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I want to confirm and clarify in our debate today that H.R. 5 does not change our Nation's longstanding First Amendment right to free religious exercise, speech, and association.

I understand that houses of worship will not be affected in their religious observances by the public accommodations provisions in H.R. 5. The current exemption in title II of the Civil Rights Act remains in place, so chapels, temples, synagogues, mosques, and other houses of worship will continue to have legal certainty to practice their religion, conduct services, and affiliate with fellow members of their religion, as well as engage and welcome others not of their faith in their houses of worship for religious activity or faith practice, as they do now.

Mr. CICILLINE. Yes, that is correct. H.R. 5 adds protected classes to title II of the Civil Rights Act but does not revise the exception for private establishments not open to the public, meaning houses of worship can continue their practices as before, including limiting admission or attendance to members of their faith.

Mr. MCADAMS. To also clarify, is it your understanding nothing in H.R. 5 compels a clergy member to perform a religious ceremony in conflict with their religious beliefs?

That is, faith groups can continue to perform marriages, blessings, baptisms, and other practices for their own members and consistent with their beliefs, consistent with their First Amendment rights, correct?

Mr. CICILLINE. Yes. H.R. 5 does not, nor could any legislation, supersede the First Amendment. H.R. 5 allows the standard set by prior civil rights law to not interfere with worship and religious practices by religious organizations.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute to just basically respond to that colloquy, because it is really interesting because none of us, especially myself, has said anything about houses of worship. We do know that is the bridge too far.

What we are concerned about in the bill is where it says any of these groups, affiliations, Catholic affiliations, Jewish affiliations who get Federal money to do other things, they would come under this, and this is where the RFRA protections is something.

So, the conversation here was nice. It provided a great cover, but it did not answer the question that many of us have asked in this process as we go forward. So I get that.

Also, as we look at this further, this is why we have asked to see if we could do this in a different way and do it in a better way to define these terms and to protect all parties in this, and not just run hastily into something that could cause problems in the future.

This colloquy was nice but did not answer the underlying question.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI).

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 5, the Equality Act.

I chair the Education and Labor Committee's Civil Rights and Human Services Subcommittee, and in our hearing on this important bill, we heard powerful testimony from Kimberly, the mother of Kai, an 8-year-old transgender girl. Kimberly is an evangelical minister from rural Texas. Her family and Kai's school were not supportive, and, in fact, school administrators made derogatory comments about Kai.

Kimberly testified that, regretfully, she gave into pressure and attempted home conversion therapy on Kai when Kai was only 4 years old. One day she found Kai praying for Jesus to take her home to be with Him forever.

Let me say that another way: A 4-year-old was suicidal.

Kimberly is now today a fierce advocate for her daughter's rights and the rights of all transgender kids to go to school in a safe and supportive environment. This bill will secure that right for all the kids like Kai around the country and will secure the right to be free from discrimination for millions of LGBTQ people in our country.

I want to close with the words from Federal Judge Michael McShane, and his marriage equality opinion. He wrote: ''Many suggest we are going down a slippery slope that will have no moral boundaries. To those who truly harbor such fears, I can only say this: Let us look less to the sky to see what might fall; rather, let us look to each other and rise.''

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. STEVENS).

Ms. STEVENS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in a jubilant manner, because every American deserves to be treated equally under the law.

I rise today in support of the basic and common principles enshrined in our Constitution, of liberty and justice for all, that no person shall be denied or be discriminated by their sexual orientation.

I rise today in support of the Equality Act that we must proudly pass today led by my friend, DAVID CICILLINE.

For in this country, in this year, 2019, we must choose acceptance to grow our economy and to promote the general welfare.

I rise because it is time to pass the Equality Act for full civil rights protections for all LGBTQ Americans. So many sacrificed so I could stand here today and speak these words. Passing this bill will send a powerful, bipartisan message to members of the LGBTQ community that they are not second-class citizens.

Today we must vote to pass the Equality Act.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. I reserve the balance of my time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN).

(Mr. LANGEVIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, as a proud member of the LGBTQ Equality Caucus, I rise in strong support of the Equality Act, a bill championed by my good friend and fellow Rhode Islander, Congressman DAVID CICILLINE.

Mr. Speaker, every person deserves to be treated equally, no matter who they are or whom they choose to love. But the simple fact of the matter is that LGBT Americans face discrimination in this country every day, whether it is in the workplace, the foster care system or the housing market.

Mr. Speaker, discrimination is never justified, and we cannot let it stand. As a person who lives with a disability, I know what discrimination feels like. I have experienced discrimination many times in my life. I don't like it when it happens to me, and I don't want it to be experienced by anyone else. It is just plain wrong.

So, Mr. Speaker, let's celebrate our diversity by promoting a culture of tolerance, inclusion, and acceptance, instead of one of fear and hate. Let's treat LGBT people with the dignity and respect that they deserve. Let's honor the strength and the courage of the LGBT people throughout history, and let's pass the Equality Act to forever secure the civil rights of members of the LGBT community.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, Congressman CICILLINE, for his leadership on this issue.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman NADLER for yielding and for his tremendous leadership on this issue.

Also, I have just got to acknowledge and thank Congressman DAVID CICILLINE for his steady and strategic leadership in bringing this bill to the floor. I, too, was at the first press conference with our great warrior, JOHN LEWIS, and it has been so exciting and uplifting to see the progress and the process in bringing this bill to the floor.

□ 1045

Mr. Speaker, as a cofounder of the LGBTQ Equality Caucus, along with our dear former colleague Congressman Barney Frank, I rise today in support of H.R. 5, the Equality Act. This critical bill, of course, would end discrimination against LGBTQ Americans once and for all.

Now, as an African American woman, it is my moral responsibility to fight discrimination wherever and against whomever it raises its ugly head. The Equality Act will ensure that there is clear, lawful protection for LGBTQ Americans under the Civil Rights Act. What is more, this bill will ensure that no one lives in fear because of their gender identity or sexual orientation.

Let me be clear. It is un-American that in 30 States it is still legal—mind you, legal—to discriminate against LGBTQ Americans in employment, in housing, in education—in every aspect of their lives.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, this discrimination disproportionately affects LGBTQ people of color. This is a shame. Discrimination must end against everyone.

And, yes, Mr. Speaker, as a person of faith, my religion teaches me to love thy neighbor as thyself and to do unto others as you would have them do unto you. So let's pass the Equality Act today so there will be, truly, liberty and justice for all.

Again, I thank Congressman DAVID CICILLINE for this today.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. STEWART).

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman and others who have worked on this.

Mr. Speaker, I am so disappointed in this legislation. I have been involved, in my time in Congress, with leaders from various LGBTQ and other organizations representing good people, as well as religious leaders, in an effort to find common ground to satisfy two important priorities.

Yes, of course—of course—we should treat each other with fairness and with dignity. I believe that all people in America should live their lives free of any discrimination. But we also have to defend the first freedom, the foundational liberty, the amendment and the principle upon which all other liberties are based.

People of faith, who are also good people, deserve to have the right to express their sincerely held religious beliefs without compulsion from the Federal Government.

This bill, unfortunately—and more than unfortunately. I mean sadly, disappointingly, this bill makes absolutely no effort to do that. It makes no effort to find common ground.

What a wasted opportunity.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH).

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to rise in support of H.R. 5, Mr. CICILLINE's bill, the Equality Act.

I rise today as a Christian. Mr. Speaker, this bill will extend the legal protections provided by the Equal Protection Clause of the United States Constitution as well as the Civil Rights Act against discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity.

And may I say that it is about time.

This groundbreaking legislation specifically bans wrongful, hurtful discrimination in housing, employment, education, and other business and government sectors based on sexual orientation and gender identity.

Individuals from the LGBTQ community are our fellow Americans. Many of them are Christians. They are our brothers and sisters. And it is, indeed, shameful that it has taken this very long to provide them with equal protection under the law.

The Declaration of Independence is, again, a guide. It is instructive as it reminds us: ''We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights.''

In closing, none of that can happen without equal treatment under the law.

''All'' means all. ''Equal'' means equal. Let's vote for equality.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Maine (Ms. PINGREE).

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chair for yielding the time, and I want to thank my friend, colleague, and fellow New Englander, Mr. CICILLINE, for his courage, his perseverance, and, frankly, his political talents at moving this bill forward and bringing us here today. And I am not going to cry in my minute.

I am proud that my home State of Maine is among the 21 States that has already enacted these protections. For almost 15 years, Mainers have stood against bigotry to provide equal access to housing, employment, and public establishments for our LGBTQ community.

And, guess what. The sky did not fall when we passed protections, and, in fact, our State is a better, more inclusive place because of it. Having guaranteed civil rights for our LGBTQ neighbors means we value the health, safety, and dignity of every Mainer.

But LGBTQ Mainers should have the same rights they enjoy in our State when they are outside of our State. This Congress must stand together in recognizing the humanity and the civil rights of all LGBTQ people, wherever they may live or travel.

The Equality Act will ensure LGBTQ citizens have equal access to employment, education, housing, credit, and all public services—public services which their tax dollars fund, by the way.

It is time to extend these civil rights to everyone, no matter who they love or how they identify. I urge my colleagues in the House to recognize that we must equally protect all members of our community under the law.

Let's pass the Equality Act.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. SHALALA).

Ms. SHALALA. Mr. Speaker, in Florida and many other States, LGBTQ Americans are still at risk of being fired, evicted, and denied services because of their sexual orientation or gender identity.

LGBTQ people confront discrimination throughout their entire lives, from harassment that youth face at school to the bias that older, same-sex couples experience when they are denied housing in retirement communities.

In the gallery today is Christian Bales, an openly gay and gender-nonconforming student who was barred from delivering his valedictorian speech at his high school on account of his sexuality. Two nights ago, Christian was honored with the 2019 Hugh M. Hefner First Amendment Award for Education.

Today, we will take a crucial step in standing up for people like Christian by passing H.R. 5.

Mr. Speaker, 2019 is the 50th anniversary of the uprising at Stonewall and the birth of the modern LGBTQ movement. There is no better way to honor the decades-long struggle for dignity and equality for LGBTQ people than for our elected leaders in Congress to pass this legislation.

I am proud to support H.R. 5.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded not to reference occupants of the gallery.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York has 10½ minutes remaining.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, too many Americans face severe discrimination because of whom they love.

LGBTQ rights are civil rights. They are human rights.

Participating and contributing equally, regardless of gender identity or sexual orientation, brings us closer to the self-evident truth that, while we are not all created the same, in a just democracy, we are all created equally.

Despite State Republican hostility, City of Austin ordinances have long protected against the same discrimination we are combating today. City contractors have complied with these ordinances, whose requirements set the standard for our community.

Both Austin and San Antonio enjoy perfect municipal Equality Index scores from the Human Rights Campaign. With this bill, we set the same type of standard for our entire country.

Mr. Speaker, 1,400 businesses in the Texas Competes coalition have sent a clear message in favor of inclusion and against discrimination.

We need strong Federal enforcement. That is what this bill does.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, we need strong Federal enforcement since local governments have imperfect tools and often have been stifled by narrow-minded State legislatures.

No American's civil rights should depend upon their ZIP Code. Don't stand in the doorway. Let's pass the Equality Act today.

Among many who have been strong advocates for this act, I particularly honor Sam Smoot and Robert Salcido with Equality Texas; Julian Tovar and Sissi Yado with the Human Rights Campaign; and, of course, our colleagues, Congressman CICILLINE and Congressman POCAN.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL), the chair of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 5, the Equality Act.

Currently, it is legal to fire an individual, prevent access to credit, and even deny or evict someone from their home just because they are LGBTQ.

The Equality Act will guarantee Federal protections by ensuring the LGBTQ community is provided full protections under Federal civil rights laws. No longer will our fellow Americans be deprived from buying a home, fired from their job, or denied a meal in a restaurant just because of who they are.

I am as pleased to help pass this landmark bill today as I was back in 1996 when I voted against the discriminatory DOMA, or, so-called, Defense of Marriage Act.

I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this bill.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE).

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, it is a fundamental precept of our beautiful country that we have equality for all. But, sadly, in this Nation, we have not had equality for every person until now.

Two-thirds of the LGBTQ community have faced discrimination, and this is simply wrong, and it is simply un-American.

I thank Mr. CICILLINE for bringing this important piece of legislation to the floor.

How ironic that my LGBTQ constituents can get married to each other but still, in 29 States, can be discriminated against in their jobs, in public education, and even in their jury service.

This is wrong; this is un-American; and today's bill, the Equality Act, rights this wrong that has been so long in coming.

I congratulate everybody.

I urge all of my colleagues to send a strong bipartisan statement: This is America; everybody has equal rights in all areas.

□ 1100

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. NEGUSE), a distinguished member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman of the Judiciary Committee for his leadership, and, in particular, Representative CICILLINE for his courage and his leadership in bringing this bill to the floor.

It is long past time that we end discrimination against those in the LGBTQ community in our country, and that is why I am so proud to support the Equality Act.

Fairness, equality—these are core American values. And yet today, in many States across the United States, Americans can be fired, can be denied a mortgage, or they might struggle in being able to obtain housing, all because of their sexual orientation or gender identity.

That ends with the passage of the Equality Act. Every American is equal under the law.

And so I would say to my friends at Out Boulder County back home, thank you for your activism. To my friends at One Colorado, thank you for your activism. To every LGBTQ American who has stood up and has fought for equality over a generation, I say thank you.

And to the Members gathered here today, I implore you: Let's join together, and let's pass the Equality Act today and end discrimination once and for all.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. DEAN), a distinguished member of the Judiciary Committee.

Ms. DEAN. Mr. Speaker, there are hard votes and there are easy votes. The hard votes involve competing values and difficult tradeoffs; the easy ones give us a chance to express our core American values loudly and clearly.

H.R. 5 is the right vote, and I thank Representative CICILLINE for his hard work and his heart in bringing this piece of justice to us.

In most States, same-sex couples can be denied service in restaurants, fired from jobs, and evicted from homes with no legal recourse. In other words, they can be mistreated or discriminated against, and their government won't stand up for them.

H.R. 5 will end that. This bipartisan legislation will ban discrimination against LGBTQ people in housing, employment, credit, public accommodations, and so much more. It says that we don't care who you love, but we do care that you are treated with decency and respect.

This legislation takes us the next step in a long American tradition of expanding civil rights and protections. It affirms that, in this country, there is no ''us'' and ''them,'' it is just us.

This is a historic day. I am proud to be a part of it. Let's cast aside old prejudices and cast a vote for justice and equality.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have left?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York). The gentleman from New York has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. LUJÁN).

Mr. LUJÁN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Equality Act because equality and fairness are core American values.

Right now, fairness is not codified in our justice system, and it is long past time to end discrimination.

When half of Americans live in a State without legal protections for LGBTQ individuals, that is not equality.

When LGBTQ Americans can be fired, evicted, and discriminated against because of who they are, who they love, or how they identify, that is not justice.

The opportunity before us is a historic one. I want to thank my colleagues who have led the effort to bring this bill to the floor.

My colleagues who vote ''no'' on this will be judged.

Mr. Speaker, this is something that we should be working on together. We will pass the Equality Act for the dignity of all Americans.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS), the conscience of the House.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from New York for yielding.

I thank DAVID, my friend and my brother, for his leadership.

Today is May 17. On May 17, 1954, the United States Supreme Court issued a decision. I remember that decision. I was 17 years old. I thought I would be attending the segregated school. It never happened for me.

Today, on this day, we have an opportunity to send a message now, to help end discrimination in our country and set all of our people free.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind all persons in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House and that any manifestation of approval or disapproval of proceedings is in violation of the rules of the House.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the distinguished majority leader of the House.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I regret that the Chamber is not full of Members or that the gallery is not jammed with people, for this is a historic day.

Many Members have quoted that extraordinary doctrine of civil rights and human rights articulated by our Founders 243 years ago: ''We hold these truths to be self-evident.'' I tell people that they may be self-evident, but they are not self-executing.

Today, we will take another step in a long journey toward a more perfect Union. Today, we will take a step, and, hopefully, it will be as it was in 1957 when we passed the Civil Rights Act that year; hopefully, it will be as it was in 1964 when we passed that civil rights bill; and, hopefully, it will be as we voted on the Disabilities Act in 1990.

All of those bills were passed in a bipartisan fashion; and, yes, there were bipartisan votes against those bills, some from my party and some from my colleagues on the Republican side. My presumption is, and my hope is, that those who voted ''no'' on those civil rights bills looked back and said: I made a mistake. That was not the vote I should have made.

Every Democrat will vote for this bill. Every Democrat will stand up and say this is another step in the quest for a better America, a more just America, a more accepting America. That is what we have the opportunity to do today.

I hope that many, if not all, of my Republican colleagues will stand not for party, not for policies of party or partisanship, but stand for principles enunciated 243 years ago but still not yet fully realized.

That is what this day is about.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this bill, which I know will pass, but I hope, as I have said, it passes with a very strong bipartisan conviction and confirmation of the fact that ''we hold these truths to be self-evident.'' This is an opportunity for the House to come together and reject discrimination and exclusion.

I am proud to be an original cosponsor of the bill that Mr. CICILLINE put forward. The Equality Act is about America. It is about who we are, what we are, and what we believe.

I want to commend the LGBTQ community and the Equality Caucus for being at the forefront of promoting full equality, equal justice, and equal opportunity for LGBTQ people and their families in this country.

The world looks to us as the strongest supporter, historically, of human rights and equal rights. Have we always been so? No, we have not.

My party was the segregationist party for many years, and we said no to that. We walked away from that. We said that was not the party we were going to be.

Of course, all of us were not members of that part of the party, but this day, we should all stand and say, yes, we believe that all men and all women and all people are created equal, by God, and endowed not by the Constitution, not by this body, but endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, and among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, and the right to live as you are.

Yes, we make judgments on what you may do, but not who you are. You may be Black; you may be White; you may be a woman; you may be a man; you may be a homosexual; you may be a lesbian; you may be a trans; you may be anything other than what I am; but you are entitled, from me and from your country, to respect and equal treatment, as we said 243 years ago.

Sadly, some States still permit discrimination against LGBT people in those areas that have been discussed. We need to put an end to that and ensure that all people in this country, no matter where they live, are protected against hate and bigotry, exclusion and discrimination. The opportunities this country offers must be open to everyone in our country.

When I first ran for office in 1966 for a seat in the Maryland State Senate, fair housing was the issue, and the proposition was you didn't have to sell your house to somebody whose color was different than yours even though they had the ability to buy it and they wanted to move into that neighborhood.

This issue that we consider today is different in particular, but not in principle. That idea is at the very core of our American society: that opportunities exist for all of our people.

Throughout our history, we have reinforced this idea with the passage of the 14th Amendment, the 19th Amendment, the 1964 Civil Rights Act, the Fair Housing Act, the Americans with Disabilities Act, and others. We uphold this commitment to a fair and more just society with passage of this Equality Act.

□ 1115

Surely, we ought to be able to agree. Republicans, Democrats, liberals, conservatives, Northeast, South, and West, surely, we can agree that all men and all women are created equal and are deserving of equal treatment.

Let's come together to make that promise of our Founders ring true.

The Bible says, ''Love your neighbor as yourself.'' Not love your straight neighbor, not love your Christian neighbor, not love your White neighbor, not love your native-born neighbor, not love your neighbor of some other distinction, but, ''Love your neighbor as yourself.''

That means, in my view, love your gay neighbor, love your lesbian neighbor, love your trans neighbor. It means love your Muslim neighbor; love your Jewish neighbor; love your African American, Latino, and Asian American neighbor; love your immigrant neighbor.

Love your neighbor, not your hyphenated neighbor, because we are all created equal.

Martin Luther King, a century after the Civil War, said to America that we are not living out the promise of America. He called us to conscience. He called us to be America. He called us to be that light to the rest of the world.

So today, we say we will judge on content of character. We will be America. We will be the best we can be of America.

Like we did on so many of the civil rights bills that have come before us, again let us vote overwhelmingly to confirm America's promise to its people and to the world. Vote for this critically important statement of America's values.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I inquire of the chairman if he has any more speakers or if he is ready to close.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I was going to ask the gentleman the same thing. I have no further speakers. I am prepared to close.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot of debate, and we have heard a lot of issues today.

One of the issues that I want to bring up today is, again, as I started out in my opening statement, no one on our side and no one who disagrees with this bill is saying anyone ought to be treated wrongly or badly in any way. That is not who we are. In fact, we have struggled with that on this floor.

This bill, I can agree with the intent. I agree with the fact that no one should be.

But my friend, the majority leader, just made a statement. He quoted scripture, and it was a good one. It says love your neighbor. And I agree with him. I have talked about it. I have preached on that many years now. But it also didn't say, ''Love your neighbor,'' and then, ''I have to agree with my neighbor.''

We can love each other and disagree. We love each other and disagree, and then we come into this place with this bill. That is where it gets not amorphous, not the intent, not what we want to do to make us feel better. It actually is how we then legislate this.

This bill is just not a good attempt. It is an imperfect step toward making something that others want to be right but, in the end, runs a real risk of causing others harm at the same time.

It is a risk that is brought on by rushing something. Even if it has been talked about for 5 years, the legislative part has been rushed, Mr. Speaker.

I understand the concern. I understand the anxiety. But let's make it right. Let's at least have an open debate. Let's discuss it here.

It is interesting to me that we had to have a colloquy on the floor to assuage some Members that this bill would not attack a worship service or who could lead a worship service or if a minister would actually have to do a service that would be against their personal faith beliefs.

The bill does not talk about that, but it does leave an open issue of public accommodation and how somebody would

look at public accommodation in a church setting. That is an honest question that needs to be answered.

It does bring up a lot of questions. What if a church or a religious organization accepts Federal money? What if a Catholic church accepts school lunch programs? What if a Jewish synagogue accepts money for homeland security? At that point, for the programs that they have, the bill says if you receive Federal money, you fall under this. Do they then have to violate their own faith beliefs?

Making one group of people deny their faith while trying to give another one a leg up is still wrong. It is not equal.

The questions that we have here today are honest disagreement. It is honest disagreement, but not in the sense of, if you take this, you have made a gender identity claim that is self-professing.

As was just said a moment ago, we talk about great ideas like the Civil Rights Act and the ADA. Disability under the ADA can be shown objectively, and I agree. As the father of a daughter who has spina bifida and is in a wheelchair, I can show objectively what that actually means. I am proud of that legislation. I was not here. I wish I had been because I have seen it open up.

In this bill, it says simply, ''Gender identity as I proclaim it at that moment.'' This is where our problems come.

Mr. Speaker, that is why I would say vote ''no'' on the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, this morning, we have heard phantom fears about the allegedly harmful effects of the Equality Act on religious freedom and women's rights. If these fears had any basis in reality, the Equality Act would not have been endorsed by more than 500 civil rights, women's rights, religious, medical, and other national and State organizations, including the American Medical Association, the Central Conference of American Rabbis, the Episcopal Church, the Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights Under Law, the Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, the NAACP, the National Alliance to End Sexual Violence, the National Coalition of Anti-Violence Programs, the National Women's Law Center, NETWORK Lobby for Catholic Social Justice, the Rabbinical Assembly, and the United Methodist Church's General Board of Church and Society.

It has also been endorsed by dozens of business associations, including the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers, and the Sports and Fitness Industry Association.

Mr. Speaker, the time has come to proclaim liberty and equality throughout the land.

Mr. Speaker, I now commend the bill to the judgment of the House, and I commend the House to the judgment of history.

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

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 5, the Equality Act.

All Americans, regardless of background, should have the ability to live their lives with dignity and free from discrimination. Equal treatment under the law is a fundamental American principle, and this important legislation provides legal safeguards against discrimination for LGBTQ individuals.

This is historic civil rights legislation that the House is considering today. Specifically, it would modify existing civil rights law to extend anti-discrimination protections to LGBTQ Americans, including protections against discrimination in employment, housing, access to public places, federal funding, credit, education, and jury service.

As an original cosponsor of the Equality Act, I strongly support its final passage. I am unfortunately not able to attend today's important vote, but I am proud to support H.R. 5 and would have voted in favor of this bill.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5 puts the Hyde Amendment and other federal and state laws that bar taxpayer funding for abortion at serious risk.

H.R. 5 also weakens conscience protections for health care providers opposed to being coerced into participating in the killing of unborn babies.

H.R. 5 defines ''sex'' to include ''pregnancy, childbirth, or a related medical condition.'' The term ''related medical condition'' means ''abortion.'' In the case Doe v. C.A.R.S., the Third Circuit stated, ''We now hold that the term ''related medical conditions'' includes an abortion.'' Furthermore, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC), which enforces Title VII, interprets abortion to be covered as a ''related medical condition.''

To further clarify, the bill goes on to state:

(b) RULES.—In a covered title referred to in subsection (a)—''(1) (with respect to sex) pregnancy, childbirth, or a related medical condition shall not receive less favorable treatment than other physical conditions; . . .

In other words, a provider may not withhold a ''treatment option,'' including ending the life of an unborn baby.

In a legal analysis released today, the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops states:

Existing prohibitions on the use of government funds for abortion can be undercut in three ways.

First, federal and state governments are themselves providers of health care. Therefore, they would themselves be subject to the constraints that the Equality Act places on all health care providers and, as such, would likely be required to provide abortions. This conclusion is reinforced by the bill's expansive definition of ''establishment,'' which is not limited to physical facilities and places.

Second, it would seem anomalous to, on the one hand, mandate that recipients of federal funds provide abortions, as the Equality Act can be read to do, but, on the other hand, prohibit use of such funds for abortions. It can (and likely will) be argued that these newly-enacted provisions, which would likely require recipients of federal funding to perform abortions, would thereby repeal by implication previously-enacted legislation forbidding the use of those very same funds for abortion.

Third, even if the bill were not construed to require the federal government to fund abortions, it could still be construed to require states that receive federal funding to do so with their own funds, which would be a departure from the longstanding principle that the federal government not require government funding of abortion even on the part of state governments.

The possibility that the Equality Act may be used to undercut the Hyde principle against government funding of abortion has been noted even by those endorsing the bill. Katelyn Burns, New Congress Opens Door for Renewed Push for LGBTQ Equality Act (Dec. 5, 2018), https://rewire.news/article/2018/12/05/new-congress-opens-door-lgbtq-equality-act/. But instead of denying that this problem exists, or (even better) urging an amendment to avoid it, one supporter of the bill has suggested that the issue simply ''has to be navigated super carefully.'' Id. In other words, there is a problem and the suggested ''fix'' is simply to keep it from becoming politically visible.

I include in the RECORD the full analysis by the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops for the record. I am also submitting an analysis by National Right to Life (NRLC) that lists similar concerns and provides further insight into these issues.

[From the Secretariat of Pro-Life Activities]

THE EQUALITY ACT: ITS IMPACT ON GOVERNMENT FUNDING OF ABORTION

The Equality Act will likely have an adverse impact on existing provisions that prohibit the use of federal funds for abortion.

Below we review relevant provisions of the bill. We then consider the likely consequences for current restrictions on federal funding of abortion.

I. TEXT OF THE EQUALITY ACT

The followings bill provisions are relevant.

I. Public accommodations. The Equality Act (H.R. 5) forbids discrimination based on ''sex,'' including ''sexual orientation and gender identity,'' in places of ''public accommodation.'' H.R. 5, §3(a)(1). The bill defines ''public accommodation'' to include ''any establishment that provides . . . health care . . . services.'' Id. §3(a)(4). The term ''establishment'' is not limited to physical facilities and places. Id. §3(c). The term ''sex'' includes ''pregnancy, childbirth, or a related medical condition.'' Id. §9(2). The bill also states that ''pregnancy, childbirth, or a related medical condition shall not receive less favorable treatment than other physical conditions.'' Id.

2. Federally-funded programs and activities. The bill also forbids discrimination based on ''sex,'' including ''sexual orientation and gender identity,'' in any program or activity receiving federal financial assistance. Id. §6. The term ''sex'' is again defined to include ''pregnancy, childbirth, or a related medical condition,'' and the listed items ''shall not receive less favorable treatment than other physical conditions.'' Id. §9(2).

II. CONSEQUENCES FOR FEDERAL FUNDING OF ABORTION

These changes in federal law will likely undercut existing prohibitions on the use of government funds for abortion.

For years it has been an accepted predicate in federal bill drafting that laws forbidding discrimination based on ''sex'' must have abortion-neutral language to blunt any inference that non-discrimination requires the provision or coverage of abortion. Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, are illustrative. Both titles forbid discrimination based on sex, and both titles have abortion

neutral amendments to mitigate or foreclose the claim that this prohibition requires a covered entity to provide or cover abortion. The fact that abortion-neutral language appears in Title VII and Title IX shows that Congress knows how to exclude abortion when it wants to. The failure to include an abortion-neutral amendment in the Equality Act therefore suggests a legislative intent to require the provision of abortion; otherwise, the Act, like Titles VII and IX, would have included such language. This conclusion is reinforced by (a) the bill's definition of sex to include ''pregnancy, childbirth, or a related medical condition,'' (b) agency and judicial interpretations construing this language, and (c) the added qualification that pregnancy and ''related medical condition[s] shall not receive less favorable treatment than any other physical conditions.''

The same reasoning—and the same conclusion—applies to the bill's non-discrimination provisions as applicable to federally-funded programs and activities. Indeed, abortion advocates themselves are currently reading the federal funding provisions of the bill to permit women to successfully challenge the denial of abortion.

Existing prohibitions on the use of government funds for abortion can be undercut in three ways.

First, federal and state governments are themselves providers of health care. Therefore, they would themselves be subject to the constraints that the Equality Act places on all health care providers and, as such, would likely be required to provide abortions. This conclusion is reinforced by the bill's expansive definition of ''establishment,'' which is not limited to physical facilities and places.

Second, it would seem anomalous to, on the one hand, mandate that recipients of federal funds provide abortions, as the Equality Act can be read to do, but, on the other hand, prohibit use of such funds for abortions. It can (and likely will) be argued that these newly-enacted provisions, which would likely require recipients of federal funding to perform abortions, would thereby repeal by implication previously-enacted legislation forbidding the use of those very same funds for abortion.

Third, even if the bill were not construed to require the federal government to fund abortions, it could still be construed to require states that receive federal funding to do so with their own funds, which would be a departure from the longstanding principle that the federal government not require government funding of abortion even on the part of state governments.

The possibility that the Equality Act may be used to undercut the Hyde principle against government funding of abortion has been noted even by those endorsing the bill. Katelyn Burns, New Congress Opens Door for Renewed Push for LGBTQ Equality Act (Dec. 5, 2018), https://rewire.news/article/2018/12/05/new-congress-opens-door-lgbtq-equality-act/. But instead of denying that this problem exists, or (even better) urging an amendment to avoid it, one supporter of the bill has suggested that the issue simply ''has to be navigated super carefully.'' Id. In other words, there is a problem and the suggested ''fix'' is simply to keep it from becoming politically visible.

If the intent were otherwise, then proponents of the bill would (and should) say so in the actual text of the bill.

NATIONAL RIGHT TO LIFE COMMITTEE, INC.

Date: May 16, 2019.

Re: Memorandum: H.R. 5, the Equality Act, and Implications on the Hyde Amendment.

H.R. 5, the Equality Act, contains language that could be construed to create a right to demand abortion from health care providers, and likely would place at risk the authority of the government to prohibit taxpayer-funded abortions.

Historically, when Congress has addressed discrimination based on sex, rules of construction have been added to prevent requiring funding of abortion or nullifying conscience laws. No such rule of construction is contained in H.R. 5.

Section 9 of the Equality Act would amend the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (CRA) by defining ''sex'' to include ''pregnancy, childbirth, or a related medical condition.'' It is well established that abortion is regarded as a ''related medical condition.'' *See* 29 C.F.R. pt. 1604 App. (1986) and *Doe* v. *CARS Protection Plus, Inc.*, 527 F.3d 358 (3d Cir. 2008).

With abortion regarded as a pregnancy-related medical condition, H.R. 5 goes on to state that ''pregnancy, childbirth. or a related medical condition shall not receive less favorable treatment than other physical conditions.''

While the CRA had previously prohibited discrimination in certain places of ''public accommodation,'' such as hotels, restaurants, and places of entertainment, H.R. 5 amends the CRA definition of ''public accommodations'' to include any ''establishment that provides health care.'' The bill states that the term establishment ''shall be construed to include an individual whose operations affect commerce and who is a provider of a good, service, or program.'' This provision would apply to individual health care providers who object to abortion, including those with religious objections (indeed, the bill explicitly overrides the protections contained in existing federal law under the Religious Freedom Restoration Act, 42 2U.S.C. 2000bb et seq.).

Further, there is an additional provision that goes on to state that health care providers ''shall not be construed to be limited to a physical facility or place.''

So to the extent that non-physical entities, including States administering Medicaid, could be considered an ''establishment that provides health care,'' funding restrictions, including the Hyde Amendment, will be put in jeopardy.

In late 2018, Executive Director Mara Keisling of the National Center for Transgender Equality said in an interview, ''The worry is that extending sex-based protections to government programs could create a backdoor legal challenge to abortion restrictions like the Hyde amendment, which could potentially threaten whatever conservative support the bill may have.''

From 1973, when abortion first became legal, until 1980, when the Hyde amendment first took effect, the joint federal-state Medicaid program was paying for roughly 300,000 abortions annually.

In *Harris* v. *McRae*, 448 U.S. 297 (1980), the Court upheld the Hyde Amendment, which restricted federal funding of abortion to cases where the mother's life was endangered (rape and incest exceptions were later added). While the Court insisted that a woman had a right to an abortion, the state was not required to fund the exercise of that right.

Currently, 17 states fund Medicaid coverage of abortion voluntarily or have laws in place requiring funding (of these, 13 are due to court decisions). Twenty-seven (27) states and the District of Columbia have laws that limit funding to cases of life endangerment, rape, and incest; six states limit abortion funding to a lesser extent.

Even if, under H.R. 5, the federal Hyde amendment was still applied to block federal funds for Medicaid abortions, States currently not funding abortion, under Title VI as federal funding recipients, could now face challenges to require them to use their own state or local funds for Medicaid abortions. Further, the CRA Sec. 201(d) and Sec. 202 explicitly supersede state laws for purposes of ''public accommodations'' law.

For example, in New Mexico, which adopted a state Equal Right Amendment (ERA), the state affiliates of Planned Parenthood and NARAL relied on this state ERA in a legal attack on the state version of the Hyde Amendment, prohibiting Medicaid funding of elective abortions. The case was *NM Right to Choose / NARAL* v. *Johnson*, No. 1999–NMSC–005. In its 1998 ruling, every justice on the New Mexico Supreme Court agreed that the state ERA required the state to fund abortions performed by medical professionals, since procedures sought by men (e.g., prostate surgery) are funded. If enacted, H.R. 5 would open the door for widespread similar litigation wherein any attempt to restrict the funding of abortion would constitute discrimination.

Enactment of H. R. 5 would open the door to legal challenges that will amount to this: pregnancy-related medical conditions (including abortion) could not be treated less favorably than other physical conditions, so any ''public accommodation'' that treats abortion differently from procedures than other procedures constitute discrimination.

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to voice my support for H.R. 5, the Equality Act. This landmark legislation would prohibit discrimination against LGBTQ individuals across key areas of life including employment, housing, credit, education, public spaces and services, federally funded programs, and jury service.

We must address the fact that, in 30 states, LGBTQ people are at risk of being fired, refused housing or denied services simply because of who they are. Far too many students face bullying or worse because of their sexual identity, and far too many Americans—teachers, nurses, and state employees—face uncertainty and discrimination in the workplace and in their day-to-day lives. In fact, nearly two-thirds of LGBTQ Americans report having experienced discrimination in their personal lives.

Our nation's civil rights laws protect people from discrimination on the basis of race, color, national origin, and, in most cases, sex, disability and religion. Unfortunately, federal law does not provide consistent nondiscrimination protections based on sexual orientation or gender identity. The need for these protections is clear: We must put an end to this type of discrimination immediately.

We know from our nation's rich history in advancing the rights of citizens that strong federal laws are often needed to protect vulnerable groups of people. Because H.R. 5 explicitly prohibits discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity in fundamental areas, it will finally give LGBTQ people the long-overdue protections and rights under federal law.

The reality is that our country is strongest when all Americans can be who they are, without fear of bias, discrimination or inequality in their workplaces or communities. I am pleased that the House is taking the much-needed action to ensure the core American values of equality and fairness are applied to members of the LGBTQ community in all circumstances. I urge my colleagues of the House to pass this critical legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 377, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of H.R. 5 is postponed.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 215, nays 191, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 215]

YEAS—215

Adams
Allred
Amodei
Arrington
Bacon
Banks
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brooks (IN)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Case
Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Cohen
Collins (GA)
Cooper
Courtney
Cox (CA)
Crist
Cuellar
Curtis
Davids (KS)
Davidson (OH)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Engel
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Evans
Finkenauer
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Granger
Green (TX)
Grijalva
Haaland
Hastings
Hayes
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Hill (CA)
Hollingsworth
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Joyce (OH)
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kim
King (IA)
Kuster (NH)
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luján
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Matsui
McCarthy
McClintock
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Moore
Morelle
Murphy
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Newhouse
Norcross
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Perry
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Reschenthaler
Richmond
Rodgers (WA)
Roe, David P.
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Rutherford
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shalala
Sherman
Simpson
Sires
Smith (WA)
Soto
Speier
Stanton
Stauber
Stefanik
Steil
Stevens
Stewart
Stivers
Takano
Taylor
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tipton
Titus
Tlaib
Torres (CA)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walden
Waltz
Wasserman Schultz
Watkins
Watson Coleman
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Wexton
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NAYS—191

Abraham
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amash
Armstrong
Axne
Babin
Baird
Balderson
Barr
Bera
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Bost
Brindisi
Brooks (AL)
Buchanan
Buck
Budd
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Chabot
Cheney
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Cline
Cloud
Cole
Collins (NY)
Comer
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Correa
Costa
Craig
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crow
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duncan
Dunn
Emmer
Estes
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fletcher
Flores
Foxx (NC)
Fudge
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gianforte
Gibbs
Golden
Gonzalez (OH)
Gooden
Gosar
Gottheimer
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harder (CA)
Harris
Hartzler
Hern, Kevin
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill (AR)
Himes
Holding
Horn, Kendra S.
Horsford
Houlahan
Hudson
Huizenga
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (PA)
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kustoff (TN)
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lesko
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McAdams
McBath
McCaul
McHenry
McKinley
Meadows
Meeks
Meng
Meuser
Miller
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mucarsel-Powell
Mullin
Norman
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Panetta
Pence
Peters
Porter
Posey
Reed
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Riggleman
Roby
Rogers (KY)
Rooney (FL)
Rose, John W.
Rouda
Rouzer
Roy
Ruiz
Scalise
Schrader
Schrier
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sherrill
Shimkus
Slotkin
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Spanberger
Spano
Steube
Suozzi
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Timmons
Torres Small (NM)
Upton
Van Drew
Walberg
Walorski
Waters
Wild
Williams
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Wright
Yoho
Zeldin

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Tonko

NOT VOTING—24

Brady
Bucshon
Burchett
Clyburn
Dingell
Duffy
Gohmert
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
LaHood
Moulton
Peterson
Ratcliffe
Rogers (AL)
Rose (NY)
Ryan
Smucker
Swalwell (CA)
Turner
Walker
Weber (TX)
Westerman
Wilson (SC)
Young

□ 1145

Messrs. GALLAGHER, THOMPSON of California, JORDAN, COSTA, and FLEISCHMANN changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. CARSON of Indiana, KENNEDY, Mses. KAPTUR, and TLAIB changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

EQUALITY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of the bill (H.R. 5) to prohibit discrimination on the basis of sex, gender identity, and sexual orientation, and for other purposes, will now resume.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. STEUBE. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. STEUBE. I am in its present form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Steube moves to recommit the bill H.R. 5 to the Committee on the Judiciary with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Add at the end of the bill the following:

SEC. 13. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this Act or any amendment made by this Act may be construed to diminish any protections under title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. STEUBE. Mr. Speaker, I want to make it abundantly clear exactly what this motion to recommit does, so I am going to read it. It is very short.

''Nothing in this act or any amendment made by this act may be construed to diminish any protections under title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972.''

The threat that this bill poses for women's sports at every level is profound. As described by the Nation's leading expert on sports, sex, and biology, Professor Doriane Lambelet Coleman, she states: ''There is a significant performance difference between males and females. . . . Testosterone is the primary driver of that difference. There is a wide gap, no overlap, between the male and female testosterone ranges. . . . There is no scientific doubt that testosterone is the reason that men as a group perform better than women in sports. Indeed, this is why men and women dope with androgens. . . .''

Requiring that biological females face competition from biological males will mean the end of women's sports in any meaningful sense.

As tennis great Martina Navratilova has written in The Washington Post: ''In its current form, the Equality Act would do significant damage to title IX

and to the Amateur Sports Act, which governs sports outside of educational settings. The new legislation would amend the 1964 Civil Rights Act by redefining 'sex' to include 'gender identity.' Without an exception, the definition would apply to all amendments to the 1964 act, including title IX. Most schools, colleges, the NCAA, and the Olympic Committee would be affected because they receive Federal funds and operate in interstate commerce.

''The legislation would make it unlawful to differentiate among girls and women in sports on the basis of sex for any purpose. For example, a sports team couldn't treat a transgender woman differently from a woman who is not transgender on the grounds that the former is male-bodied. Yet the reality is that putting male- and female-bodied athletes together is co-ed or open sport. And in open sport, females lose.

''Some Equality Act advocates argue that this is hyperbole and outdated stereotype. They say, as the ACLU has, that there is 'ample evidence that girls can compete and win against boys.' They are wrong. The evidence is unequivocal that starting in puberty, in every sport except sailing, shooting, and riding, there will always be significant numbers of boys and men who would beat the best girls and women in head-to-head competition. Claims to the contrary are simply a denial of science.''

Those are not my words. Those are the words of female tennis great Martina Navratilova.

In footnote 44 of the committee report on this bill, the Democrat majority states: ''The committee acknowledges that the addition of sex as a protected characteristic under title VI of the bill raises some questions about how the revised title VI should be read in relation to title IX of the Education Amendments Act. It is the committee's intention not to alter in any way title IX or the scope or availability of its exemptions as they currently stand. Rather, title IX and the revised title VI should be read as being complimentary provisions that provide overlapping protection against sex discrimination.''

But, of course, we all know that allowing biological males to compete against biological females is not an ''overlapping protection.'' It is, instead, a violation of women's rights to engage in competitive sports on an even playing field and to enjoy the protection of their own spaces reserved for biological females.

So this motion to recommit is essential to protecting the rights of women and girls in sports that H.R. 5 currently denies.

Even the Obama administration wrote a letter to schools regarding title IX enforcements making clear that they should continue to be able to enforce policies that are ''tailored requirements based on sound, current, and research-based medical knowledge about the impact of the individual's participation on the competitive fairness or physical safety of the sport.''

Adoption of this motion to recommit will not kill the bill. It will not delay the bill's consideration. If this motion to recommit is adopted, the bill proceeds directly to final passage.

If H.R. 5 becomes law, our daughters will be asking us: ''What did you do when moves were made to eliminate women's sports?'' It is worth considering that question now before it is too late.

I urge all my colleagues to join me in protecting title IX and protecting women's sports and supporting this motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. HILL of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the motion to recommit with all of my heart.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. HILL of California. Mr. Speaker, I can't believe that we are standing here and having a man tell me what kind of protection I need in sports. This is fear-mongering about trans women playing in sports. Are you kidding me?

I don't know if my colleagues on the other side of the aisle realize that they have met trans people, but they have. They definitely have. I have met many, and this motion reflects nothing more than the prejudice of my colleagues.

My staff has put together a lot of talking points for you today, but it is much simpler than that. The Equality Act ensures that LGBTQ women and girls who are lesbian, bisexual, or transgender will all have the same opportunities as their peers in sports, in housing, and in jobs.

The discrimination that trans individuals face just trying to live their lives every single day is something beyond what most of us could ever imagine.

Through my work and the issue of homelessness, I saw trans women disproportionately affected by discrimination at every single stage of their lives. They have higher rates of poverty, higher rates of sexual abuse, higher rates of homelessness.

And I can tell you, no trans person is trying to game the system to participate in sports. That does not happen, and that is a sad scare tactic that has no place on the floor of the people's House.

State schools and athletic organizations across the country have found for many years that letting LGBTQ student athletes, including girls and women who are transgender, participate in sports does not harm women's and girls' sports in any way.

As an athlete, athletic success is based on so many factors, like individual ability and strength, and those abilities vary widely for people who aren't even trans. It has nothing to do with whether someone is transgender or not. In fact, major advocates for women and girls in sports, such as the National Women's Law Center, the Women's Sports Foundation, Women's Leaders in College Sports, and others, support trans-inclusive policies and oppose efforts to exclude transgender people from participating in sports.

This is not a new concept. Trans people have participated in sports for years. Stop the fear-mongering. This is 2019, and we are not afraid of the boogieman that you are trying to create. We are ready to move forward and tell all of our constituents, all of our communities, all Americans that they matter equally.

You, my colleagues, are on the wrong side of history, and we will be waiting for you on the other side when we reject this amendment and pass H.R. 5.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. PAPPAS).

Mr. PAPPAS. Mr. Speaker, thank you to my colleague, Representative HILL from California, my fellow co-chair of the Equality Caucus, as she rightfully notes nothing—nothing—in the Equality Act infringes upon women's rights. If it did, we wouldn't be supporting it so vociferously today.

This MTR is an army of words marching in search of an issue that doesn't exist. For those of us who have been involved in the fight for equality, this tactic isn't new or surprising. We have seen it before. We have seen the deliberate distractions, the unfounded fears, the faulty arguments on our way toward progress.

This legislation simply gives LGBTQ individuals full equality—nothing more and nothing less.

When we end legal discrimination in housing, employment, and public services, we will steer our Nation closer to the full realization of its founding principles and the notion that we are all created equal.

As a proud member of the LGBTQ community, I can attest that attitudes in this country have changed for the better, and it is time that our laws catch up. Congress can send a message to LGBTQ Americans everywhere that we see you, that we celebrate you for who you are.

This vote will change laws, and it will save lives.

In passing the Equality Act today, we can say, unequivocally, that everyone matters, that everyone can be themselves, that no one should live in fear or be treated as a second-class citizen in the United States of America, not today and not ever—full equality under the law, nothing less and nothing more.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this motion to recommit. I welcome you to become a part of history. Join us on the right side of history. Do the right thing today. Vote ''no'' on this MTR, and stand for full equality for the LGBTQ community.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. STEUBE. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of passage.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 181, noes 228, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 216]

AYES—181

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

NOES—228

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Axne
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brindisi
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Case
Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Cox (CA)
Craig
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Cummings
Cunningham
Davids (KS)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Engel
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Evans
Finkenauer
Fletcher
Foster
Frankel
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green (TX)
Grijalva
Haaland
Harder (CA)
Hastings
Hayes
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Hill (CA)
Himes
Horn, Kendra S.
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luján
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Massie
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Morelle
Mucarsel-Powell
Murphy
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Norcross
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rouda
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shalala
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stanton
Stevens
Suozzi
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres Small (NM)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Van Drew
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—23

Brady
Bucshon
Burchett
Clyburn
Dingell
Duffy
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
LaHood
Moulton
Pence
Peterson
Ratcliffe
Rose (NY)
Ryan
Smucker
Swalwell (CA)
Turner
Walker
Weber (TX)
Westerman
Wilson (SC)
Young

□ 1204

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 236, noes 173, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 217]

AYES—236

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Axne
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brindisi
Brooks (IN)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Case
Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Cox (CA)
Craig
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Cummings
Cunningham
Davids (KS)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Engel
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Evans
Finkenauer
Fitzpatrick
Fletcher
Foster
Frankel
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green (TX)
Grijalva
Haaland
Harder (CA)
Hastings
Hayes
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Hill (CA)
Himes
Horn, Kendra S.
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Hurd (TX)
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luján
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Morelle
Mucarsel-Powell
Murphy
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Norcross
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Reed
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rouda
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shalala
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stanton
Stefanik
Stevens
Suozzi
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres Small (NM)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Van Drew
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—173

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Bost

Brooks (AL)	Hagedorn	Palmer
Buchanan	Harris	Pence
Buck	Hartzler	Perry
Budd	Hern, Kevin	Posey
Burgess	Herrera Beutler	Reschenthaler
Byrne	Hice (GA)	Rice (SC)
Calvert	Higgins (LA)	Riggleman
Carter (GA)	Hill (AR)	Roby
Carter (TX)	Holding	Rodgers (WA)
Chabot	Hollingsworth	Roe, David P.
Cheney	Hudson	Rogers (AL)
Cline	Huizenga	Rogers (KY)
Cloud	Hunter	Rooney (FL)
Cole	Johnson (SD)	Rose, John W.
Collins (GA)	Jordan	Rouzer
Collins (NY)	Joyce (OH)	Roy
Comer	Joyce (PA)	Rutherford
Conaway	Kelly (MS)	Scalise
Cook	Kelly (PA)	Schweikert
Crawford	King (IA)	Scott, Austin
Crenshaw	King (NY)	Sensenbrenner
Curtis	Kinzinger	Shimkus
Davidson (OH)	Kustoff (TN)	Simpson
Davis, Rodney	LaMalfa	Smith (MO)
DesJarlais	Lamborn	Smith (NE)
Duncan	Latta	Smith (NJ)
Dunn	Lesko	Spano
Emmer	Long	Stauber
Estes	Loudermilk	Steil
Ferguson	Lucas	Stewart
Fleischmann	Luetkemeyer	Stivers
Flores	Marchant	Taylor
Fortenberry	Marshall	Thompson (PA)
Foxx (NC)	Massie	Thornberry
Fulcher	Mast	Timmons
Gaetz	McCarthy	Tipton
Gallagher	McCaul	Upton
Gianforte	McClintock	Wagner
Gibbs	McHenry	Walberg
Gohmert	McKinley	Walorski
Gonzalez (OH)	Meadows	Waltz
Gooden	Meuser	Watkins
Gosar	Miller	Webster (FL)
Granger	Mitchell	Wenstrup
Graves (GA)	Moolenaar	Williams
Graves (LA)	Mooney (WV)	Wittman
Graves (MO)	Mullin	Womack
Green (TN)	Newhouse	Woodall
Griffith	Norman	Wright
Grothman	Nunes	Yoho
Guest	Olson	Zeldin
Guthrie	Palazzo	

NOT VOTING—23

Brady	LaHood	Swalwell (CA)
Bucshon	Moulton	Turner
Burchett	Peterson	Walker
Clyburn	Ratcliffe	Weber (TX)
Dingell	Rose (NY)	Westerman
Duffy	Ryan	Wilson (SC)
Johnson (LA)	Smucker	Young
Johnson (OH)	Steube	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). The Chair will remind all persons in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House and that any manifestation of approval or disapproval of proceedings is in violation of the rules of the House.

□ 1212

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, due to my only daughter, Amie Westerman, having her wedding rehearsal dinner on Friday, May 17, 2019, I will not be present for the vote on H.R. 5, The Equality Act. Had I been present for the vote, I would have recorded a Nay vote.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ROSE of New York. Mr. Speaker, due to a death in my family, I had to miss votes on Thursday, May 16 and Friday, May 17.

Had I been present, I would have voted: "nay" on rollcall No. 210, McKinley Amendment No. 2 to H.R. 987; "yea" on rollcall No. 211 Harder Amendment No. 6 to H.r. 987; "yea" on rollcall No. 212 Wexton Amendment No. 21 to H.R. 987; "nay" on rollcall No. 213 Motion to Recommit for H.R. 987; "yea" on rollcall No. 214 Final Passage for H.R. 987; "nay" on rollcall No. 216 Motion to Recommit for H.R. 5; and "yea" on rollcall No. 217 Final Passage for H.R. 5.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained on May 17, 2019, in order to deliver the Commencement Address at the Concordia Seminary in Saint Louis, Missouri. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 215, "yea" on rollcall No. 216, and "nay" on rollcall No. 217.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I was absent during this morning's vote on final passage of H.R. 5 due to travel for an unavoidable medical appointment back in Ohio. Had I been present for this vote on H.R. 5, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 215, "yea" on rollcall No. 216, and "nay" on rollcall No. 217.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind all persons in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House and that any manifestation of approval or disapproval of proceedings is in violation of the rules of the House.

REQUEST TO CONSIDER H.R. 962, BORN-ALIVE ABORTION SURVIVORS PROTECTION ACT

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from any further consideration of H.R. 962, the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under guidelines consistently issued by successive Speakers, as recorded in section 956 of the House Rules and Manual, the Chair is constrained not to entertain the request unless it has been cleared by the bipartisan floor and committee leaderships.

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I urge the Speaker to immediately schedule this important legislation that will protect equality of life for the unborn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is not recognized for debate.

ADJOURNMENT FROM FRIDAY, MAY 17, 2019, TO MONDAY, MAY 20, 2019

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday next, when it shall convene at noon for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

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

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. SCALISE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of inquiring of the majority leader the schedule for next week, and I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), my friend.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the House will meet at 12 p.m. for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business, with votes postponed until 6:30 p.m. On Tuesday and Wednesday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate and 12 p.m. for legislative business. On Thursday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business.

We will consider several bills under suspension of the rules. The complete list of suspension bills will be announced by the close of business today.

The House will also consider H.R. 1500, the Consumer First Act. This legislation seeks to reverse the administration's efforts to dismantle the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau.

In addition, the House will consider H.R. 1994, the Setting Every Community Up for Retirement Enhancement Act of 2019. The legislation is intended to increase the flexibility of 401(k) plans and improve access to the accounts, particularly for small businesses and employees. The bill includes a host of provisions aimed at encouraging small businesses to provide private retirement benefits to their workers.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask about the conversations and negotiations that are going on regarding the disaster supplemental. I know the gentleman is well aware that there are some good, I think, very fruitful, negotiations going on. Clearly, we want to make sure about some of the things that weren't in the bill that went out of the House, especially as it relates to the crisis at the border, as it deals with unaccompanied children, as well as making sure that we get the right kind of help to our farmers who had devastation to their crops in these disasters.

I ask the gentleman if he can give an indication of a timeline.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his question.

As the gentleman knows, we passed an initial bill some many weeks ago. The Senate didn't pass that. We then passed, more recently, a bill which did, in fact, take care of everyone we know who has had a natural disaster in the interim as well as those we had taken care of the first time around.

So, we think we have a good bill that was passed; however, as the gentleman also referenced, the President has asked for an additional supplemental of a little over $4 billion referenced for humanitarian issues at the border. That is being reviewed.

As the gentleman probably also knows, an offer was made to our side.

That offer has now been responded to with respect to both the initial and the supplemental—initial, I mean the disaster bill—and we are looking for an answer back at some point in time to our response. But, hopefully, we can reach an agreement.

Mr. SCALISE. Hopefully, those conversations do continue on.

I am encouraged by the negotiations in terms of how both sides seem to be willing to get this resolved and, hopefully, quickly, ideally, if we could have a bill on the floor next week that would be a very bipartisan bill to address this so that we can get the relief.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCALISE. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Clearly, if we get an agreement—and that, of course, is the big if, but, hopefully, we can. If we can do that, then we will want to move as quickly as possible.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I do want to ask about the appropriations process because I know the gentleman from Maryland had talked earlier this week about a desire to have the entire appropriations process completed by the end of June. He also talked about a robust amendment process.

I would just ask the gentleman, as we look at this week, the concerning trend that we have been talking about a few weeks now, when amendments came out of the Rules Committee this week, 26 amendments came out that were offered by Democrats, and only 1 amendment was allowed by a Republican.

As the gentleman from Maryland talks about a robust appropriations process, I would hope he would pay closer attention to fairness in that robustness, because 26 Democrat amendments allowed and only 1 Republican amendment allowed is surely not a fair process. It might be considered robust, but in a hyperpartisan sense.

So I hope as we get into the appropriations process the gentleman, and especially the leadership from the Rules Committee, would take into account that this is a process where the House should be able to come together and offer their ideas and let the will of the House prevail, but at least allow for that debate here on the House floor on as many amendments as possible in as fair a way as possible.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his comment. We have had this discussion on a number of occasions.

I am convinced that Mr. MCGOVERN, the chairman of the Rules Committee, does, in fact, want to have the kind of process that we talked about and that the gentleman just referenced. He also knows that, in the last Congress, we had the most closed rules of any Congress in which I have served, and perhaps in history, 103 closed rules.

But having said that, I am hopeful that the gentleman's side will come forth with amendments that are, as the gentleman says, subject to rational debate and are not gotcha amendments. I am not alleging they are gotcha amendments, but that is obviously a concern that the gentleman had when he was in charge and that we have when we are in charge.

But I know that Mr. MCGOVERN wants to have a fair process, and we are talking about that, so we will continue to do that.

Mr. SCALISE. I appreciate that, and, again, we will be watching and, hopefully, see that they become more fair as we get into that appropriations process.

Finally, I would like to ask the gentleman about legislation that has been filed that is a companion to a Senate bill that passed the Senate with a vote of 77 votes to stand up against the BDS movement.

As we both know, and I know the gentleman has been supportive of these efforts, the concern is that Israel continues to come under attack by many countries around the world trying to delegitimize their economy and delegitimize their status as a Jewish state by this movement to undermine their economy, to boycott and divest from Israel.

So we have legislation. The companion bill is H.R. 336 by Mr. MCCAUL from Texas. It doesn't have the concerns. There were some concerns over the way that the Senate bill came over, but at least we do know, because of the vote, with 77 votes, it was a very bipartisan vote.

There is strong concern by the Senate to address this and strong concern by many Members of the House, Republican and Democrat, to stand up to the BDS movement, and not just in words.

Clearly, there are resolutions out there. We can all give speeches and say that we are against it, but it actually takes real action and real effort, things that are in the legislation that give teeth to our stand against BDS and for Israel.

Of course, if you look at some of the examples in the legislation, not just words, but $33 billion in military assistance to Israel, security cooperation enhancements, things that ensure that Israel maintains a qualitative edge to defend itself from the daily threats that, unfortunately, we see from other countries and terrorist organizations that want to undermine their status as a Jewish state.

With that, could the gentleman give us an indication, would there be a timeline that we can establish to bring this bill to the floor short of the discharge petition?

There is a discharge petition with more than 180 signatures already on it to bring this bill to the floor, but it would be a lot better if it were truly bipartisan from both leadership sides saying that we are willing to stand up against this movement, not just in words, but in deeds.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. First of all, I would say words are important. That is why we all debate, because we think words are important.

But having said that, I share the gentleman's view, as he well knows, with reference to the BDS movement, which I think is contrary to the interests of our ally, Israel, and contrary to our own interests.

Having said that, as I indicated to the gentleman last week, I have been discussing this with Mr. ENGEL, and he, as you know, shares the view which I have expressed and my friend has expressed, and his committee is going to be addressing that, I expect, in the near term. When they do, we will decide what actions to take at that point in time, and I look forward to discussing it with the gentleman.

Mr. SCALISE. We will continue to discuss it. I appreciate that.

Clearly, as we have an interest in not just expressing our words, like on many other important issues, we have to back that up with laws, legislation that gives teeth to the words and gives true support to our friends, especially Israel, in such a time of need where this movement is growing. And we want to move as quickly as possible, so we will continue to have this conversation and, hopefully, get a formal timeline as soon as possible.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. My friend mentioned there are essentially four components of the bill to which he referred, three of which are noncontroversial, as the gentleman knows, and one of which has issues with respect to its constitutionality. Without resolving that issue, the three that are in that bill, I think, enjoy bipartisan support. They were held up in the Senate, as the gentleman probably knows, but we want to make sure those three certainly are adopted.

Mr. SCALISE. Clearly, the Senate looked at that as well and worked through that. They actually made some changes to the bill which we conformed into this. The discharge petition has a rule that will actually conform it to the Senate to address those issues.

Again, the Senate bill got 77 votes, highly bipartisan, especially on such an important issue. So, hopefully, we will continue those conversations and come to an agreement on a timeline that is expedited.

Mr. Speaker, unless the gentleman has anything else, I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1230

MORAL ARC OF THE UNIVERSE BENDS TOWARD JUSTICE

(Mr. LOWENTHAL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, if we hold true to the idea that America

stands for equality, equity, and diversity, then equal rights must apply to and be protected for all Americans.

No American should be discriminated against because of their sexual orientation or gender identity. Yet, despite the historic accomplishments toward equality over the past decade, LGBTQ Americans still face systemic discrimination.

We know the fight for equality is always on the right side of history, and today's passage of the Equality Act is a much-needed step forward in that fight.

Today's vote allows us to see the moral arc of the universe, as Martin Luther King, Jr., said, bend toward justice.

TRIBUTE TO TOMMY TICE

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

Mr. WOMACK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor one of Arkansas' most successful football coaches, Tommy Tice of Huntsville, Arkansas, who retires this month after 42 years in coaching and athletic administration.

Coach Tice coached more football games as a head coach than anyone in Arkansas history: 454 games. He had a combined record of 288 wins, 160 losses, and 6 ties, an overall winning percentage of 63 percent.

He was selected head coach of the Arkansas All-Star football game six times. He had a State championship, 13 conference titles, and 19 playoff appearances.

An Arkansas Sports Hall of Fame inductee in 2016, Coach Tice has been a teacher and mentor to dozens of coaches throughout the State of Arkansas.

He is one of my best friends, and I can't think of anyone more impactful on student-athletes than Coach Tommy Tice. I congratulate him on a remarkable career, and I wish him well in his retirement.

HONORING NEVADA ASSEMBLYMAN TYRONE THOMPSON

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

Mr. HORSFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the life of Nevada Assemblyman Tyrone Thompson, who recently passed.

Tyrone's passion for service and community was reinforced by action. He was constantly on the front lines advocating for children in family court as a CASA advocate. Through his life-coaching and mentoring efforts, he spearheaded the annual Clark County Summer Business Institute, providing summer college and career exploration for high school students.

When Tyrone had the opportunity to be appointed and then elected to the Nevada Assembly in District 17, he made it his mission to propose new ideas to move Nevada forward and bring an experienced and pragmatic voice to the challenges our State faces. He became a leader and champion for increased funding, for more equitable education for all students, and for making our schools and communities safe from gun violence.

Tyrone was always present, leading the way to make the North Las Vegas community and the people in it stronger, whether it was working tirelessly to improve education, addressing racial equity and inclusion, volunteering with Camp Anytown, supporting Project Homeless Connect and Family Connect, or launching the My Brother's Keeper initiative.

At the age of 52, he still had so much more to offer to his community, in public service, and most importantly, to his family.

I am proud of the work my dear friend accomplished, and I am honored to ensure that his legacy is permanently enshrined in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

May he rest in peace.

COMMEMORATING NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

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

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Mr. Speaker, this week, communities across the country honored law enforcement officers in recognition of National Police Week.

Police officers put their lives on the line every day to protect our loved ones and neighbors. These brave men and women experience daily trauma and injury. In fact, the stress endured by our police officers contributes to a suicide rate that is 50 percent higher than the national average.

That is why I introduced the STOIC Act with my Democratic colleague from Pennsylvania, MADELEINE DEAN. This is a bipartisan bill to better address the mental health needs of our law enforcement officers.

I think that Republicans and Democrats should all be able to get together to fight against suicide and for the worthy cause of suicide prevention. Just yesterday, the Senate passed their version of STOIC with unanimous consent.

I want us to work together to unite our country, and I hope we can vote on this legislation that has strong bipartisan support. I hope that my colleagues from across the aisle will work with us to address the mental health needs of our Nation's law enforcement.

COMMIT TO REPRODUCTIVE JUSTICE

(Mrs. FLETCHER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. FLETCHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the women of this country, for their health and for their rights.

In this Congress, in this House, we have worked to ensure women's access to healthcare, to protect women and men with preexisting conditions, to lower the cost of prescription drugs, and to make healthcare more affordable and accessible. But in State houses across the country, women's access to their most basic healthcare is under attack. And it is not just their healthcare that is under attack; it is their equality.

The law passed in the Alabama State House this week is the most extreme and dangerous since Roe v. Wade, banning abortion at any point in pregnancy and threatening doctors with life in prison.

It is not just this Alabama law; it is laws in Georgia, Mississippi, and my home State of Texas, and the efforts of the current administration that result in a dramatic reduction in women's access to reproductive healthcare and basic family planning services and a denial of their reproductive rights.

Doctors and public health leaders agree that the cost of these laws will be women's lives. We cannot let that happen.

As we work to protect our care, we must support the women of this country and their right to safe, affordable, nonjudgmental reproductive healthcare. We must commit to reproductive justice.

HONORING MISSISSIPPI'S FALLEN OFFICERS

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

Mr. GUEST. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week, the 38th Annual National Peace Officers Memorial Service honored the men and women who paid the ultimate sacrifice upholding the rule of law and protecting the people of our great Nation.

Last year, Mississippi lost five officers in the line of duty. I would like to honor them as we remember their service and sacrifice.

Please join me in honoring Police Officer Emmett Paul Morris, Corporal Walter Zachery Moak, Patrolman James Kevin White, Patrol Officer LeAnn Simpson, and Police Officer Robert McKeithen.

President Ronald Reagan once said there can be no more noble vocation than the protection of one's fellow citizens.

May we remember these brave officers, their sacrifice to protecting our communities, and the sacrifice they made for the people who call Mississippi home.

URGING THE SENATE TO PASS THE EQUALITY ACT

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

Ms. DELBENE. Mr. Speaker, today, I am proud to join my colleagues in passing the Equality Act, which ensures

that LGBTQ Americans are treated equally.

In more than half our Nation, LGBTQ Americans can still be fired, denied credit, and evicted from their home simply based on who they are and whom they love.

It happened to someone in my State. He was a volleyball coach at a college in Virginia. They had just finished their most successful season when he was fired without explanation.

Unfortunately, in Virginia, there are no employment protections for being LGBTQ, so he and his family moved to Washington State where there are protections for LGBTQ workers, and they are thriving.

Not everyone can just pack up and leave, and they shouldn't have to. That is why we need to guarantee that LGBTQ Americans have equal rights and protections in all 50 States, no exceptions.

I urge the Senate to take action and pass the Equality Act so all Americans are treated equally.

HONORING OMAHA POLICE OFFICER KERRIE OROZCO

(Mr. BACON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BACON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today during National Police Week to ask my colleagues to support H.R. 2378, the Kerrie Orozco First Responders Family Act.

As we approach the 4-year anniversary of Omaha Police Officer Kerrie Orozco being killed in the line of duty, this legislation will show our first responders that we care about them and have their back.

The Kerrie Orozco First Responders Family Act will amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to allow for the surviving family members of a fallen U.S. citizen first responder to be naturalized upon compliance with all requirements, waiving any residency waiting period. This bill is simply extending the privileges to first responders that current law affords to spouses of U.S. military killed while serving our country.

In 2015, Officer Orozco was killed. Her husband, Hector, was going through the immigration process. His immigration status was put in jeopardy because his wife made the ultimate sacrifice protecting our community.

Every day, thousands of first responders leave loved ones to risk their lives for our safety. They need to have the peace of mind that if something should happen to them, their loved ones will be taken care of.

I look forward to working with Democrats and Republicans alike to protect our first responders and their families by passing the Kerrie Orozco First Responders Family Act.

It did pass unanimously last Congress. We need to pass it again, get it to the Senate, and get it done.

RECOGNIZING CAPE MAY COUNTY AS A COAST GUARD COMMUNITY

(Mr. VAN DREW asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VAN DREW. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate being allowed to speak to the Members of the House.

On May 8, 2015, Coast Guard Commandant Admiral Paul Zukunft proclaimed Cape May County a Coast Guard Community, an honor claimed by only 18 cities and only one other county in the entire Nation.

The designation, which is confirmed by the United States Coast Guard and the United States Congress, is in recognition of a strong and special relationship between the people of Cape May County and the local Coast Guard personnel, making Coast Guard men and women and their families feel a sense of community in their home away from home. It is an invaluable contribution to morale and service excellence.

South Jersey is honored to have Cape May and the Coast Guard as part of its community.

Most of all, we should remember all that they went through during the recent shutdown. Our Coast Guard should never have to suffer through that set of circumstances ever again. That is why we have sponsored legislation to protect our Coast Guard in the future.

□ 1245

HONORING THE SERVICE OF JASON DOMBKOWSKI

(Mr. BAIRD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Jason Dombkowski, who is retiring after 25 years of faithful public service with the West Lafayette Police Department. Jason has been the Chief of Police at the department for 11 years, serving his fellow officers and community with integrity and professionalism.

He received his master's degree in Technology, Leadership, and Innovation from Purdue University, and has completed the Indiana Law Enforcement Academy, the FBI National Academy at Quantico, and the U.S. Secret Service Dignitary Protection Programs, among others.

In addition to his remarkable career, Jason remains a steadfast pillar in the community, known for his commitment, leadership, and service. He serves on the YWCA board, and has been a board member for the Red Cross, Lafayette Crisis Center, the Lafayette Catholic Diocese Bishop's Review Board.

He also volunteers with the ''Shop With a Cop'' program and coaches a youth flag football team.

He and his wife, Cristie, have four children, and reside in West Lafayette.

Congratulations on your retirement, Jason. I know you will continue to serve our community well in your new capacity, and I wish you the very best.

ISSUES OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CASE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, we heard a great deal of applause today from all around the gallery when the so-called Equality Act passed.

Equality, what it really means is equality for some, but if you believe the teachings of Moses and Jesus, then you are not only not going to be treated equally, you are going to be persecuted, prosecuted, tied up in court.

You will have people try to destroy not only you, but any religious institution that tries to faithfully follow the teachings of Moses and Jesus.

So the Equality Act is a misnomer, as is the statement that this means the end of persecution.

Somehow, I hear Al Pacino in the background when it comes to persecution, saying, Oh, I'm just getting started.

So I come before the House with a broken heart, as someone who has studied, loved history, studied history, continues to read more history, constantly.

This Nation is in big trouble. We have gone from the days when—I guess the Bible is still probably the most-quoted book, year after year, in this body, but somehow it often is used for personal abuse or used without giving real context and real meaning.

But above every door in the gallery is the side profile of what were once considered the greatest lawgivers in all of history. Some of us learned about the code of Hammurabi. He is up there. The Justinian Code is next to Hammurabi.

I think there are two or three Popes that were considered great lawgivers.

Some wonder why Napoleon is up there, but the Napoleonic code is still the basis of law in Louisiana.

Jefferson wasn't there during the Constitution, but he helped with a great many laws and, of course, did most of the writing of the Declaration of Independence. But there was much in the Constitution, or a number of things were based on some things that Jefferson had already worked on.

But the only profile that is not a side profile is that of Moses.

When Prime Minister Netanyahu spoke last in here, from this podium behind me, the second level—some people wonder why the President, or people like Netanyahu speak at the second level and not the top level, and that is because this is the people's House. To speak in here you must either be a Member of Congress or have been invited by the Congress to speak here. That is why they are at the second level.

But, at the end of Prime Minister Netanyahu's speech, he paid tribute to the fact that he was facing a great Israelite, Moses; that, like I say, at one time he was considered the greatest lawgiver of all times.

In view of decisions over the last 50 years, we have had a majority—the Supreme Court, probably has reduced his 10 commandments down to four or five.

But this bill, today, will allow persecution and prosecution of anyone who tries to faithfully follow the teachings of Moses and Jesus.

When it comes to marriage, I know the Supreme Court has ruled. They have substituted a majority, at least five judges, substituted their opinions, and that is what they are, opinions, for that of the law, the Constitution; because the Constitution, if you really followed it strictly, marriage is not mentioned as a power or something that the Federal Government would have power over. So, as the 10th Amendment says, such a thing would be left to the States and the people. And many of us believe that is where it should have been left.

But the Supreme Court, at least five oligarchs, decided to take that over. And since they were so much wiser in their own eyes than Moses and Jesus, they substituted their opinion for the opinions of the people of 50 different States and, just basically, took over that function, without amending the Constitution, without even changing the law legislatively, or referendum, any means like that. They just substituted their opinion.

It was Moses who said a man shall leave his father and mother, a woman leaves her home, and the two will become one flesh.

When Jesus was asked—naturally the Pharisees were testing him, trying to trick him, but he quoted Moses verbatim; man shall leave his father and mother, a woman leaves her home, the two will become one flesh. But Jesus added another line on to that: What God has joined together, let no man put asunder. Nobody separate.

There is a video called White Winds, and in that video, the research they have done indicated that there has only been one time in recorded history when legal marriage included same-sex couples.

And, of course, those of us that have studied history, think about, historically, the Roman Empire days, when same-sex couples were widely accepted. Ancient Greece, same-sex couples were widely accepted.

But according to the research, this indication was that they say marriage is, basically, as being an institution for procreation. And so marriage was a man and woman. Have whatever same-sex relations you want, but in those times and places, marriage was said to be between a man and a woman, if it was legal.

Some of us would think back to the days of Sodom and Gomorrah, when—well, the term ''sodomy'' comes from Sodom. But when same-sex relations were widely accepted, obviously, no discrimination.

But according to the research in the documentary, marriage, even in Sodom and Gomorrah, did not include same-sex couples because marriage was for procreation, family.

According to the research, there is one recorded piece of information about legalized marriage being same-sex couples. It was from a Babylonian Talmud that indicated that during something called the Days of Noah, marriage was legal between a same-sex couple.

So, according to the research of that documentary, we are living in days similar to the days of Noah before the flood.

We are now beginning, in this country, in recent years, to experience what people fled to this country to avoid experiencing, and that is, discrimination against an individual because of their religious belief as Christians.

Whether the Pilgrims, or so many other groups that came, of course, there were some, even prisoners that came for other reasons. But in the settlement of North America, what is now the United States, over 90 percent accepted Judeo-Christian beliefs as appropriate and the norm.

Some called Jefferson anything but a Christian, but he made clear that he believed the teachings of Jesus. The story is told that—and I did ask the opinion, or not an opinion, but ask for the facts from the Congressional Research Service—about this Capitol being used as the largest Christian church in Washington, D.C., in the District of Columbia.

They came back with the information that it truly was; that what we now call Statuary Hall—back at the time it was the House of Representatives' Chamber—for the majority of the 1800s it was considered, or it was used on Sundays for Christian worship service. And Thomas Jefferson, as CRS verified, would come to the church service—the nondenominational, Christian worship service that was held just down the hall—each Sunday that he was in Washington during his time as President.

The story is told that on one of those occasions he was riding his horse, as he normally did, to come to church up here on top of Capitol Hill in the Capitol. And someone saw him with a big Bible and asked, Where are you going, Mr. President? And he said, I'm going to church up in the Capitol.

And the individual said, But you don't believe everything that they do.

And he said, Sir, I am the highest elected magistrate in this country. It is imperative that I set the proper example.

So those were early beliefs. Sometimes it is hard for us to reconcile those beliefs with the cruelty of slavery.

Even Jefferson, in the first version of the Declaration of Independence—what looks like the longest grievance against King George—Jefferson was saying, We have a right to separate from King George because of the fact that he allowed slavery to ever start in America.

So, on the one hand, Jefferson actually understood how destructive slavery was; and on the other hand, he had slaves.

But it is—if you look through our history and how we improved up until now, the great strides in civil rights, great victories in civil rights, have come based on a powerful push from churches, Christian churches, and from people who were guided by Christian principles.

The 1730s, 1740s, 1750s, sometimes referred to as the first great awakening in America, powerful, powerful time of revival.

Winthrop is said to have spoken to a majority of Americans. They knew of him or had heard him speak. He was a traveling evangelist.

□ 1300

Many historians say it was the great awakening and the belief in religious freedom that drove—the belief in freedom that drove those early Americans to a Revolution in standing for the rights given by our creator and acknowledging, of course, that there is a creator.

Of course, the Constitution is written, agreed to in 1787, ratified in 1789, but it is concluded, it is dated, ''In the year of our Lord one thousand seven hundred and eighty-seven,'' and it is referring to our Lord.

I am sure that if many judges, many Federal judges had their way, we would strike ''our Lord'' from the Constitution, as them thinking that is somehow unconstitutional to mention ''our Lord'' in our own Constitution.

But you look in the 1800s, certainly there were secularists who saw the damage of slavery and there were some churches that supported it, but the movement toward abolition was driven by people who believed in God, most of them in Jesus Christ.

John Quincy Adams, who ran for the House after being President, stood up down the hall over and over to speak against slavery. He had written to a guy named William Wilberforce in England. Wilberforce had a spiritual Christian awakening and ran for parliament. He believed God's call on him was to bring an end to slavery in all of the British empire, and that is what he spent his adult life in parliament trying to do.

He had a victory at one point, partially through his parliamentary career, in getting the slave trade outlawed. But still slavery persisted, just not the trade in Great Britain. And then 3 days before he died in 1833, slavery was outlawed altogether.

John Quincy Adams thought he was supposed to bring an end to slavery in America the way Wilberforce had fought and successfully done in England, but he didn't get it done.

He served in the House of Representatives from 1831 until his massive stroke in 1848. It happened when he was trying to get up and speak against the war with Mexico, because he was afraid war with Mexico would end up perpetuating slavery even longer.

Daniel Webster, one of the great abolitionists, he would have crowds gather around outside his office during times when he would read the Bible out loud from within his office.

I have been here in Congress since January of 2005, and I don't believe I have ever heard anybody reading out loud from the Bible and having crowds gather around the outside of their office in the hall here at the Capitol, but it used to happen.

Daniel Webster was driven by his Christian beliefs that slavery had to come to an end. He, John Quincy Adams, so many others believed that it was totally inconsistent. How could we expect God to keep blessing America when we were putting our brothers and sisters in chains? The church-ordained ministers were such a powerful force in bringing an end to the evil cruelty called slavery here in America.

Then in the 1950s and 1960s, we didn't have a great awakening in the 20th century, but nonetheless, there was an ordained Christian minister named Martin Luther King, Jr., and he was guided, informed by his Christian beliefs. He was the most powerful individual force in moving our country into accepting what the Constitution said and in assuring that people would be treated equally.

But what Congress has been doing in recent years is passing more and more legislation that will permit persecution of people trying to follow their Christian beliefs, and that passed the House today.

Born out of the best intentions of people that don't want to see anybody persecuted, and yet as a result of this bill, if it were to become law, there would be widespread persecution and prosecution of people who try to hold to their Christian beliefs.

And I know our friends don't want to harm battered women or do damage to women's shelters, but I tried to encourage my friends, look at the literature about women who are victims of sexual assault.

Having been a felony judge for a decade, I heard testimony constantly about the victims and the victims' suffering and their ongoing suffering and their trauma that they continued to live through and the things that triggered their trauma.

It appears from the research literature that women—of course, we are told that one out of four women will experience sexual assault.

We are also told that it is a fraction of 1 percent, a fraction of a fraction, perhaps, of 1 percent of people who truly suffer from gender dysphoria.

It used to be called a disorder. I think it still was in the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual IV. It for sure was in III. But now in V, it is called gender dysphoria, dysphoria being the opposite of euphoria. It is a confusion, a dissatisfaction, an unhappiness with a biological gender, so gender dysphoria.

It is interesting, even in the Equality Act itself, I mean, at one place here it recites findings, and here on the bottom of pages 6 and 7, it points out that about one in five transgender people experience homelessness.

Now, it doesn't go into the reasons for that, if that is true. And possibly there could be discrimination that leads to homelessness, but since this is a condition of unhappiness, a dysphoria, we don't know the reasons for one in five, if that is correct, of people suffering from gender dysphoria being homeless.

But without giving that finding, you go through the bill, this bill is going to allow people to sue lenders who don't lend to people suffering from gender dysphoria at the same rate as those who do not suffer from gender dysphoria. Well, not only can those seeking loans come against and sue the bank and win, the attorney general of the United States is authorized under this bill to bring the full power of the United States Government at war against any individual who questions or is concerned about lending money to someone suffering from this dysphoria.

But if someone even considered the fact that this gender unhappiness or dysphoria, if they even considered that, then they are going to lose the lawsuit under this bill to the individual and to the Attorney General of the United States.

Now, previously, ministers were thought to have some religious exemption. This is the first bill in American history we could find, and it is certainly the first one since the Religious Freedom Restoration Act of 1993, but the first time a bill actually spells out specifically that you cannot claim religious beliefs as a defense.

So I am not hearing people talk about it, but I understand that Orthodox Jewish synagogues believe they should have men as rabbis.

Well, under this, if it becomes law, if a woman comes forward and says, ''I believe I am a man and I want to be your rabbi,'' and they are not hired, well, not only does that person have a claim against the synagogue, but also the Attorney General can come in and destroy the synagogue financially. And that can happen with any church.

If a church says, ''We love everybody,'' like my own church, Christian church, Green Acres Baptist, we love everybody. We welcome anybody in our church. We will not discriminate against anybody who wants to come worship the Lord with us. But if you want to be married, it needs to be what Moses and Jesus said marriage is. Well, in the past, you could utilize religion, religious beliefs as a defense, but if this is the law of the land, then there will be no defense for religious beliefs.

And, again, if White Winds is correct, then for the first time since the days of Noah, we have come to believe that we are so much smarter and so much wiser than Moses and Jesus. So it is an amazing time.

I know Christian friends say, LOUIE, you seem so down. You know, Paul said, ''Rejoice in the Lord always, and again I say rejoice.'' And I understand that, but I also know that as Jesus contemplated Jerusalem, he had a broken heart. He said:

> How many times have I wanted to bring you under my wing and love you and protect you, and you wouldn't have it.

So there is a rebellion going on in this country, a rejection of things upon which this country was founded.

And, you know, people try to paint someone like me as being a hater. I am not a hater. There is nobody in this body I hate.

At a recent event, I had a person who looked like a woman, she said she believed she was a woman, and we had a talk for about 20 minutes. And I understood her thinking and I understood what she felt, though she was a biological man. We disagreed about her lifestyle, but I had nothing but Christian love. And we hugged, agreed to disagree, and hugged as we went our ways. We were up here at the Washington Convention Center.

I don't hate her. I don't hate anybody.

Plenty of people hate me.

But it is so unfair to say that anybody, just because they believe in the teachings of Moses and Jesus, is a hater. It is simply not true.

But I do know that if anybody is not willing to forgive and love, they haven't really grasped what it means to be a Christian.

□ 1315

But it doesn't mean you have to accept and encourage and applaud things that you know are not helpful. I mean, for heaven's sake, the most thorough research ever done on transgender—and it was done, I believe it was Finland, a 30-year study, people seeking sex change surgery—that 30-year study found that those who were seeking sex change surgery were 20 times more likely to commit suicide. Now, how could somebody who loves their fellow man and fellow woman, how could somebody who truly loves them want them in a state of mind in life that they are 20 times more likely to kill themselves, to take that precious gift of life they were given? How is that loving somebody to want them, encourage them, Oh, you stay in this lifestyle. You are ten times more likely to kill yourself, but that is fine, we applaud you for being in that situation, 20 times more likely to kill yourself.

And there is this great study here, ''The New Atlantis, a Journal of Technology and Society'', this is from the fall of 2016, of a special report on sexuality and gender: Findings from the biological, psychological, and social sciences, by Lawrence Mayer, MB, MS, Ph.D., and Paul R. McHugh, MD. Dr.

McHugh is an amazing, brilliant man. He was the head of psychiatry at Johns Hopkins. Johns Hopkins was the first hospital in the United States who did sex change operations.

But as Dr. McHugh points out, after about 20 years of monitoring the people on whom they did sex change surgery, they found that the patients who went through this brutal, really brutal sex change surgery, were no better off mentally than they were before. That was Johns Hopkins' finding. They said: Why should we cut off or take out perfectly healthy organs if the result is the person is no better? So they quit doing sex change operations. As I understand it, they were later threatened with losing a lot of money in support, so they are back doing them now.

We hear from the left all the time about the importance of science, and yet when it comes to science, like the heartbeat bill based on science, we have been told that it is nothing but a mass of tissue inside a pregnant woman. And yet, technology now has gotten so good that at some 6 or 8 weeks into a pregnancy, you can hear a heartbeat, and that heartbeat is from a living person.

And as has been said on this floor previously, if someone sees a body collapse, you run up and check if there is a heartbeat. If there is a heartbeat, you call for an ambulance. If there is no heartbeat, you call for a morgue. We put a lot of stock in a heartbeat, so why shouldn't it be part of a bill? And yet States that have passed the legislation that says there is a heartbeat, then you can't do an abortion, it is a living being.

Personally, I am thankful that nurturing women are the ones who carry a child in utero, because if it were left to us men, I don't believe there would be near as much love and affection felt by the child in utero.

But I think back about when our first child was born 8 to 10 weeks prematurely and my wife had to stay in Tyler. I didn't know whether to stay with her or go with our child who was taken to Shreveport, trying to keep her alive. She said: Go. Do anything you can for our child.

So I went to Shreveport. When I got there, the neonatologist, Dr. Singh—just a wonderful, wonderful doctor. He loved those babies—he said: Look, your baby's eyes, they are not working properly. She can't see you, just a general blur. But she has been listening to your voice for many months now. Even though she was in the womb, she could hear your voice. She knows your voice. You talk to her. Stay here and talk to her, caress, talk, that will be a great comfort.

And as most people know, a premature child, usually the lungs are the last to develop, and that was Katy's case. The breaths were so short and just erratic, and the heartbeat was really fast and erratic. It was in Tyler and it was in Shreveport. After a couple hours of my sitting there and just talking to her and caressing her little arms and face, Dr. Singh came over and said: Have you looked at the monitors? And I hadn't. I was looking at our child.

I looked up. The breathing was still fast, the heart was still fast, but they had stabilized, they were not erratic. And Dr. Sing said: She is drawing strength from you. She is drawing life and strength from you. Well, how was I going to leave after that? They said I could only stay 2 hours, but I couldn't leave. My child was drawing strength from me.

So after I had been there 8 hours, he came over and said: Sir, you really have to leave, you have got to take a break, you can't sit here this long. And I said: But look at the monitor, she is doing well, I don't want to leave. Eventually, they forced me to leave, but my mind was back with Katy.

Anyway, that child knew my voice. She could hear my voice those 7 months in the womb. They know. They make a difference.

And the people who have supported the heartbeat bill, all of them that I am aware of here in this body, it is based on Judeo-Christian beliefs and the value of one person, the right to life that precedes the right to liberty and pursuit of happiness.

This body has been in the business of taking away religious freedoms for quite some time, and it appears that it is going to continue. But, Mr. Speaker, I just want people to understand, the positions of the people I know of who were against the Equality Act, it is not out of any hate, it is not out of any desire to be discriminatory, part of it is a desire not to have people 20 times more likely to kill themselves.

For heaven's sake, we have enough veterans taking their own lives, so tragic; Americans taking their lives, so tragic. There is not much you can say at a funeral of someone who has taken their life that brings a lot of comfort to the family.

It specifically says in here, the Equal Credit Opportunity Act, as amended, and it says right here in the bill that people who are transgender, one in five will experience homelessness, without telling us why. It says, So you have got to give them credit. Well, we just brought our economy to the brink of ruin in 2008. And at some point, in the beginning of that tragedy, we almost lost everything, back in the nineties, when banks were required to lend money for homes to people who couldn't afford it.

And I personally feel like some of the lenders who pushed people into homes fraudulently that they couldn't afford should have done some jail time. But it went on, it happened. A lot of lenders have told me over the years: We are being forced to lend money to people we know can't afford it, but, if we don't, the Federal Government is coming after us. And if this bill becomes law, that will be the case, too.

A banker who says, Well, I am a little concerned, there is a 20 percent chance that this person suffering from gender dysphoria is going to be homeless. They don't make good decisions. Maybe it is because of some discrimination, but certainly some of it is because of poor personal decisions. And now I have got the Federal Government under this Equality Act saying I have got to lend them money anyway. That if the fact that they are 20 percent more likely to be homeless, if I consider that at all and say, We can't risk that money, we don't want to bring the country to the brink of failure again, then the United States Attorney General is authorized to sue me. The individual that is not granted the loan will be authorized to sue.

This bill, though, unlike the Hate Crimes Act, some of us were pushing in the Hate Crimes Act, let's at least define what sexual orientation is. So because, as I said back then in debate, if you don't define sexual orientation, some judge sometime in the Supreme Court at some point will say, Well, you didn't define it, but you used the term sexual orientation. So the meaning of that is very clear: anything you are oriented toward sexually. So that would legalize some sexual orientations that are currently crimes, whether it is necrophilia, pedophilia.

Some have tried to say that I equated homosexuality and bestiality. They were lying. I never did that. I said, let's define out those things that we can agree should not be included, and we were refused any type of limiting definition.

So one thing in this, there is a limitation that says, sexual orientation. The term sexual orientation means, homosexuality, heterosexuality, or bisexuality.

But then when it comes to gender identity, that definition is going to cause a great deal of problems. And it makes clear, it even spells out that you cannot deny access to a restroom, locker room, dressing room, based on gender identity. It says, that is in accordance with the individual's gender identity.

My friend, very smart friend, Mr. Askin, said that he has been amazed over the years how courts could move forward and progress in determining people's civil rights. He felt like we are not going to ever have a problem with men claiming to be women, so they can get huge scholarships, national notoriety, millions of dollars, or television appearances. No man would ever do that. And if they tried, the courts have been really good about being able to discern who is faking, who is a man that says they are a woman and they really don't mean it, and who is legitimately a man thinking that they are a woman.

□ 1330

The trouble with that is this Equality Act makes clear no individual has the right to tell someone who says, ''I think I am a woman,'' if you don't think they are a woman and you try to

ask questions to determine if they are really thinking they are a woman before you treat the person like one, you have just violated the Equality Act. You can't call into question somebody's own self-determinative identity of what they are, genderwise. This bill makes that very clear. They and the Attorney General of the United States can come after you.

That is why some people who have probably never voted for a Republican in their lives have been heard saying: Wait a minute. Title IX back in 1970 says you have to have an equal number of women's scholarships and men's scholarships.

We had a witness who is a professor and said she was one of the first couple of people to get a women's athletic scholarship under title IX at Villanova, where she went to school. She pointed out: Look, here are the three fastest times of the women in the 2016 Olympics in the 400 meter. Those are those three dots. And then the thousands of blue dots, thousands of which are faster than those women, those are men, and many of those are second-tier athletes. They are not great male athletes, and they still beat the best women's time.

Just in the last couple of weeks, we had a guy who believes he is a woman, and he broke a number of weightlifting records for women.

I know there are a lot of Democratic Party voters who may have been here in the gallery clapping, violating the rules and clapping on the passage of the Equality Act, but I have a feeling they have a daughter who cannot get an athletic scholarship even though she is the best female athlete in her high school, one of the best female athletes in the State, and they are shut out from a female athletic scholarship because guys are now applying who think they are women, and you can't question them.

If they tell you they have self-identified as a woman under this Equality Act, if that becomes the law, and you try to challenge them on whether they really do think they are a woman or not, then you are wide open to the Attorney General coming into your school and costing mega-dollars.

But I have talked to people who worked in women's shelters, and they have said: We have been totally dedicated for decades to helping women who are battered by sexual assault, maybe a husband assault. But we are a Christian group, and if we are mandated to allow a man to come in because he thinks he is a woman, we are mandated to bring them in where these women are so vulnerable and so fragile, we will have to close our doors.

I have had small college leaders tell me: If this bill becomes law, we will have to change so much in the way of accommodation to accommodate people under the new law that we will have to shut our doors. We are just barely making it by a shoestring right now.

Now, the massive colleges and universities, you know, they are getting so much money these days, they will be okay. But the small colleges, they are going to have trouble coming up with the money.

The women's shelters are going to have trouble coming up with the money, and they are not going to want to. They care so deeply about the women who have been battered. I have seen it. I have talked to them. But I have experienced the love they have for these women. They are just at the end of their rope. And they sometimes call the women's homeless shelter. They have nowhere else to go.

Now, after they have been brutalized by a husband or some other man, somebody that is stalking them, they are going to be told they can't keep a man out if he thinks he is a woman. They will close their doors.

So I know this Equality Act was done out of the spirit of caring and not wanting to hurt anybody's feelings, but as we have heard over and over throughout the history of this place, rights do have to be balanced.

So on the one hand, you have people who are very confused and unhappy about their gender, even though there is also plenty of evidence to indicate that a child who identifies with the gender that that child is not biologically, if that child is left alone, not pushed in one direction or another, over 80 percent of the time that child will ultimately resolve the situation and become comfortable, mentally, with their biological gender.

But someone like Walt Heyer—I love the guy; he has been a woman, physically, and he is back being a man—tried to commit suicide, and now he spends his time lovingly counseling, encouraging, trying to talk people down from killing themselves. He is just a sweetheart of a guy. I saw him again, recently.

But if this Equality Act becomes law, he won't be able to do that anymore. You can't try to talk somebody through their difficulty, their suicide ideations if you are going to encourage them to be mentally what they are biologically, because this allows even the Attorney General to come after people like that.

People in this body would think such a person is mean-spirited. I don't find a mean-spirited bone in Walt Heyer's body. He is just a sweetheart of a person.

But when you hear people say this bill will bring an end to persecution, it will bring an end to discrimination, that is true with regard to someone who is different, mentally, from what they are biologically at that moment.

As I said, the studies indicate that over 80 percent of the time, someone who is left alone and not trying to be coached one way or another, they end up having their mental attitude on gender resolving and being biologically and mentally the same gender.

But you try to counsel somebody on that, you are going to be sued individually. The Attorney General can come after you. And if your position is based on the kind of love that Jesus Christ has filled you with, care and compassion, and you try to counsel someone out of that love and compassion, well, you have just violated the Equality Act, and Big Brother government is coming after you.

It is really tragic. We used to have more religious freedom. Yes, there were a lot of battles between denominations in America, and that is why, in the Continental Congress, everybody didn't trust one person in the Continental Congress to do a prayer that was fair to everybody, because there were so many different denominations.

It sounded like the Quakers were usually the toughest to please by a prayer by somebody who was not a Quaker. But they were always able to come together and agree: Okay. This minister may not be from my Christian denomination, but that minister will do a fair prayer for all of the Christian denominations here.

But that is why, when Benjamin Franklin made his motion 5 weeks into the Constitutional Convention, that they begin each day with prayer the way they had during the Continental Congress, it ended up being voted down, because, basically, they were saying: We don't have a treasury. We are not getting paid, and so we can't afford to hire a chaplain we can all agree on. So, if we can just get a Constitution together, then we can have a treasury, then we can hire a Christian minister to come in here and pray for all of the denominations represented here.

That is when Randolph from Virginia said: Okay. All right. You are right. We don't have money to hire a chaplain right now, so I move that we recess. Here we are, the end of June. A few days from now, it will be July Fourth. We are going to celebrate our Nation's independence. I move that we recess here in this Constitutional Convention and we reconvene together at a church that has a minister that we can all trust to be fair to our Christian denominations. Then we will worship together, and after we worship together, then we will come back and try this constitution, try putting one together.

Now, that one passed, and they all gathered at the Reformed Calvinist Church in Philadelphia.

My friend Dave Brat loves that because he is Calvinist.

And the Reverend William Rogers was the minister presiding. Apparently, he did an awesome job as a Christian minister of bringing all of these delegates attending the Constitutional Convention together.

It was written by others that when they reconvened, there was a new spirit. Yes, they had disagreements, but there was a new spirit there.

I know people are taught nowadays that Benjamin Franklin was a deist, someone who doesn't believe in God, just thinks some force, some thing,

something, created the universe, and if that thing or force, person, is still around, it never interferes with nature or man. Everybody is on their own.

But it was Ben Franklin that said: ''I have lived, Sir, a long time, and the longer I live, the more convincing proofs I see of this truth—that God governs in the affairs of men. And if a sparrow cannot fall to the ground without His notice, is it possible that an empire can rise without His aid?

We have been assured, Sir, in the Sacred Writings, that 'except the Lord build the House they labor in vain that build it.' I firmly believe this; and I also believe that without his concurring aid we shall succeed in this political building no better than the builders of Babel.''

We will be confined by our local partial interests; and we, ourselves, shall become a byword down through the ages.

That is because he knew this was the best chance in the history of all of the world to have people self-governing. The Romans had a form and the Greeks had a form, but not like this.

We have been blessed. We have continued to work together over the centuries to get the Constitution to where all people will be treated as they are created: equal; not equal in talent or intellect, but equal in the sight of God, our Creator.

Yet, the Equality Act sends a message that if you are going to base your life on the teachings of Moses or Jesus or both, then we will not only persecute you, we will prosecute you. And the Attorney General of the United States is authorized under the Equality Act, basically, to destroy your life if you happen to believe and practice what Moses and Jesus said.

We have done so much destruction of families in this country over the last 50 to 60 years, and it is tough. I have seen it. People I love have been a single mom or single dad raising kids. It is tough.

We have taken action, passed laws that really have been destructive of the home as a nuclear home. We have seen the falling away from Judeo-Christian beliefs.

As John Adams said, this Constitution is only meant for a religious and a moral people. It is wholly inadequate for the government of any others.

So this is one more nail in America's coffin. As Jefferson said, I fear for America because I know God is just. But this says Moses and Jesus were just wrong. Anybody who tries to follow those teachings publicly, we are going to destroy you until we make everybody equal except Orthodox Jews and Christians following the Bible, and also Muslims who are following the Koran. They will not be able to follow the teachings of the Koran if this becomes law.

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

REMOVAL OF DELEGATE AND APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO HOUSE DEMOCRACY PARTNERSHIP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, and pursuant to section 104(a) of House Resolution 6, 116th Congress, and the order of the House of January 3, 2019, the Chair removes the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Ms. PLASKETT) from the House Democracy Partnership, and appoints the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS) to fill the vacancy.

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 46 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, May 20, 2019, at noon 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:

1056. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel, Export-Import Bank, transmitting two (2) notifications of a nomination and an action on nomination, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

1057. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel, Millennium Challenge Corporation, transmitting five (5) notifications of a vacancy, a designation of acting officer, a nomination, and an action on nomination, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

1058. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Standards Branch, BSEE, Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's Major final rule — Oil and Gas and Sulfur Operations in the Outer Continental Shelf--Blowout Preventer Systems and Well Control Revisions [Docket ID: BSEE-2018-0002; 190E1700D2 ET1SF0000.EAQ000 EEEE500000] (RIN: 1014-AA39) received May 16, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1059. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Great Lakes Pilotage Rates — 2019 Annual Review and Revisions to Methodology [USCG-2018-0665] (RIN: 1625-AC49) received May 16, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

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. TAKANO: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 2333. A bill to direct the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct an assessment of the responsibilities, workload, and vacancy rates of Department of Veterans Affairs suicide prevention coordinators, and for other purposes (Rept. 116–70). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. TAKANO: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 2359. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to submit to Congress a report on the Department of Veterans Affairs advancing of whole health transformation; with an amendment (Rept. 116–71). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. TAKANO: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 2372. A bill to direct the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct an assessment of all memoranda of understanding and memoranda of agreement between Under Secretary of Health and non-Department of Veterans Affairs entities relating to suicide prevention and mental health services; with an amendment (Rept. 116–72). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. KIM (for himself and Mr. RATCLIFFE):

H.R. 2819. A bill to extend the authority for the establishment of a commemorative work in honor of Gold Star Families, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD:

H.R. 2820. A bill to authorize the cancellation of removal and adjustment of status of certain individuals who are long-term United States residents and entered the United States as children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ (for herself and Ms. CLARKE of New York):

H.R. 2821. A bill to authorize the cancellation of removal and adjustment of status of certain nationals of certain countries designated for temporary protected status or deferred enforced departure, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. SHERRILL (for herself and Mr. UPTON):

H.R. 2822. A bill to amend title V of the Social Security Act to provide for an extension of funding for family-to-family health information centers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. SPEIER (for herself, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. CASE, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CORREA, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. LEE of California, Mrs. LEE of Nevada, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. GOMEZ):

H.R. 2823. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to deem certain service in the organized military forces of the Government of the Commonwealth of the Philippines and the Philippine Scouts to have been active service for purposes of benefits under programs administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. COHEN (for himself, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. LAWSON of Florida):

H.R. 2824. A bill to amend the Fair Credit Reporting Act to require the inclusion of

credit scores with free annual credit reports provided to consumers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER (for himself, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, and Mr. TURNER):

H.R. 2825. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the rehabilitation credit for certain small projects, to eliminate the requirement that the taxpayer's basis in a building be reduced by the amount of the rehabilitation credit determined with respect to such building, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. JUDY CHU of California (for herself and Mrs. NAPOLITANO):

H.R. 2826. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for behavioral and mental health outreach and education strategies to reduce stigma associated with mental health among the Asian American, Native Hawaiian, and Pacific Islander population; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. DINGELL:

H.R. 2827. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to deem any perfluoroalkyl or polyfluoroalkyl substance used as a food contact substance to be unsafe and therefore treated as adulterated under such Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KING of New York (for himself, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. NORTON, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. CONNOLLY, and Mr. SWALWELL of California):

H.R. 2828. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide that for purposes of computing the annuity of certain law enforcement officers, any hours worked in excess of the limitation applicable to law enforcement premium pay shall be included in such computation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LEVIN of Michigan (for himself and Mr. MASSIE):

H.R. 2829. A bill to clarify that Congress has not provided authorization for the use of military force against Iran; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MEADOWS (for himself, Mr. CUELLAR, and Mr. ROUZER):

H.R. 2830. A bill to direct the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration to create a task force to process applications submitted for determinations, assessments, and waivers for unmanned aircraft systems; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. MITCHELL (for himself, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. LANGEVIN):

H.R. 2831. A bill to require the Secretary of Labor to award grants for promoting industry or sector partnerships to encourage industry growth and competitiveness and to improve worker training, retention, and advancement as part of an infrastructure investment; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. OMAR (for herself, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. POCAN, Mr. PAPPAS, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Mr. KHANNA):

H.R. 2832. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a business credit for gain from the sale of real property for use as a manufactured home community, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. PORTER (for herself, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. PRESSLEY, and Mr. LEVIN of Michigan):

H.R. 2833. A bill to require the student loan ombudsman of the Department of Education to provide student loan data to the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ROUZER:

H.R. 2834. A bill to revise the boundaries of a unit of the John H. Chafee Coastal Barrier Resources System in Topsail, North Carolina, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER (for himself, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. KATKO, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee, and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 2835. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to reform certain forfeiture procedures, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. TORRES of California (for herself and Mrs. WAGNER):

H.R. 2836. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Department of State for fiscal years 2020 through 2022 to provide assistance to El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras through bilateral compacts to increase protection of women and children in their homes and communities and reduce female homicides, domestic violence, and sexual assault; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. LEE of California (for herself, Ms. NORTON, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. TITUS, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. FRANKEL, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. MOORE, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. SOTO, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. NADLER, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. POCAN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. KILMER, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. CORREA, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. CRIST, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. SCANLON, Ms. HAALAND, Ms. MENG, Mr. RASKIN, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. HIMES, Mrs. FLETCHER, Mrs. CRAIG, Ms. PORTER, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. CISNEROS, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. PAYNE, and Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ):

H. Res. 388. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of the International Day Against Homophobia, Transphobia, and Biphobia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. KIM:

H.R. 2819.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, of the Constitution

By Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD:

H.R. 2820.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

H.R. 2821.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to . . . provide for the . . . general Welfare of the United States; . . .

By Ms. SHERRILL:

H.R. 2822.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 1 of section 8 of the Constitution.

By Ms. SPEIER:

H.R. 2823.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 2824.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 2825.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section VIII, Clause I

By Ms. JUDY CHU of California:

H.R. 2826.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the United States Constitution

By Mrs. DINGELL:

H.R. 2827.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 2828.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress shall have Power . . . To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. LEVIN of Michigan:

H.R. 2829.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 1 of the Constitution.

By Mr. MEADOWS:

H.R. 2830.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution: To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H.R. 2831.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers.

By Ms. OMAR:

H.R. 2832.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 1

By Ms. PORTER:

H.R. 2833.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. ROUZER:

H.R. 2834.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 2835.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 (The Congress shall have Power ''To regulate Commerce with foreign nations, and among the several States and within the Indian Tribes'') and Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 (The Congress shall have Power ''to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof''). Additional authority derives from Article III, Section 1, (''The judicial Power of the United States, shall be vested in one Supreme Court, and in each inferior courts as the Congress may from time to time ordain and establish. The Judges, both of the Supreme and inferior Courts, shall hold their Officers during good Behavior, and shall at stated times, receive for their Services, a Compensation, which shall not be diminished during their Continuance in Office.) Additional authority also derives from Article III, Section 2, Clause 3 of the Constitution.

By Mrs. TORRES of California:

H.R. 2836.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

According to Article 1: Section 8: Clause 18: of the United States Constitution, seen below, this bill falls within the Constitutional Authority of the United States Congress.

Article 1: Section 8: Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 4: Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 36: Mr. CARTWRIGHT and Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL.

H.R. 74: Mr. WRIGHT.

H.R. 75: Mr. WRIGHT.

H.R. 85: Mr. WRIGHT.

H.R. 95: Mr. LEWIS.

H.R. 141: Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 147: Mr. WRIGHT.

H.R. 153: Mr. WRIGHT.

H.R. 158: Ms. NORTON and Ms. CLARKE of New York.

H.R. 256: Mr. WRIGHT.

H.R. 296: Mr. GAETZ.

H.R. 307: Mr. GRIFFITH, Mrs. MILLER, and Ms. HOULAHAN.

H.R. 336: Mrs. WALORSKI.

H.R. 383: Mr. STAUBER.

H.R. 435: Mr. SMITH of Washington and Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.

H.R. 438: Mr. WRIGHT.

H.R. 490: Mr. DIAZ-BALART.

H.R. 500: Ms. FINKENAUER.

H.R. 510: Mr. CHABOT and Mr. CLINE.

H.R. 516: Mr. WRIGHT.

H.R. 523: Mr. WRIGHT.

H.R. 549: Mr. PHILLIPS.

H.R. 550: Ms. LEE of California.

H.R. 554: Mr. SIRES.

H.R. 555: Mr. PETERS, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. TRONE, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. HARDER of California, Mr. SIRES, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. MCHENRY, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. VELA, Mr. NORCROSS, and Mr. PAPPAS.

H.R. 569: Ms. BASS.

H.R. 586: Mr. HICE of Georgia and Mr. OLSON.

H.R. 641: Ms. DELBENE.

H.R. 647: Mr. LEVIN of California and Mr. KINZINGER.

H.R. 649: Mr. CURTIS.

H.R. 674: Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 693: Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. COSTA, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. TAKANO, Mrs. FLETCHER, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. PETERSON.

H.R. 732: Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 748: Mrs. FLETCHER and Mr. MARCHANT.

H.R. 771: Mr. NORMAN.

H.R. 777: Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 838: Ms. SCHRIER, Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio, Mr. DEUTCH, and Mr. MARCHANT.

H.R. 849: Mrs. AXNE.

H.R. 864: Mr. SIRES.

H.R. 885: Ms. BASS.

H.R. 891: Mr. WRIGHT.

H.R. 906: Mr. BYRNE.

H.R. 939: Mr. CICILLINE and Mr. COURTNEY.

H.R. 943: Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. ALLRED, Mr. EMMER, Mr. CROW, Mr. WRIGHT, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. RIGGLEMAN, and Mrs. MURPHY.

H.R. 946: Ms. UNDERWOOD, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, and Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

H.R. 955: Ms. MENG and Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 961: Ms. BASS.

H.R. 1002: Mr. COLLINS of New York.

H.R. 1042: Mr. COLLINS of New York.

H.R. 1044: Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma, Mr. ALLRED, and Mrs. WALORSKI.

H.R. 1058: Ms. PINGREE.

H.R. 1080: Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. RUSH, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, and Mr. CASTRO of Texas.

H.R. 1130: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 1139: Mrs. TORRES of California.

H.R. 1146: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. BRINDISI, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. SHERRILL, Mr. FOSTER, and Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 1149: Mr. CRIST.

H.R. 1154: Mrs. HAYES, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. PINGREE, and Mr. LEVIN of California.

H.R. 1209: Ms. WILD, Mr. MAST, Ms. NORTON, Mr. HARDER of California, Mr. HIMES, Mr. MALINOWSKI, Ms. TITUS, Mr. SUOZZI, and Ms. HAALAND.

H.R. 1225: Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. CORREA, and Mr. BACON.

H.R. 1228: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 1236: Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 1274: Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia and Mr. TED LIEU of California.

H.R. 1309: Mr. COOPER.

H.R. 1321: Mr. CASE.

H.R. 1327: Mr. WENSTRUP and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.

H.R. 1345: Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 1372: Mr. JORDAN, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. RIGGLEMAN, and Mr. CLOUD.

H.R. 1374: Mr. ROUZER, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. MASSIE.

H.R. 1396: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Ms. UNDERWOOD, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. DELGADO, Mrs. HAYES, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. WRIGHT, and Mr. OLSON.

H.R. 1398: Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. BACON, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania, and Mr. BRINDISI.

H.R. 1423: Mr. TRONE, Mr. MORELLE, and Mr. MOULTON.

H.R. 1443: Mr. GAETZ.

H.R. 1446: Mr. MAST and Ms. GABBARD.

H.R. 1534: Ms. DELBENE.

H.R. 1549: Mr. COLE.

H.R. 1554: Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania, Mr. KING of Iowa, and Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 1570: Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. UNDERWOOD, Mr. HORSFORD, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. OMAR, and Mrs. HAYES.

H.R. 1575: Mr. CISNEROS.

H.R. 1579: Mr. AMODEI and Mr. COSTA.

H.R. 1591: Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 1595: Ms. HOULAHAN and Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 1636: Mr. ALLRED and Mrs. HAYES.

H.R. 1643: Ms. OMAR, Mr. CRIST, and Ms. PRESSLEY.

H.R. 1646: Mr. O'HALLERAN, Ms. STEVENS, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. HARDER of California, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. KILMER, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. VELA, and Mr. LAMB.

H.R. 1692: Mrs. FLETCHER and Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 1716: Mr. WALTZ, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 1717: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.

H.R. 1730: Mr. YOUNG and Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 1767: Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. LONG, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. STEVENS, and Mr. UPTON.

H.R. 1793: Mr. BERA.

H.R. 1794: Mr. CISNEROS.

H.R. 1814: Mr. RASKIN and Mr. GALLEGO.

H.R. 1830: Mr. STAUBER, Mr. BALDERSON, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CONAWAY, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. DESAULNIER, and Mr. WENSTRUP.

H.R. 1837: Mr. ROONEY of Florida, Mrs. LEE of Nevada, Ms. STEVENS, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. LAMB.

H.R. 1869: Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico, Mr. COMER, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. HILL of Arkansas, Mr. HARDER of California, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. COSTA, Mr. LUCAS, Ms. PINGREE, and Mrs. HARTZLER.

H.R. 1878: Mr. KIM, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. SPANBERGER, Ms. BASS, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. TRONE, and Mrs. TRAHAN.

H.R. 1882: Ms. DEAN.

H.R. 1885: Mr. WRIGHT.

H.R. 1896: Mr. KATKO.

H.R. 1903: Mr. RUTHERFORD and Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 1911: Mrs. HARTZLER.

H.R. 1943: Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 1949: Mr. STIVERS.

H.R. 1950: Mr. STIVERS.

H.R. 1964: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 1965: Mr. CÁRDENAS.
H.R. 1980: Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. TONKO, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. HECK, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. MENG, Mr. LAMB, and Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
H.R. 2015: Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. STEWART, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. HILL of Arkansas, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. JOHN W. ROSE of Tennessee, and Ms. FINKENAUER.
H.R. 2029: Ms. BONAMICI.
H.R. 2040: Ms. STEFANIK.
H.R. 2070: Mr. COOPER.
H.R. 2073: Mr. DESAULNIER.
H.R. 2074: Mr. RASKIN, Mr. HECK, and Ms. PINGREE.
H.R. 2088: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. FINKENAUER, Mr. LEVIN of California, Mr. MCNERNEY, and Mr. DEFAZIO.
H.R. 2098: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 2117: Mr. COOPER.
H.R. 2134: Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H.R. 2137: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H.R. 2147: Mr. KIND, Mr. DUNN, Mr. GIANFORTE, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. CASE, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. SOTO, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, and Mrs. AXNE.
H.R. 2151: Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ.
H.R. 2156: Mr. MCKINLEY.
H.R. 2178: Mr. COLLINS of New York and Ms. PINGREE.
H.R. 2182: Ms. LEE of California, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. COOPER.
H.R. 2186: Mr. HASTINGS and Mr. CROW.
H.R. 2195: Ms. OMAR.
H.R. 2208: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 2300: Mrs. LURIA and Mr. KENNEDY.
H.R. 2326: Mrs. RADEWAGEN, Ms. PORTER, and Mr. VELA.
H.R. 2334: Mrs. FLETCHER and Ms. JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 2340: Ms. PORTER.
H.R. 2343: Mr. RIGGLEMAN and Mr. STEUBE.
H.R. 2354: Mr. KIND, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Mrs. LAWRENCE.
H.R. 2367: Mr. COX of California.
H.R. 2382: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. TONKO, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. CRIST, Ms. MENG, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. SCHRADER, and Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 2402: Mr. LAWSON of Florida and Mr. O'HALLERAN.
H.R. 2435: Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. SIRES, and Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico.
H.R. 2474: Mr. AGUILAR and Mr. KIND.
H.R. 2476: Mr. MALINOWSKI and Mr. SCHWEIKERT.
H.R. 2480: Mr. LIPINSKI and Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 2483: Mr. TRONE.
H.R. 2489: Mr. SWALWELL of California and Ms. BASS.
H.R. 2491: Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, and Ms. SLOTKIN.
H.R. 2507: Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mrs. RODGERS of Washington, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. RASKIN.
H.R. 2528: Mr. BEYER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. HILL of California, and Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 2554: Mrs. RODGERS of Washington and Mr. DELGADO.
H.R. 2555: Mr. BILIRAKIS.
H.R. 2568: Mr. KIND.
H.R. 2577: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 2579: Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. VAN DREW, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
H.R. 2585: Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. UNDERWOOD, and Mr. KHANNA.
H.R. 2591: Mr. SOTO.
H.R. 2618: Mr. BURGESS.
H.R. 2634: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 2643: Ms. FINKENAUER.
H.R. 2651: Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Ms. BONAMICI.
H.R. 2692: Mr. LUJÁN.
H.R. 2700: Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER and Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee.
H.R. 2726: Ms. MOORE and Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 2742: Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. CONAWAY, and Mr. JOHN W. ROSE of Tennessee.
H.R. 2747: Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. KHANNA, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. PINGREE, and Mr. SIRES.
H.R. 2748: Mr. HUFFMAN, Mrs. DINGELL, and Mr. TONKO.
H.R. 2776: Mr. LOEBSACK and Mr. WELCH.
H.R. 2778: Mr. PAYNE, Mrs. MCBATH, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. SIRES, Ms. SCANLON, and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H.R. 2809: Mr. GALLEGO, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. GARAMENDI, and Mr. HORSFORD.
H.J. Res. 2: Mrs. DINGELL.
H. Con. Res. 20: Mr. WITTMAN.
H. Con. Res. 36: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mrs. DINGELL, and Ms. LOFGREN.
H. Res. 134: Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ.
H. Res. 165: Mr. FITZPATRICK and Mr. RASKIN.
H. Res. 231: Mr. KILMER.
H. Res. 246: Mr. BUCSHON and Mr. GUEST.
H. Res. 296: Mr. CALVERT.
H. Res. 349: Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. CASE, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. WATKINS, Ms. CLARKE of New York, and Mr. TAKANO.
H. Res. 358: Mr. RUSH, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. ESPAILLAT, and Mr. RASKIN.
H. Res. 363: Mr. PERLMUTTER.
H. Res. 374: Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. CALVERT.
H. Res. 383: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. PALAZZO, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. RYAN, Ms. SPANBERGER, Mr. GREEN of Tennessee, Mrs. TORRES of California, and Ms. LOFGREN.

DISCHARGE PETITIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XV, the following discharge petition was filed:

Petition 3, May 15, 2019, by Mr. MAST on House Resolution 348, was signed by the following Members: Mr. Mast, Mr. Hagedorn, Mr. Womack, Mr. Posey, Mr. Rice of South Carolina, Mr. Calvert, Mr. Gaetz, Mr. Upton, Mr. Armstrong, Mr. Cole, Mr. Biggs, Mr. McKinley, Mr. DesJarlais, Mr. Thompson of Pennsylvania, Mr. Scalise, Mr. McCaul, Mr. Zeldin, Mr. Kustoff of Tennessee, Ms. Stefanik, Mr. Bost, Mr. Rouzer, Mr. Ferguson, Mr. Kinzinger, Mr. Guthrie, Mr. Gonzalez of Ohio, Mr. Gosar, Mr. Katko, Mr. Banks, Mr. Sensenbrenner, Mr. Gallagher, Mr. Steil, Mr. Riggleman, Mrs. Walorski, Ms. Granger, Mr. Gianforte, Mr. Davidson of Ohio, Mr. Rogers of Kentucky, Mr. Burchett, Mr. Green of Tennessee, Mr. Moolenaar, Mr. Comer, Mr. Wittman, Mr. Smucker, Mr. Flores, Mr. Hice of Georgia, Mr. Balderson, Mr. Marshall, Mr. Johnson of Ohio, Mr. Rutherford, Mr. Wenstrup, Mr. Williams, Mr. Brady, Mr. Budd, Mr. Norman, Mrs. Hartzler, Mrs. Miller, Mr. Gibbs, Mr. Baird, Mr. Hill of Arkansas, Mr. Luetkemeyer, Mr. Wright, Mr. Carter of Texas, Mr. Fulcher, Mr. Newhouse, Mr. Cook, Mr. McCarthy, Mr. Gooden, Mr. Collins of New York, Mr. Arrington, Mr. Byrne, Mr. Latta, Mr. Smith of Nebraska, Mr. Smith of Missouri, Mr. Guest, Mr. Joyce of Pennsylvania, Mr. Meuser, Mr. Duncan, Mr. Loudermilk, Mr. Walker, Mr. Babin, Mr. Mitchell, Mr. Carter of Georgia, Mr. Yoho, Mr. Stauber, Mr. Emmer, Mr. Dunn, Mr. Bilirakis, Ms. Cheney, Mr. Long, Mr. Graves of Louisiana, Mr. John W. Rose of Tennessee, Mr. Bishop of Utah, Mr. Olson, Mr. Rogers of Alabama, Mr. Rooney of Florida, Mr. Johnson of South Dakota, Mr. Amodei, Mr. Crawford, Mr. Weber of Texas, Mr. Thornberry, Mr. Young, Mr. Kelly of Mississippi, Mr. Conaway, Mr. Kevin Hern of Oklahoma, Mr. Bucshon, Mr. Fitzpatrick, Mr. Hudson, Mr. Holding, Mr. Watkins, Mr. Simpson, Mr. Mooney of West Virginia, Mr. Fleischmann, Mr. David P. Roe of Tennessee, Mr. King of New York, Mr. Bacon, Mr. Collins of Georgia, Mr. Buchanan, Mr. Kelly of Pennsylvania, Mr. Buck, Mr. Curtis, Mr. Stivers, Mrs. Lesko, Mr. McClintock, Mr. Joyce of Ohio, Mr. Spano, Mr. Duffy, Mr. Lamborn, Ms. Herrera Beutler, Mrs. Rodgers of Washington, Mr. Bergman, Mrs. Wagner, Mr. Diaz-Balart, Mr. Wilson of South Carolina, Mr. Ratcliffe, Mr. Schweikert, Mr. Barr, Mr. Reschenthaler, Mr. Allen, Ms. Foxx of North Carolina, Mr. Hurd of Texas, Mr. Harris, Mr. Palazzo, Mr. Rodney Davis of Illinois, Mr. Burgess, Mr. LaHood, Mr. Hunter, Mr. Walden, Mr. Perry, Mr. Cline, Mr. Steube, Mr. Smith of New Jersey, Mr. Griffith, Mr. Grothman, Mr. Jordan, Mr. Crenshaw, Mr. Tipton, Mr. LaMalfa, Mr. Chabot, Mr. Mullin, Mr. Austin Scott of Georgia, Mr. Timmons, Mr. Brooks of Alabama, Mr. Marchant, Mr. Turner, Mr. Graves of Georgia, Mr. Aderholt, Mrs. Brooks of Indiana, Mr. Meadows, Mr. Pence, Mr. Reed, Mr. Woodall, Mr. Estes, Mr. Roy, Mr. Shimkus, Mr. Webster of Florida, Mr. Graves of Missouri, Mr. Stewart, Mr. Lucas, Mr. Higgins of Louisiana, Mr. Abraham, Mr. Walberg, Mr. Waltz, Mr. Palmer, Mr. McHenry.

DISCHARGE PETITIONS—ADDITIONS AND WITHDRAWALS

The following Members added their names to the following discharge petitions:

Petition 1 by Mr. SCALISE on House Resolution 102: Mr. Rooney of Florida.

Petition 2 by Mr. HICE of Georgia on House Resolution 132: Mr. Kustoff of Tennessee, Mr. Byrne, Mr. Ratcliffe, Mr. Walker, Mr. Smucker, Mr. Harris, Mr. Palazzo, Mr. DesJarlais, Mr. Collins of Georgia, Mr. Gohmert.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING OFFICER ROBERT CARROLL ON BEING NAMED OAK LAWN'S TOP COP OF 2019

HON. DANIEL LIPINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 17, 2019

Mr. LIPINSKI. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Officer Robert Carroll of the Oak Lawn Police Department for being named the Village's Top Cop of 2019. The Oak Lawn Lion's Club bestows this award on a distinguished member of the force after being nominated by his or her peers and selected by a committee of police department leaders.

Officer Carroll has served the Oak Lawn community as an exemplary first responder. While performing his duties, Officer Carroll has put his life on the line to make numerous felony arrests and to keep the Village of Oak Lawn safe. Officer Carroll has received several letters from citizens recognizing him for his compassion and professionalism in the line of duty. Officer Carroll is an exceptional member of the Oak Lawn Police Department and his record stands as a shining example for others seeking to serve Oak Lawn and our larger Chicagoland community.

I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Oak Lawn Police Officer Robert Carroll. I congratulate him on his accomplishments and thank him for his service.

TRIBUTE TO SYDNEY STROTHER SMITH III

HON. H. MORGAN GRIFFITH

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 17, 2019

Mr. GRIFFITH. Madam Speaker, I pay tribute to Sydney Strother Smith III of Abingdon, Virginia, a faithful servant of his God and country.

Strother was born on August 1, 1941, to Strother and Betsy Smith. His father was one of the Army's last commissioned cavalry officers, and during young Strother's baptism at Fort Knox on December 7, 1941, news from Pearl Harbor interrupted the service. As his father fought in World War II as a tank commander, Strother lived in Richmond with his mother and grandfather. They remained there after his father returned from the war.

Hoping to follow in his father's footsteps by joining the military, Strother enrolled at the Virginia Military Institute in Lexington. A fall from cliffs broke his back, however, and ended hopes of a military career. Among his roommates at VMI, he was the only one not to die in Vietnam, convincing him that God had a different purpose for his life.

Strother is known as a dedicated and effective organizer of the Republican Party in Virginia. He was the founding president of the Young Republicans Club at the University of Richmond and served as vice president of the statewide Young Republicans Federation, where he helped expand the number of clubs statewide and met his future wife Barbara. He managed his father's successful campaign for the Virginia House of Delegates as a Republican at a time when Virginia was still largely controlled by the Democratic Party and went on to manage other campaigns for the House of Delegates, United States Senate, and House of Representatives. After moving to Washington County to practice law, he became an active member of the county party and instilled it with new blood. He served as chairman of the county party from 1974 to 1980 and, along with Professor Ray Hancock, organized the College Republicans at Emory and Henry College, my alma mater.

Strother also achieved distinction in his legal career. He became one of the youngest attorneys to argue in front of the United States Supreme Court and would return several times, as well as appear before the Virginia Supreme Court. He was drawn toward cases in which he championed the underdog. One example unfolded over 25 years as he represented an elderly Kentucky mountain man, John Johnson, and eventually Mr. Johnson's heirs against the industrial giant Bethlehem Minerals. Mr. Johnson claimed rights over the coal on his property, and Strother argued his case up to the Kentucky Supreme Court, then to the U.S. Supreme Court, and back to Kentucky. When the case was finally resolved, Mr. Johnson's heirs and co-litigants were awarded $37 million in damages, and willful trespassing became part of mineral rights law. Strother relished such cases and often engaged in them on a pro bono basis, about which his wife sometimes noted that his family had bills to pay, too.

Strother was an active member of the Anglican Church. He was a chancellor, canon lawyer, and a priest ordained in 1987, and he helped to found and rector six parishes. He also belonged to numerous civic organizations. He was an Eagle Scout as a boy and a scout leader as an adult, a member of the Sons of the Revolution, and a reenactor with the Mountain Men of Revolutionary War fame. An amateur pilot, a published poet, a joke collector and storyteller, he is a man of seemingly endless talents but one: punctuality. His nickname, the ''Late Great Strother Smith,'' reflects his habit of being late to just about everything, including his wedding. The one exception: voting, which he would always be in line for by 6 am.

Strother's family includes his wife of 53 years, Barbara Ann Smith; daughters Ambler Dumler and her husband John, Sydney Smith and her husband Tim Gilhool, and Beth and her husband Andy Stockner; brother, Richard Smith and his wife Sarah of Alexandria, VA; sister Rev. Caroline Parkinson of Nashville, TN; and grandchildren Josef, Marshall, and Aidan Dumler, Jimmy and Molly Gilhool, and Virginia, Josie, and Cora Stockner.

TRIBUTE TO BLAKE EDWARD BUTLER

HON. KEN CALVERT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 17, 2019

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to a public servant and American patriot, Blake Butler, who passed away suddenly on May 3, 2019 at his home in Yerevan, Armenia. Today I ask that the U.S. House of Representatives join me to honor and remember the life of Blake Edward Butler.

Blake Butler joined the U.S. Department of State in 2009 as a U.S. Foreign Service Officer. In 2018, he began his tour as the Human Resources and Financial Management Officer at U.S. Embassy Yerevan. From 2015 to 2018 he served as the Assistant General Services Officer at U.S. Embassy Buenos Aires where he led the team that provided logistical support to 14 different U.S. government agencies and close to 400 employees. Blake's other assignments included General Services Officer at U.S. Embassy Baghdad; Environmental, Science, Technology and Health Officer at U.S. Embassy Paris; and Vice Consul at U.S. Embassy Port-au-Prince. Prior to joining the Foreign Service, he worked as a civil service employee for the Department of State as a budget analyst and in the office responsible for the President's foreign travel. He was the recipient of multiple Department Superior Honor and Meritorious Honor Awards. In addition to his service with the Department of State, Blake valiantly served in the U.S. Army's Reserve from 2001 to 2011 and was deployed overseas on multiple occasions.

Blake was the loving husband of Sara Hurst Butler, who previously worked in my office, and the proud father of Everett Ian Butler. Blake received his BA from Baylor University and his MBA and Master's in Health Administration from Texas Woman's University.

As we look at the incredibly rich history of our country we realize that this history is comprised of men, just like Blake, who chose a life of public service. I am grateful for Blake's service to our country and my thoughts, prayers and deepest condolences goes out Blake's wife, son, parents and brother. There are no words that can relieve their pain and what words I offer only begin to convey my deep respect and highest appreciation. I hope they know that the goodness Blake brought to this world will always be remembered.

ROYAL ROTH

HON. STEVE SCALISE

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 17, 2019

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I rise to congratulate my friend, Royal Roth, on his well-deserved retirement after a long and

happy career. On June 30, 2019, Royal will finish out seventeen rewarding years at the United Parcel Service (UPS), where he currently works as a Vice President in the UPS Global Public Affairs group.

Royal is a welcome and familiar face to many of us. He found his way to Washington via the campaign trail, while working for the late First Lady Barbara Bush during the 1992 election. After the election, he landed at the National Republican Senatorial Committee before moving onto then-Senate Majority Leader Bob Dole's staff.

After several productive years on Capitol Hill, Royal moved on to The American Trucking Associations before joining UPS in 2002. Royal has worked tirelessly on behalf of American workers, taxpayers, and businesses over the past decades. He retires at the height of his career, with an impeccable reputation and much hard-earned good will behind him.

While Royal will be missed in Washington, he and Patrick will enjoy spending more time shuttling between New Orleans and Fairhope. As an avid University of Alabama football fan, I know we'll always be able to find him watching his beloved Crimson Tide play in Tuscaloosa (and sometime soon, lose to LSU). It is with many thanks for his friendship and years of service that Jennifer and I congratulate Royal and wish him well as we send him off on this new chapter of his life.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BRAD R. WENSTRUP

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 17, 2019

Mr. WENSTRUP. Madam Speaker, due to the death of my father, I was unable to attend the following votes.

Had I been present, I would have voted: YEA on Roll Call No. 185; YEA on Roll Call No. 186; YEA on Roll Call No. 187; YEA on Roll Call No. 188; NAY on Roll Call No. 189; NAY on Roll Call No. 190; YEA on Roll Call No. 191; YEA on Roll Call No. 192; NAY on Roll Call No. 193; NAY on Roll Call No. 194; YEA on Roll Call No. 195; NAY on Roll Call No. 196; NAY on Roll Call No. 197; NAY on Roll Call No. 198; NAY on Roll Call No. 199; YEA on Roll Call No. 200; YEA on Roll Call No. 201; and NAY on Roll Call No. 202.

IN RECOGNITION OF FLOWER MOUND HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPAL SONYA LAIL

HON. MICHAEL C. BURGESS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 17, 2019

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, today I rise to recognize the outstanding career of Ms. Sonya Lail. This spring, she is retiring from her position as principal of Flower Mound High School, where she has served in multiple leadership positions for the past 17 years.

Ms. Lail grew up in El Paso, Texas, where she was inspired by one of her teachers to become an educator. She went on to pursue her Bachelors of Science degree in education from the University of Texas at El Paso, and achieved master's degrees from Texas Tech University and Sul Ross State University.

In 2002, Ms. Lail joined Flower Mound High School as an assistant principal, a position in which she served for five years, and served as an associate principal for another four years. She has led FMHS as its principal for the last eight years. From day one, Ms. Lail has been a dedicated leader and educator, working to help each student meet his or her full potential.

After nearly two decades of service to Flower Mound High School, Ms. Lail will be sorely missed by the entire Jaguar community. I am grateful for her total of thirty-three years in education and public service, and I wish Ms. Lail every continued success in her well-earned retirement.

IN MEMORY OF JOSUE FLORES

HON. SYLVIA R. GARCIA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 17, 2019

Ms. GARCIA of Texas. Madam Speaker, today we remember the life of Josue Flores. At the young age of eleven years old, Josue was murdered while he walked home from school in Houston's Northside. Three years have passed since that day and every day that passes our community still feels sadness and mourns his loss. As family, friends and neighbors gather tonight at Holy Name Catholic Church to remember our little angel, we also remember what we are all striving for. We want safety. We want security. We want justice.

All of us have a role to play in making our community safer. The concerned parents and neighbors of Safe Walk Home go above and beyond. Together, they form a powerful force of protection for our school children. When I served in the Texas Senate, we worked hard to secure funding for organizations that help provide safe passage for children going to and from school in high crime or violent areas. Now, here in Congress, I continue to believe that we must do more to make the trip to and from school safe for every child in Houston, in Texas, and across the United States. Josue continues to touch our lives and watch over our work. Let us rededicate ourselves to keeping our children safe from harm.

HONORING OFFICERS DURING NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

HON. STEVE CHABOT

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 17, 2019

Mr. CHABOT. Madam Speaker, this week is National Police Week, a week the American people join hundreds of thousands of law enforcement officers across the country to honor all those who have made the ultimate sacrifice in order to keep our communities safe.

Words alone can never fully express our gratitude for the sacrifices that police officers and their families make to protect the rest of us. And too often, it takes a tragedy to realize just what is at stake, and what we owe to those who are willing to take that risk.

It's why I do all that I can as a Member of Congress to help give police officers the resources they need to do their job effectively and safely. For example, this week, we passed important legislation to reauthorize the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Program. This important program helps protect the men and women who serve in law enforcement by giving states and localities the resources they need to ensure that all police officers have the proper equipment to keep them safe and help prevent line-of-duty deaths.

Every day and night, in cities and towns across America, the men and women who wear the uniform risk their lives to protect us as we go to school, to work, and spend time with our families.

And so, as we commemorate National Police Week, let's take a moment to thank those officers for their bravery, selfless dedication and tireless efforts to keep our communities safe.

To those who serve us, who wear the uniform, and the badge, and the gun, thank them for their service. I also thank them for their dedication and the sacrifices they and their families make to keep the rest of us safe. God bless them.

PERSONAL EXPLANATON

HON. LARRY BUCSHON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 17, 2019

Mr. BUCSHON. Madam Speaker, I was unavoidably detained on May 16, 2019, in order to deliver the Commencement Address at the Concordia Seminary in Saint Louis, Missouri.

Had I been present, I would have voted: YEA on Roll CAll No. 210; NAY on Roll Call No. 211; NAY on Roll Call No. 212; YEA on Roll Call No. 213; and NAY on Roll Call No. 214.

HONORING PATTY AND IAN CARLIS

HON. THEODORE E. DEUTCH

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 17, 2019

Mr. DEUTCH. Madam Speaker, I am honored to rise today in recognition of my friends Patty and Ian Carlis, who have been selected as the honorees of Congregation Keneseth Israel's annual Gala.

Patty and Ian Carlis have been active and engaged members of their community, helping to leave a lasting impact for the people of Lehigh County, Pennsylvania, and beyond. Moved by the historic atrocities of the Holocaust and the need for greater awareness, Patty used the performing arts to educate her community's young people. Through shows like ''The Library'' and other works, Patty played an instrumental role in inspiring the annual Youth and Prejudice Conference, paving the way for a more sophisticated and meaningful understanding of the Holocaust for middle and high-school students.

Ian Carlis served as a dentist at Bethlehem Smiles, going on to become the President of the dental staff of Lehigh Valley Hospital,

where he was a clinical educator for the Hospital and a member of the Continuing Dental Education Committee. Ian has graciously served both the profession and the community which he values so greatly.

To take their service even further, the Carlises went on to create the Ian and Patty Carlis Fund, a donor-advised fund which provides an array of grants to various organizations in greater Lehigh Valley.

As a Lehigh Valley native myself, I congratulate them on this well-deserved honor and thank them for their continued leadership in their community. May they go from strength to strength.

IN HONOR OF FIFTY YEARS OF DEDICATED SERVICE BY THE MICHIGAN 33RD DISTRICT COURT

HON. DEBBIE DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 17, 2019

Mrs. DINGELL. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Michigan's 33rd District Court for fifty years of dedicated service. The court's efforts continue to improve and protect the communities of Southeastern Michigan.

Originally located above the Trenton Police Station, the 33rd District Court was established on January 1, 1969. The court and its staff work diligently in coordination with law enforcement officials to protect Southeastern Michigan, overseeing criminal and civil trials. Beyond its judicial duties, the 33rd District Court offers a wealth of services for defendants, offenders, and students. Through the Sobriety Court program, over one-hundred individuals suffering from severe alcohol and drug abuse have received supervision, assistance, and treatment, dramatically reducing the recidivism rates of participants. The 33rd District Court is also highly involved in education, offering multiple programs to teach students about the criminal justice system.

Regarded for its accessibility, timeliness, and courtesy, the 33rd District Court has faithfully served the community for fifty years. The efforts of the court and its staff highlight a deep commitment to justice and public safety. We thank the 33rd District Court for its exceptional service to Southeastern Michigan and its continued work in reducing crime. The 33rd District Court stands as a role model in criminal justice and its distinguished reputation is a testament to its impact on the community and the state of Michigan.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Michigan's 33rd District Court for fifty years of exemplary service. The court's work in criminal justice, reform, and education are worthy of commendation.

IN RECOGNITION OF WENDY SEELIGER-DIETSCHWEILER

HON. MICHAEL C. BURGESS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 17, 2019

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Ms. Wendy Seeliger-Dietschweiler, who recently was recognized by the DFW World Affairs Council as "2019 International Educator of the Year." Ms. Seeliger-Dietschweiler is the Social Studies Chairwoman at Lewisville High School—Harmon Campus, where she currently teaches Advanced Placement World History, 10th Grade World History, and ESL World Geography. She also serves as the faculty sponsor of the school's Junior World Affairs Council.

Ms. Seeliger-Dietschweiler has been an educator for the past 22 years. She received her Bachelors of Arts degree at the University of Texas at Austin and a Master of Arts in Public Administration from Webster University. She also has earned a certification in Education Administration.

This teacher takes great pride in leading her students by example. Ms. Seeliger-Dietschweiler is an active volunteer in her community and encourages her students to do the same. Her community service includes participation in many organizations, including the Lewisville Lions Club, Keep Lewisville Beautiful, and Texas Refugee Services. Previously, she served as a Peace Corps volunteer and taught English in China.

I congratulate Ms. Wendy Seeliger-Dietschweiler for winning this prestigious award, and I am grateful for her dedication to her students and our North Texas community.

CELEBRATING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF UCLA

HON. TED LIEU

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 17, 2019

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Madam Speaker, today I rise to celebrate the 100th anniversary of the founding of the University of California, Los Angeles. What was once the largest teacher training school in the state was rechristened the Southern Branch of the University of California, developing into the full-fledged university, nestled in the hills of Westwood, with the global reputation it enjoys today.

With 14 Nobel Laureates, 13 MacArthur Fellows, nine National Medal of Science Winners, three Pulitzer Prize winners, a Fields Medal, and an A.M. Turing Award, UCLA's academic credentials are rivaled by few. And, with 117 NCAA team championships and 261 Olympic Medals, the UCLA Bruins are in the highest echelon of collegiate sports, with the likes of Jackie Robinson, Kareem Abdul-Jabar, Michelle Kwan, and Troy Aikman wearing the Blue and Gold.

Along the way to such a historic milestone, each successive class of students and their professors, doctors and researchers have lit new paths, bringing new discoveries to the fore and making groundbreaking accomplishments in almost every field.

The first node on the Internet in Leonard Kleinrock's laboratory in Boelter Hall; Coach John Wooden's almost uninterrupted streak of 10 NCAA men's basketball championships and his Pyramid of Success—building blocks in the pursuit of excellence; the first diagnosis of AIDS in the United States; and the first confirmation of the existence of a supermassive black hole at the center of the Milkey Way Galaxy by Andrea Ghez—UCLA has played an important role in shaping the course of history, advancing our understanding of the natural and man-made worlds, and setting standards time and time again for academic and athletic excellence.

Not only is the UCLA community proud of the accomplishments of its students and athletes while they attended this important institution, but also of the achievements of alumni as they pursue careers in every field.

UCLA has contributed many of this country's most dedicated public servants, including my predecessor, Congressman Henry Waxman, whose 40–year record in the U.S. House of Representatives saw passage of numerous consumer and patient protections; Ralph Bunche, who helped negotiate an end to the 1948 Arab-Israeli War; and Tom Bradley, the first African American mayor of Los Angeles. Legendary actress and comedienne Carol Burnett, Academy Award-winning director Dustin Lance Black, Academy Award-winner Tim Robbins, film composer John Williams, and Rock and Roll Hall of Famer Jim Morrison are only a few of the Bruins who have left their mark on the entertainment industry and the collective consciousness of American culture for the past century.

Given all that has happened in the first 100 years of UCLA's existence, I eagerly look forward to what UCLA will accomplish in its next hundred. With the launch of the UCLA Grand Challenges Initiatives in 2013, UCLA has set admirable goals aimed at increasing sustainability and tackling depressive disorders. The Sustainable LA Grand Challenge focuses on transitioning Los Angeles to rely on 100 percent renewable energy and 100 percent locally sourced water by 2050, enhancing the health of the local ecosystem and making the region a model for the world. The Depression Grand Challenge aims to understand, prevent, and treat depression, ultimately cutting the burden in half by 2050 and eliminating it by the end of the century.

UCLA's accomplishments would only be possible with the support and resources of the Bruin family. I would like to commend Chancellor Gene Block on his successful stewardship of the Centennial Campaign, which raised $4.7 billion in total from more than 205,000 donors to fund programs for students and faculty in every comer of campus.

On the eve of UCLA's centennial, I would like to extend my sincerest congratulations to Chancellor Block, UC President Janet Napolitano, and the rest of the UCLA community as they prepare for a year of celebration. I would also like to recognize all the people in UCLA's history that worked to make sure the university could light the way for the past century and the next 100 years to come. Go Bruins.

REMEMBRANCE OF THE LIFE OF COMMISSIONER CHRISTOPHER MCNAIR

HON. TERRI A. SEWELL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 17, 2019

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the extraordinary life and legacy of the late Christopher McNair. Commissioner McNair was a beloved member of the Birmingham community who, even in the

face of unspeakable tragedy, led his community with grace and love towards a more equal and just future.

Commissioner McNair's daughter, Denise, was killed in the 16th St. Baptist Church bombing on Sunday, September 15, 1963. It was in that moment that the McNair family became forever intertwined with the Civil Rights Movement.

Commissioner McNair was born in Fordyce, Arkansas on November 22, 1925. Commissioner McNair left his family and 11 younger siblings to serve in the Army during World War II. After leaving the service, he studied at Tuskegee University and earned a degree in agronomy in 1949. It was there that he met Thelma ''Maxine'' Pippen, a fellow classmate, and fell in love. After graduation, Commissioner McNair took a job in Tupelo, Mississippi teaching veterans and visited Maxine on the weekends in Birmingham while staying with her grandparents. The two married shortly after and settled in Tupelo.

When Mrs. McNair became pregnant, the couple moved back to Birmingham to be near family. On November 17, 1951, Carol Denise was welcomed to the world by her loving parents and became the center of their lives. Commissioner McNair was an amateur photographer and photographed Denise's childhood, including the iconic photo of her wearing her red winter coat and matching hat.

On the morning of September 15, 1963, Mrs. McNair and Denise left their home to attend church at 16th St. Baptist Church. Tensions were high in Birmingham as the Civil Rights Movement continued, and there were frequent acts of violence throughout the city. That morning was no exception—four members of the Ku Klux Klan bombed the basement of the church, killing Commissioner McNair's daughter, Denise, 11, Addie Mae Collins, 14, Carole Robertson, 14, and Cynthia Wesley, 14. These young girls became known to the world as the 4 Little Girls.

That morning, Commissioner McNair was at home preparing to go to his church, St. Paul Lutheran, when he heard the explosion and mistook it for thunder. After a neighbor explained what happened, he raced to the hospital, and was initially relieved because he did not see Denise's name on a list of the injured. Later, though, Mr. and Mrs. McNair were asked to walk into a separate room. There, the bodies of the four girls were covered, but Commissioner McNair instantly recognized Denise's shoe peeking out.

After overcoming their anger and sadness, the family was ready to return to their new normal. The McNairs welcomed two more blessings into their lives over the next five years: Lisa McNair, almost exactly a year after her sister's death, and Kimberly McNair in 1968. Both girls were seen as small miracles to the family and quickly became the light of their parents' lives.

After Denise's death, Commissioner McNair dedicated himself to serving the community and the people of Alabama. He knew he needed to help the state to reconcile its racial differences and to help heal the scars from the 1960s. In 1973, Commissioner McNair was elected the first African American State Representative since Reconstruction, and in that role, he worked tirelessly to bring positive national attention to the city he loved.

Commissioner McNair spent years in the public eye as an elected official, working hard to pass legislation that would help all residents. After serving in the legislature, Commissioner McNair took a chance and ran for the Jefferson County Commission. His bid for office was successful and he was sworn into office in 1986 where he served until his retirement in 2001.

On behalf of Alabama's 7th Congressional District, I ask my colleagues to join me in remembering the life of Commissioner Christopher McNair, whose election to the Alabama State Legislature inspired countless men and women to run for office in the state of Alabama, to continue fighting for social justice, and to educate future generations about the Civil Rights Movement. May we celebrate the totality of his life today and honor his great works during his 28 years of service to Birmingham and the State of Alabama.

HONORING PETE RICHMOND

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 17, 2019

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Pete Richmond as the Napa Valley Grower of the Year for 2019.

Mr. Richmond's career in agriculture began in 1986 after earning a degree in Agricultural Business from California State University, Fresno. He gained valuable experience as a viticulturist while working at Bien Nacido Vineyards. Mr. Richmond went on to work for many prestigious wineries. In 1992 he was at Stag's Leap Winery; he worked at Atlas Peak Winery from 1993 to 1995; from 1995 to 2001 he was at Kendall Jackson. Mr. Richmond founded the Silverado Farming Company, a vineyard management company, in 2001. Many of the finest wineries and vineyards in the Napa Valley contract with Silverado Farming Company to manage their vineyards. The company oversees vineyard management for over 650 acres of grapes.

Mr. Richmond's passion for agriculture is not confined to the vineyard. He is involved in our community—through his philanthropic contributions and the Boards on which he sits. In 2006, Mr. Richmond established the One Percent for the Community Fund, a foundation that receives one percent of gross revenue profits made by the Silverado Farming Company. The foundation uses the money to support at-risk youth in our community and helps find a solution for a variety of issues that impact farm workers. Mr. Richmond is on the Farmworker Foundation Board of Directors, OLE Health Operating Board, and the OLE Health Foundation Board. He is also an Advisory Board Member for Teens Connect, a member of the Marketing Committee for the Napa Valley Community Foundation, and a past member of the Napa Valley Grapegrower's Board of Directors. He is active in the housing community as a member of Napa Valley Community Housing and Napa County Housing Commission. Mr. Richmond is also involved with Ag for Youth and is a former Babe Ruth Baseball League Coach.

Madam Speaker, Mr. Richmond is the community member we should all strive to be. He is a person of integrity, is generous and caring, and well-deserving of the title Napa Valley 2019 Grower of the Year. It is therefore fitting and proper that we honor Pete Richmond here today.

RECOGNIZING MRS. SUSAN MARY MAHEU GUERRA

HON. JOAQUIN CASTRO

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 17, 2019

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Mrs. Susan Mary Maheu Guerra, who passed away on May 20, 2018. Ms. Guerra hales from my hometown of San Antonio. She is survived by her husband, Eliberto Guerra; son, Christopher Guerra; daughters, Jessica Guerra and Trina Bacon; and seven grandchildren. Her contributions to the San Antonio community will last for many years to come. She will be greatly missed.

Mrs. Susan Guerra was born in New Orleans, Louisiana on January 12, 1951 to Donald and Marilyn Maheu. Mrs. Guerra's journey began after being accepted at the age of 18 to the Order of the Daughters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul at Guardian Angel Settlement in St. Louis, Missouri. She attended St. Louis University, receiving a bachelor's degree in social work.

After serving nine years as a nun, Mrs. Guerra heard another calling to care for those in her community. She began working with juvenile probations and at-risk families. Upon marrying Eliberto Guerra and starting a family of their own, Mrs. Guerra desired to do more for children in need. In 1986, The Guerra Family established the Guardian Angel Child Development Center.

With over 30 years of persistence and determination, Guardian Angel flourished enrolling over two generations of children. The center has provided many with a second home. Guardian Angel is now a beacon of hope in San Antonio and its Southside community. The center offers a broad range of after school and summer programs such as computer classes and performing arts.

Madam Speaker, I am proud to be part of a community that cherishes our future generations. Mrs. Susan Guerra's legacy will be felt by many as her commitment to child development has inspired many. To know of her work in bettering the lives of our kids is truly remarkable. I have no hesitation in saying that her legacy will endure.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE HEAD START PROGRAM

HON. ALBIO SIRES

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 17, 2019

Mr. SIRES. Madam Speaker, today I recognize the significant contribution of the Head Start Program in promoting school readiness and overall success for some of the most vulnerable children in our communities. On May 18, 2019, Head Start will celebrates its 54th year of strengthening children and families and this year, the Early Head Start program also celebrates its 25th anniversary.

In New Jersey alone, there are currently twenty-six Head Start Programs and twenty-

nine Early Head Start Programs, with over 15,000 combined funded slots for these two programs. In addition to providing academic programming, Head Start also provides critical health and nutrition programs, as well as support services that help many families work their way towards economic stability.

I am proud to support the important work of Head Start in providing children and families within the 8th District of New Jersey every opportunity to succeed.

HONORING BATTALION CHIEF MICHAEL MCMILLIN ON BEING NAMED OAK LAWN'S TOP FIREFIGHTER OF 2019

HON. DANIEL LIPINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 17, 2019

Mr. LIPINSKI. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Battalion Chief Michael McMillin of the Oak Lawn Fire Department for being named the Village's Top Firefighter of 2019. The Oak Lawn Lions Club bestows this award on a distinguished member of the department after being nominated by his or her peers and selected by a committee of fire department leaders.

Battalion Chief McMillin has distinguished himself as a tremendous first responder and dedicated servant to the Village of Oak Lawn. His devoted service to the community has earned him admiration from his fellow firefighters as well as the people of Oak Lawn. Battalion Chief McMillin exemplifies the true characteristics of leadership and has brought professionalism and tremendous dedication to the Oak Lawn Fire Department.

I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Battalion Chief Michael McMillin of the Oak Lawn Fire Department. I congratulate him on his accomplishments and thank him for his service.

IN HONOR OF NANCY HEDBERG FOR THE 2019 TOWNSHIP CLERK OF THE YEAR AWARD

HON. DEBBIE DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 17, 2019

Mrs. DINGELL. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Nancy Hedberg for her award of 2019 Township Clerk of the Year by the Michigan Association of Municipal Clerks. Her numerous years of dedicated service are worthy of commendation.

Nancy Hedberg has faithfully served her community of Scio Township for thirty-two years. Mrs. Hedberg was initially hired as a design consultant and worked on several initiatives, including the Jackson Boulevard project. In 1987, she was appointed to the Planning Commission, spending fourteen years supervising land development in Scio Township. From 1998 to 2008 , she served on the Board of Review, and from 2008 onward has worked as the Scio Township Clerk. During her tenure as Township Clerk, Mrs. Hedberg has displayed incredible tenacity and empathy.

Nancy Hedberg's efforts have had a profound impact on the residents of Scio Township. Her exemplary work highlights a commitment to public service by developing deep relationships with members of her community. Praised for her continued optimism and tireless work ethic, Nancy Hedberg has been an integral member of the Scio Township hall. We thank Mrs. Hedberg for her commitment to serving Scio Township, and we congratulate her on her well-deserved award of the 2019 Township Clerk of the Year and her retirement. Her compassion and leadership will be missed, and we wish her good health and every happiness in her retirement years.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Nancy Hedberg for her years of distinguished public service. Her work has been instrumental to the people of Scio Township.

DRUG PRICING AND SENIORS

HON. SYLVIA R. GARCIA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 17, 2019

Ms. GARCIA of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the action being taken by this body to protect and expand affordable health care and lower prescription drug costs.

Because of soaring prescription drug costs, Texans and Americans are struggling to meet their health needs.

These costs are especially burdensome for the 65,000 senior citizens in my district, where the average senior takes 4½ medications each month.

Last year, nearly 20 percent skipped doses due to the high costs alone. This is absolutely unacceptable.

This moment calls for action to protect the health and well-being of Americans.

And action is exactly what House Democrats are doing. The bills passed this week will tackle out-of-control drug prices head-on and fight the Trump administration's efforts to destabilize Medicare and our health care markets.

SUPPORTING THE EQUALITY ACT

HON. DEBBIE MUCARSEL-POWELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 17, 2019

Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL. Madam Speaker, I'm proud to represent a community, Key West, where our motto is "One Human Family.''

We welcome over 450 thousand LGBTQ tourists each year who feel appreciated in our home.

Protecting every American from discrimination is not only a fundamental value of our country, it's essential for the health of our economy.

For the first time in American history, we passed legislation that would add protections for a community that has been ignored for too long.

The Equality Act ensures that no one can lose their job or home because of whom they love or who they are.

It finally includes protections for our LGBTQ community that are inherent in the Constitution for all Americans.

This is the United States of America.

Equality Matters.

After all, we are all one human family.

HONORING AMERICAN LEGION POST 13 IN STAUNTON, VIRGINIA

HON. BEN CLINE

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 17, 2019

Mr. CLINE. Madame Speaker, I rise today to recognize 100 years of the American Legion and specifically Post 13 in Staunton, Virginia. In March of 1919, Congress chartered and incorporated the American Legion as a veteran's organization that works to strengthen communities while encouraging patriotism and honor. The American Legion is dedicated to its fellow servicemembers and veterans.

Soon after its national charter was passed, a group of veterans of World War I gathered at the YMCA on Main Street in Staunton, Virginia, to organize a local American Legion post. This year, in 2019, that post celebrates its centennial. For the past 100 years, the Clemmer-McGuffin American Legion Post 13 has shown unwavering support to veterans, servicemembers, and the communities of Augusta County and Staunton, Virginia. This Staunton American Legion post is named after two local servicemen, Augusta County resident Jay F. Clemmer, and Staunton resident Robert A. McGuffin. Both young men were students at the Staunton Military Academy and were killed in 1918 during World War I. Today, I recognize the Clemmer-McGuffin American Legion Post as they celebrate their 100 years of assembly in the Shenandoah Valley.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE LIFE, SERVICE, AND SACRIFICE OF MR. MITCHELL LUNDGAARD

HON. MIKE GALLAGHER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 17, 2019

Mr. GALLAGHER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life, service, and sacrifice of Appleton firefighter Mitchell Lundgaard.

Mr. Lundgaard began his career with the Appleton Fire Department in March of 2005 and spent the next 14 years serving and protecting his community. Through his dedication and hard work, Mr. Lundgaard achieved the rank of firefighter inspector.

On Wednesday, May 15, 2019, Mr. Lundgaard tragically lost his life while on active duty. His heroism and bravery in response to a medical call will forever be remembered. He was a true leader in the Appleton community, and his absence will be felt across all of Northeast Wisconsin.

Mr. Lundgaard's years of service to our community and his commitment to ensuring the safety of others set the highest example of citizenship that we must all strive for. Mr. Lundgaard's death is a tragedy for our community, and my deepest condolences go out to his wife, three daughters, and the rest of their family.

Madam Speaker, I ask that the members of this chamber rise in honor of Mr. Lundgaard's life, and that we keep him and his family in our thoughts and prayers.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE FLOWER MOUND HIGH SCHOOL BOYS SOCCER TEAM

HON. MICHAEL C. BURGESS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 17, 2019

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, today I rise to honor the Flower Mound High School Boys Soccer Team for winning the school's first Texas UIL 6A State Soccer Championship. Coach David Doyle led the Jaguars through a remarkable season, and I congratulate all players and coaches for reaching this goal.

In winning the state championship, the students have demonstrated teamwork, dedication, and perseverance. This year, the FMHS Boys Soccer Team has elevated the bar for future student athletes. Its seniors are leaving an impressive legacy for their school and the Flower Mound community.

The team earned the nickname ''Cardiac Jags'' for their hard-fought championship run. The championship game ended only after 100 scoreless minutes, when Brock Clayton delivered the game-winning shot in a 4–1 penalty kick shootout win against San Antonio L.E.E. Goalie Landon Leach was named the state championship game MVP for making a penalty kick save in regulation and a second save in the final shootout.

It is a privilege to represent Flower Mound High School in the U.S. House of Representatives. I am glad to join the students' family, friends, and North Texas community to celebrate the 2019 Flower Mound High School Boys Soccer Team's achievements, and I wish them every continued success.

NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

HON. DON BACON

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 17, 2019

Mr. BACON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor May 15, 2019 as Peace Officer Memorial Day and May 13 through the 19, 2019 as Police Week. I stand in support of those who put their lives on the line, day in and day out, for the protection of those within the State of Nebraska and all over the United States. My district is home to two sheriff offices, a large urban police force, numerous community police departments, the Nebraska State Patrol, and a hand full of federal agencies. They have unique differences in their responsibilities yet they are strikingly similar in how they function. The different shapes of the badges they wear on their chests proudly proclaims their distinct alliance to their home agency, but it is also a symbol that binds them all together into one brotherhood.

These gallant law enforcement professionals are driven to serve the public of their jurisdictions. To protect the life, limb, and property in their assigned patrol areas during their long hours for which they have this solemn duty. To those on the front line of our safety; it is not about the pay, the hours, or the conditions they work in. What is of importance to them is the satisfaction of making the world a better and safer place. They are the thin blue line that stands between us and some of the darkest parts of our society.

When one of these brave individuals put on their uniform and departs their home for the streets, they are not worried for their own safety. They know their fellow officer have their back when needed. At great personal sacrifice, they are pained by missing the baseball games or recitals of beloved children; the birthdays and holidays they worked instead of being home with their families.

I, like so many other members of the military, have a very personal connection and appreciation for those who choose this profession. I spent nearly thirty years in the military and much of that time was deployed with combat forces protecting our freedoms overseas: The men and women in military uniform depend on those back home in the blue uniform.

Like so many others in the military, when I was overseas, I left my wife and children here in the U.S. As a former commander, I can tell you that the fastest way to negatively affect a soldier, sailor, airman, or marine within a combat situation was to have them worry about their family back home. Our great police officers, allow the military to be a success. I am in awe with the dedication that each officer displays daily. When our military is reunited with their family after a deployment, they can relax knowing their fellow public servants provide a shield of protection. This is a profession that takes a different type of individual, someone who is consistently putting their lives on the line, someone that I have always looked up to, a group of individuals that I cannot thank enough for the blanket of security that they provide.

There are members of the law enforcement community who serve, retire, and move on in their lives. Eventually they go home and lay down their badge in retirement, but they will no longer miss these family events. These professionals have the gratitude of the constituents of my district and I want to thank them for their dedication to protect and serve. I would like to honor some of these courageous people who have long distinguished careers or who recently retired. They are:

Deputy Sheriff David J. Wintle, of the Douglas County Sheriff's Office, for over 29 years of service (deceased). This included 13 years as a K–9 handler.

Deputy Sheriff Clarence Cooper, of the Sarpy County Sheriff's Office, for 22 years of service (deceased). He also served 20 years in the U.S. Air Force.

Officer Paul Briese Sr., of the Eppley Airfield Police Department, for 11 years of service (deceased). He also served 28 years with the Omaha Police Department and 4 years as the Sheriff of Boone County, NE.

Officer Robert Wondra, of the Omaha Police Department, for over 25 years of service (retired). This included 22 years as a member of their SWAT team. He also served in the U.S. Marine Corps.

Chief Les Johnson, of the Bennington Police Department, for 26 years of service (deceased).

Detective Matthew Elsasser, of the Papillion Police Department, for 13 years. He is the Papillion Police Department's 2018 Officer of the Year.

I want to thank these officers and all others for their service and sacrifice.

HONORING DENNIS PEDISICH

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 17, 2019

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Dennis Pedisich for his involvement with Community Health Initiative and his leadership in providing health insurance to residents of Napa County.

Mr. Pedisich has been active in our community since earning his Master in Business Administration from Santa Clara University. He sat on the Community Health Initiative Board of Directors for nine years. During his time on the Board, he held many positions, including that of Vice President. Mr. Pedisich has selflessly given many hours of his time to the Community Health Initiative, which has provided over 18,000 uninsured individuals with health insurance and access to care.

Mr. Pedisich has been active in our community in other positions as well. He has been the President of the Napa Valley College Foundation, the Justin-Siena High School Board of Trustees, and the Kiwanis Club of Napa Valley. He also sits on the Board of Trustees for the Queen of the Valley Medical Center. As the former President of Napa Community Bank and Vice President of Rabobank, Mr. Pedisich has shared his expertise of the finance community with the local non-profit sector and has helped many businesses thrive through his generosity with his time and knowledge.

Madam Speaker, Mr. Pedisich is an active member of our community who uses his expertise to assist others and help important local institutions, such as the Community Health Initiative, thrive. The Community Health Initiative has been able to reach such a large number of Napa residents in no small part because of Mr. Pedisich. It is therefore fitting and proper that we honor Dennis Pedisich here today.

TRIBUTE TO ANDRES D. SARABIA

HON. JOAQUIN CASTRO

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 17, 2019

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge and honor the passing of Mr. Andres D. Sarabia, a community leader in San Antonio, Texas. Mr. Sarabia dedicated his life to advocating on behalf of others and guiding people to use their own voice to hold their elected officials accountable. He passed away on Friday, May 3, 2019, and will be missed by the San Antonio community.

Mr. Sarabia served as the first president of Communities Organized for Public Service (COPS) and was actively involved with the organization's advocacy efforts for more than four decades. Through COPS, he worked to organize and empower local residents to

speak up on issues that affected their communities, working to address inequities in how local government services and resources were allocated. Mr. Sarabia and COPS successfully advocated across a diverse portfolio of issues, ranging from improvements in neighborhood infrastructure to the establishment of Palo Alto College on San Antonio's south side. The organization continues to serve as forum for residents to discuss and amplify their voices on important issues.

Perhaps Mr. Sarabia's most enduring legacy will be the foundation he helped establish through COPS and the steady stream of local leaders, activists and residents who have been empowered through the organization's work to engage with their government, advocate for the betterment of their community, and continue the important work of holding elected officials accountable.

I join my fellow residents of San Antonio in honoring Mr. Andres Sarabia's legacy of civic engagement, leadership and service.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BILL JOHNSON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 17, 2019

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I was absent during last night's amendment votes and final passage vote on H.R. 987 due to travel for an unavoidable medical appointment back in Ohio. Below is how I would have voted on the amendments and final passage.

Had I been present, I would have voted: YEA on Roll Call No. 210; NAY on Roll Call No. 211; NAY on Roll Call No. 212; YEA on Roll Call No. 213; and NAY on Roll Call No. 214.

FALLEN OFFICER REMEMBRANCE—NATIONAL POLICE WEEK 2019

HON. MICHAEL GUEST

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 17, 2019

Mr. GUEST. Madam Speaker, earlier this week, the 38th Annual National Peace Officers' Memorial Service honored the men and women who paid the ultimate sacrifice upholding the rule of law and protecting the people of our great nation. Last year, Mississippi lost five officers in the line of duty. I'd like to honor them as we remember their service and sacrifice. Please join me in honoring:

POLICE OFFICER EMMETT PAUL MORRIS

Emmett Paul Morris, 61, lost his life in the Line of Duty May 17, 2018, in a vehicle crash. He served with the Raleigh Police Department for two years. He is survived by his wife of 20 years, Dean King Morris; daughter, Candice Lea Morris; son, Paul Scott Morris; three step sons; and twelve grandchildren. He served with the Reservoir Police Department prior to his service with Raleigh Police Department.

CORPORAL WALTER ZACHERY MOAK

Walter Zachery Moak, 31, lost his life in the Line of Duty September 29, 2018, by gunfire. He was employed with the Brookhaven Police Department for three years and had previously worked for the Wesson Police Department and Lincoln County Sheriffs Department. Zach devoted his time to his family and enjoyed working with and helping people in his community.

PATROLMAN JAMES KEVIN WHITE

James Kevin White, 35, also lost his life in the Line of Duty September 29, 2018, by gunfire. He was employed with the Brookhaven Police Department for 3 months and was previously employed with Lawrence County Sheriffs Department, where he worked for many years. He was a soldier in the Army National Guard and served his country in Operation Iraqi Freedom. James was a Purple Heart recipient. He is survived by two children.

PATROL OFFICER LEANN SIMPSON

LeAnn Simpson, 23, lost her life in the Line of Duty November 24, 2018, in a vehicle crash. She worked with the Philadelphia Police Department for 15 months. She was also a U.S. Army veteran joining the U.S. Army at the age of 17. She is survived by her parents, James and Wilma Simpson-McMillan, three sisters and four brothers.

POLICE OFFICER ROBERT MCKEITHEN

Robert McKeithen, 58, lost his life in the Line of Duty May 5, 2019, by gunfire. Officer McKeithan was a U.S. Air Force veteran. He had served with the Biloxi Police Department for 24 years and was planning on retiring by the end of the year. He received the Medal of Valor when he risked his life to save four children during Hurricane Katrina. He enjoyed spending time with his family and was deeply involved in his community. He is survived by his wife, daughter, stepdaughter, and two stepsons.

Ronald Reagan once said, ''there can be no more noble vocation than the protection of one's fellow citizens.'' May we remember these brave officers, their service to protecting our communities, and the sacrifice they made for the people who call Mississippi home.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE CENTRAL HIGH SCHOOL PRODUCTION OF EURIPIDES' MEDEA

HON. MICHAEL C. BURGESS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 17, 2019

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, today I rise to congratulate the cast and crew of Central High School's production of Euripides' Medea, which won the 2019 Texas UIL Class 6A State One-Act Play Championship.

This is the first time that Central High School has won the State One-Act Play Championship, a remarkable artistic accomplishment, in school history. This victory was a team effort, and all members of the cast and crew have rightfully earned this honor.

I also congratulate Ms. Renee Powell for earning a spot on the State All-Star Cast and Mr. Jose Gonzalez for earning an Honorable Mention. This recognition of their talent and dedication is well-deserved.

I am glad to join the entire Keller ISD community in celebrating the success of these students, and I wish them every continued success in their academic and professional endeavors.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JACK BERGMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 17, 2019

Mr. BERGMAN. Madam Speaker, on Roll Call Vote Nos. 197, 198, 199, 200, 201 and 202 from May 10, 2019 I am not recorded because I was not present in the House. I was presiding over a commissioning ceremony for my cousin, Joe Gutsoke, who was newly commissioned in the Army as a 2nd Lieutenant in the University of North Dakota's ROTC program.

Had I been present, I would have voted: NAY on Roll Call No. 197; NAY on Roll Call No. 198; NAY on Roll Call No. 199; YEA on Roll Call No. 200; YEA on Roll Call No. 201; and NAY on Roll Call No. 202.

RECOGNIZING BARBARA STANFIELD AS A HOSPITAL HERO OF 2019

HON. DENVER RIGGLEMAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 17, 2019

Mr. RIGGLEMAN. Madam Speaker, this week marks National Hospital Week. As such, I'd like to recognize the important work being done by one of my constituents, Ms. Barbara Stanfield. Barbara works at LifePoint Health's Sova Health in Danville, Virginia, and has been selected as a 2019 Hospital Hero by the Federation of American Hospitals, an award recognizing hospital employee for their dedicated work inside and outside the four walls of their hospital.

Barbara Stanfield has been a fixture at Sova Health for over 40 years and is best known for small acts of kindness that have a significant impact on those around her. Barbara works to comfort those receiving a difficult diagnosis, as she battled both multiple sclerosis and cancer. She further channels her experience with illness through her service on the hospital's cancer committee, which focuses on improving care, resources, and education for cancer patients in the community.

Barbara's commitment to those in need doesn't stop when she leaves the hospital though; she also supports the Relay for Life, United Way, and the Boys & Girls Club.

Madam Speaker, I hope you'll join me in congratulating Barbara Stanfield for her recognition as a Hospital Hero of 2019.

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

The Senate was not in session and stands adjourned until 3 p.m., on Monday, May 20, 2019.

Committee Meetings

No committee meetings were held.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 18 public bills, H.R. 2819–2836; and 1 resolution, H. Res. 388 were introduced. **Pages H3961–62**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H3963–64**

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

H.R. 2333, to direct the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct an assessment of the responsibilities, workload, and vacancy rates of Department of Veterans Affairs suicide prevention coordinators, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 116–70);

H.R. 2359, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to submit to Congress a report on the Department of Veterans Affairs advancing of whole health transformation, with an amendment (H. Rept. 116–71); and

H.R. 2372, to direct the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct an assessment of all memoranda of understanding and memoranda of agreement between Under Secretary of Health and non-Department of Veterans Affairs entities relating to suicide prevention and mental health services, with an amendment (H. Rept. 116–72). **Page H3961**

Journal: The House agreed to the Speaker's approval of the Journal by a yea-and-nay vote of 215 yeas to 191 nays with one answering "present", Roll No. 215. **Pages H3929, H3950**

Equality Act: The House passed H.R. 5, to prohibit discrimination on the basis of sex, gender identity, and sexual orientation, by a recorded vote of 236 ayes to 173 noes, Roll No. 217.

Pages H3931–50, H3950–53

Rejected the Steube motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on the Judiciary with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with an amendment, by a recorded vote of 181 ayes to 228 noes, Roll No. 216. **Pages H3950–52**

Pursuant to the Rule, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted. **Page H3931**

Meeting Hour: Agreed by unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12 noon on Monday, May 20th for Morning Hour debate. **Page H3953**

House Democracy Partnership—Appointment: The Chair announced the removal of Representative Plaskett and the Speaker's appointment of the following Member to the House Democracy Partnership to fill the vacancy: Representative Davis (CA). **Page H3961**

Quorum Calls—Votes: One yea-and-nay vote and two recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H3950, H3952 and H3952–53. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 9 a.m. and adjourned at 1:46 p.m.

Committee Meetings

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies held a markup on the Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill, FY 2020. The Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies

Appropriations Bill, FY 2020 was forwarded to the full Committee, without amendment.

MEMBERS' DAY HEARING: HOUSE COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Members' Day Hearing: House Committee on Science, Space, and Technology''. Testimony was heard from Representatives Norman, Babin, Tipton, and Sherman.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR MONDAY, MAY 20, 2019

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Readiness and Management Support, closed business meeting to markup those provisions which fall under the subcommittee's jurisdiction of the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2020, 4 p.m., SR–232A.

Subcommittee on Airland, closed business meeting to markup those provisions which fall under the subcommittee's jurisdiction of the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2020, 5 p.m., SR–232A.

Subcommittee on Strategic Forces, closed business meeting to markup those provisions which fall under the subcommittee's jurisdiction of the proposed National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2020, 5:30 p.m., SR–232A.

Committee on Foreign Relations: to receive a closed briefing on the prospects for Afghan peace, 5 p.m., SVC–217.

House

Committee on Rules, Full Committee, hearing on H.R. 1500, the ''Consumers First Act''; and H.R. 1994, the ''Setting Every Community Up for Retirement Enhancement Act of 2019'', 5 p.m., H–313 Capitol.

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, Full Committee, business meeting to consider public release of Michael Cohen interview transcripts (February 28 and March 6, 2019) and certain exhibits, 5:30 p.m., HVC–304. This meeting is closed.

Next Meeting of the **SENATE**

3 p.m., Monday, May 20

Senate Chamber

Program for Monday: Senate will be in a period of morning business. At 5:30 p.m., Senate will vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the nomination of Daniel P. Collins, of California, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit.

Next Meeting of the **HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

12 noon, Monday, May 20

House Chamber

Program for Monday: To be announced.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Congressional Record The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087–390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Publishing Office, at *www.govinfo.gov*, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Publishing Office. Phone 202–512–1800, or 866–512–1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, *contactcenter@gpo.gov*. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197–9000, or phone orders to 866–512–1800 (toll-free), 202–512–1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202–512–2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.
POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Publishing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.