



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 166

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 17, 2020

No. 161

House of Representatives

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 17, 2020

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CICILLINE).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
September 17, 2020.

I hereby appoint the Honorable DAVID N. CICILLINE to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Assistant Parliamentarian, Kyle T. Jones, offered the following prayer:
O Father of mercies and God of all comfort, our only help in time of need; we humbly beseech Thee to behold, visit, and relieve all Thy sick servants for whom our prayers are desired.

Look upon us all with the eyes of Thy mercy; comfort us with a sense of Thy goodness; preserve us from the temptations of the enemy; and give us patience under our affliction.

In Thy good time, restore us to health and enable us to lead the residue of our lives in Thy fear and to Thy glory, and grant that finally we may dwell with Thee in life everlasting.
Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 4(a) of House Resolution 967, the Journal of the last day's proceedings is approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NOR-

MAN) will lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. NORMAN 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.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO PRODUCE A DUPLICATE EN- GROSSMENT OF H.R. 1812

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be authorized to produce a duplicate engrossment of H.R. 1812.

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

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

QUINTIN WASHINGTON

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

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, good local journalism builds the foundation of a strong community. In the Lowcountry, we are blessed with some fantastic journalists, and I would like to highlight one of them today: Quintin Washington.

Through his independent web series, called Quintin's Close Ups, Quintin has kept his finger on the pulse of our community by doing literally thousands of interviews with the Lowcountry's most influential people. From Presidential candidates to Members of Congress to business officials, you would be hard

pressed to find an elected official in South Carolina who has not sat down with Quintin on camera.

Mr. Speaker, Quintin doesn't do this for money or notoriety, but a genuine love for our community and a desire to make sure that everyone is informed. His interviews are invaluable to the Lowcountry, and we are incredibly grateful for his service.

I know that I speak for everyone in the Lowcountry when I wish Quintin Washington many more years of first-class journalism.

HONORING THE LIFE OF MARK SERTICH

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

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Mark Sertich.

A hockey legend and leader in the Duluth community, Mark passed away last month at 99 years old.

Upon graduation from Duluth's Denfeld High School in 1939, Mark served his country in World War II as a radio operator under General Patton. When he returned home from the war, Mark dedicated his time and efforts into growing the game of hockey in the Duluth community because he knew the true power of hockey was its ability to bring people together.

Mark helped build hockey rinks, coached youth teams, and served as the head of the Duluth Amateur Hockey Association—all helping to ensure his passion would pass down to the next generation.

Mark's love for the game of hockey lasted his entire life. In fact, he holds the Guinness World Record as the oldest hockey player, and he continued to play with my former colleagues in the Duluth Fire Department for over 30 years. I had the great honor of playing

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

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



Printed on recycled paper.

H4493

with Mark during some of those games, and I am thankful to everyone at the Fire Department who made those games possible.

Mr. Speaker, I know that Mark Sertich is already missed by his family, friends, and all of the Duluth community, but I hope they are comforted in knowing that his life as a hockey legend, community leader, World War II veteran and a member of the greatest generation will be long remembered and celebrated.

CALIFORNIA WILDFIRES

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

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, it is wonderful to see the gentleman in the Chair.

Mr. Speaker and colleagues, a month ago yesterday, a siege of lightning strikes ignited the CZU Lightning Complex fire in my congressional district, and it is now the 10th most destructive wildfire in California's history.

Over the past month, the fire has destroyed nearly a thousand homes in my district and forced 77,000 of my constituents to evacuate. Thanks to the extraordinary—and I mean, extraordinary work—of thousands of first responders, the fire is now over 90 percent contained.

As we work toward recovery, much of the Bay Area and the entire western United States is still breathing the toxic smoke from these fires, which can have lasting effects and worsen chronic heart and lung diseases and have a terrible impact on children whose lungs are still developing.

Congress should immediately pass my legislation, the Smoke Planning and Research Act to help local governments address this public health crisis.

I am also calling on Congress to pass the WIRED Act to allow States to require wireless companies to deploy infrastructure that is resilient enough to support cell phone networks during disasters.

NATIONAL POW/MIA RECOGNITION 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. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize tomorrow, September 18, as National POW/MIA Recognition Day.

This important day of respect, reflection, and recognition was established through a 1979 proclamation by President Jimmy Carter. To date, more than 83,000 Americans are still missing from World War II, the Korean war, the Vietnam war, and more.

The brave Americans who rose to the occasion to protect and defend our country are the bravest among us.

Many return home. Far too many do not. We owe it to those individuals and to the families of those individuals to continue the search. The pain that these families endure due to uncertainty is unfathomable.

To ensure that these men and women are never forgotten, a flag, that I am sure all of us recognize, was designed in consultation with Evelyn Grubb, wife of an Air Force POW, and Mary Helen Hoff, wife of a Navy man deemed missing in action.

Today, that flag is displayed in the U.S. Capitol rotunda, serving as a reminder that we must continue our work on behalf of military families and continue the search for our POW/MIA servicemembers.

HEROES ACT FOR THE PEOPLE

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

Mr. RUIZ. Mr. Speaker, nearly 200,000 Americans have tragically died from COVID-19 in the United States. In Riverside County, California, 1,136 have died and 56,201 people have been infected.

We have record-breaking unemployment in our Nation, with 13.7 percent unemployment in Riverside County.

They are our family, our neighbors, our friends. My constituents are struggling, and they urgently need relief. The Senate must get their act together. Their delay in stalling is a shame, and to make matters worse, their skinny-aid excuse of a proposal is much worse than a day late and a dollar short.

In fact, it has been 125 days since the House passed the HEROES Act. They must meet the HEROES Act at least halfway to provide another round of stimulus checks, extend unemployment benefits, small business support, and money for local and State governments to pay for essential services, like for police, firefighters, and teachers.

The Senate must act. The Senate must step up and bring this legislation for a vote. Meet us halfway to slow the spread and save lives as quickly and safely as possible. We need the HEROES Act for the people.

ABRAHAM ACCORDS

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, for our friends and allies in Israel, the Abraham Accords are the first agreement with a neighboring Arab country since 1994. Peace agreements between Israel, Bahrain, and the United Arab Emirates bring a significant shift in the balance of power in the Middle East, and strengthens the American position against Iran, which is a leading sponsor of terror in the world.

Thanks to President Trump's bold vision for American foreign policy, we have rebuilt trust with our regional partners and show a united front against the oppressive regime in Tehran.

After decades of division in the Middle East, the Abraham Accords will lay the foundation for peace and prosperity in the region for decades to come. Normalized relations across the region will accelerate growth by expanding diplomatic, economic, and financial ties.

Mr. Speaker, there is much to be optimistic about, these recent historic Abraham Accords will bring a new wave of peace and prosperity in the Middle East.

HEROES ACT AND THE PEOPLE

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, more than 4 months ago, the House passed the HEROES Act, legislation that protects our HEROES on the front line of this pandemic, our police officers, firefighters, healthcare workers, sanitation workers, it provides stimulus payments for up to \$6,000 per family, extends unemployment benefits of \$600 per week through January, and gets hazard pay and much-needed resources to frontline workers.

This bill has sat on my MITCH MCCONNELL's desk since then.

In the meantime, tens of millions of Americans are out of work with unemployment levels four times higher than they were before this pandemic. More than a million layoffs and State and local budget cuts that are crippling services for those who need them the most. A total of 6.3 million Americans have been infected and nearly 200,000 have died.

Mr. Speaker, instead of voting on the HEROES Act, the Senate Republicans put forward their own bill that didn't come close to addressing the problems we face: The economic catastrophe and the public health crisis.

The American people deserve better. They need help. They deserve a Senate and Republicans in the Senate that work for them, and a President who tells them the truth.

Rest assured, Democrats are going to continue fighting for all those that our Republican colleagues in the Senate and that President Trump have left behind.

WE THE PEOPLE

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

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Speaker, today is a special day in which we pause to cherish the bedrock of our union that is the Constitution.

The great experiment that is this Nation rests upon the spirit that Madison enshrined in this document. It is the

unwavering commitment to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, the American ethos that sustains us to this day.

The essence of our democratic republic lies in the words, “We the People.” This creed is the glue that holds our United States together, and it ought to be revered. When held close, our Nation will continue to prosper through generations to come. As Henry Clay once said, “The Constitution of the United States was made not merely for the generation that then existed, but for posterity-unlimited, undefined, endless, perpetual posterity.”

Unique to the world is our tireless belief in a better tomorrow. If we are to sustain this hope, we must maintain an enduring commitment to the ideals of the Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage every American, young and old alike, to study the framework and celebrate the greatest Nation that this world has ever known. Let this day serve as a reminder of everything that was and everything that can be so long as we remain united under the articles of the Constitution.

□ 0915

CONDEMNING ANTI-ASIAN SENTIMENT

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

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 908, condemning all forms of anti-Asian sentiment as related to COVID.

I cast my “yes” vote today in memory of Vincent Chin. The anti-Asian racism and hate that led to his murder in Highland Park, Michigan, in my district, is alive today, and it is what led to the June 9 horrific attack in 1982.

I am proud to stand with my sister in service, the first Asian-American woman in the Michigan Legislature, State Senator Stephanie Chang, to say that the disgusting wave of hate against our Asian-American friends and neighbors we are witnessing in our country will not stand.

In this moment, I think of one of our Nation’s greatest heroes, Detroitier Grace Lee Boggs. While she would be proud of our vote here today, she would remind us that our work is not done.

We must commit, as she did for over 100 years, to the revolutionary struggle to liberate our world from hate, embrace all humankind with love, and grow our own souls in the process.

I thank so much Congresswoman MENG for her leadership, and I urge my colleagues to please vote “yes.”

SUPPORTING HYPERBARIC OXYGEN THERAPY FOR VETERANS

(Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring importance to a treatment issue that faces our Nation’s veterans suffering from traumatic brain injury, TBI, and post-traumatic stress disorder, PTSD.

In line with National Suicide Prevention Month, I am introducing the Veterans National Traumatic Brain Injury Treatment Act today. This bill will help so many of our veterans who are suffering from TBI and PTSD by creating a pilot program, increasing their access to hyperbaric oxygen therapy, HBOT. There are presently many treatments for PTSD and TBI, but they do not work for everyone.

As a physician for over 30 years, I have long been a strong advocate for HBOT, since I was in the North Carolina legislature. This type of treatment has restored the lives of so many of our veterans when all else failed. But the Department of Veterans Affairs has refused to use this treatment despite many requests by Members of Congress.

This is a bipartisan issue. It is time for Congress to authorize this treatment option by the Department of Veterans Affairs. Charitable organizations—donations, not taxpayer funds—will pay for this program. My pilot program should show how efficacious this treatment truly is.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation, as we owe our veterans and their families this treatment option for those who have lost all hope to help their lives return to some sense of normalcy.

CONDEMNING ALL FORMS OF ANTI-ASIAN SENTIMENT AS RELATED TO COVID-19

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1107, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 908) condemning all forms of anti-Asian sentiment as related to COVID-19, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. TLAIB). Pursuant to House Resolution 1107, the resolution is considered read.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 908

Whereas 23,000,000 Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders account for 7 percent of the Nation’s population in the United States;

Whereas over 2,000,000 Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders are working on the frontlines of this COVID-19 pandemic in health care, law enforcement, first responders, transportation, supermarkets, and other service industries;

Whereas the use of anti-Asian terminology and rhetoric related to COVID-19, such as the “Chinese Virus”, “Wuhan Virus”, and “Kung-flu” have perpetuated anti-Asian stigma;

Whereas since January 2020, there has been a dramatic increase in reports of hate crimes and incidents against those of Asian descent;

Whereas according to a recent study, there were over 400 cases related to COVID-19 anti-Asian discrimination between February 9, 2020, and March 7, 2020;

Whereas the increased use of anti-Asian rhetoric has resulted in Asian Americans being harassed, assaulted, and scapegoated for the COVID-19 pandemic;

Whereas in March 2020, anti-Asian violence includes: a woman wearing a mask was kicked and punched at a New York City subway station; two children and two adults were stabbed at a wholesale grocery in Midland, Texas; a couple was assaulted and robbed by a group of attackers in Philadelphia; and a 16-year-old boy was sent to the hospital after being attacked by bullies in Los Angeles, California;

Whereas the increased use of anti-Asian rhetoric has also resulted in Asian-American businesses being targeted for vandalism;

Whereas there are approximately 2 million Asian American-owned businesses that generate over \$700 billion in annual revenue and employ nearly 4.5 million workers;

Whereas the World Health Organization (WHO) and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) recognize that naming COVID-19 by its geographic location or linking it to a specific ethnicity perpetuates stigma;

Whereas in 2015, the WHO issued guidance calling on media outlets, scientists, and national authorities to avoid naming infectious diseases for locations to avoid stigmatizing groups of people;

Whereas, on February 27, 2020, the Secretary of Health and Human Services stated “ethnicity is not what causes the novel coronavirus” and that it is inappropriate and inaccurate to call COVID-19 the “Chinese virus”;

Whereas, on February 28, 2020, Dr. Mitch Wolfe, the Chief Medical Officer of the CDC said, “Stigma is the enemy of public health”;

Whereas, on March 10, 2020, Dr. Robert Redfield, the Director of the CDC, testified that use of the term “Chinese coronavirus” is wrong and inappropriate; and

Whereas the Secretary General of the United Nations called for international solidarity and an end to any ill-founded discrimination of the outbreak’s victims: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) calls on all public officials to condemn and denounce any and all anti-Asian sentiment in any form;

(2) recognizes that the health and safety of all Americans, no matter their background, must be of utmost priority;

(3) condemns all manifestations of expressions of racism, xenophobia, discrimination, anti-Asian sentiment, scapegoating, and ethnic or religious intolerance;

(4) calls on Federal law enforcement officials, working with State and local officials—

(A) to expeditiously investigate and document all credible reports of hate crimes and incidents and threats against the Asian-American community in the United States;

(B) to collect data to document the rise of incidences of hate crimes due to COVID-19; and

(C) to hold the perpetrators of those crimes, incidents, or threats accountable and bring such perpetrators to justice; and

(5) recommits United States leadership in building more inclusive, diverse, and tolerant societies—

(A) to prioritize language access and inclusivity in communication practices; and

(B) to combat misinformation and discrimination that put Asian Americans at risk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The resolution shall be debatable for 1 hour, 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 Ohio (Mr. JORDAN) each will control 30 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 include extraneous material on H. Res. 908.

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 such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 908, a resolution condemning all forms of anti-Asian sentiment as related to COVID-19.

Among other things, the resolution, introduced by my colleague from New York, Representative GRACE MENG, calls upon all public officials to condemn and denounce anti-Asian sentiment, and it calls on Federal law enforcement officials to investigate and document all credible reports of hate crimes against Asian Americans, to collect data on the rise of hate crimes incidents due to COVID-19, and to hold perpetrators accountable.

The COVID-19 pandemic is an ongoing crisis for our country. Over 6.6 million Americans have been infected, and almost 200,000 have died from COVID-19. It has upended the lives of almost every American in some way, and it will continue to do so for some time as we brace for a potential second wave of infections.

On top of bearing the burdens that the pandemic has imposed on all Americans, Asian Americans have been forced to carry the added anxiety of confronting racial prejudice, including racially motivated harassment and violence stemming from the stigma that has unfairly associated them with COVID-19 because of the virus' origin in China, a stigma that has been reinforced by rhetoric suggesting such a link.

According to the Asian Pacific Policy and Planning Council, since March 19, there have been almost 2,600 cases of anti-Asian discrimination related to COVID-19.

According to the resolution, at the pandemic's earliest stage in this country, between February 9 and March 7, there were over 400 such incidents. These include the stabbings of an Asian-American father and two young children, ages 2 and 6, in Texas.

Public health entities, including the World Health Organization and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, have recognized that labeling a virus by geographic or ethnic terms unfairly stigmatizes certain communities and ultimately harms public

health. For this reason, Secretary of Health and Human Services Alex Azar rightly condemned the use of the phrase "Chinese virus" in testimony before the Ways and Means Committee, stating that: "Ethnicity it is not what causes the novel coronavirus."

It is incumbent on all public figures, including elected officials like us, to publicly condemn bigotry and the stigmatization of racial or ethnic groups unfairly targeted for blame. We must speak out clearly against such attitudes and acts of hate whenever they occur, but particularly in the face of public panic or fear during a national emergency, when society can be especially vulnerable to racist appeals and prejudices.

While many public figures have admirably sought to end COVID-19-related animosity, some, unfortunately, appear not to share the same sense of moral duty. Rather than using their bully pulpits to confront prejudice and racial hatred, they have instead chosen repeatedly to use derogatory and prejudicial phrases and remarks, reinforcing the exclusion and stigmatization of Asian Americans in the face of a national crisis, a tactic that sadly has a long and ugly history in our country.

Left unchecked, this type of rhetoric has, in the past, led to grave injustices like the Chinese Exclusion Act and the internment of Japanese Americans during World War II.

In the year 2020, condemning bigotry and racial scapegoating should not be hard for any Member of this House to do. It is long past time to leave the days of yellow peril hysteria and unjustified blame of the other behind.

The House can take an important step in that direction by passing H. Res. 908 unanimously. I urge strong support for this resolution, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, we oppose this legislation. Everyone knows racism is wrong, but that is not what this legislation is about.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS).

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, let's be clear. There is no denying where the virus originated. It was China.

There is no denying the Chinese Communist Party has done everything in its power to cover up their role in the ongoing pandemic, intentionally misleading the global community and forcing their friends in the World Health Organization to do their bidding.

That being said, how is that Democrats are still refusing to acknowledge China's role in the coronavirus pandemic? Just recently, a Chinese virologist acknowledged that the coronavirus was released from a Chinese lab in Wuhan. Are we just to pretend that didn't exist or is not even a possibility?

It seems like the route the Democrats would like us to take is to pretend that the Communists in China absolutely played no role in the global

pandemic and blame it all on the President.

To be clear, Madam Speaker, all forms of racism and discrimination are abhorrent, including anti-Asian sentiment. If that is what we were talking about today, that would be even better. But this is not what we are talking about today.

The underlying tone, even from the chairman, is discussing how we deal with this in words. I have stood on this floor several times over the past year-and-a-half in denouncing all forms of hatred on both sides.

But let's be honest. That is not what this bill is really about. This bill is exactly what this entire Congress has been about the entire time: Democrats ignoring the real issues plaguing Americans, just for the opportunity to criticize President Trump.

Despite their overwhelming failure to undermine the Trump administration through the Russian collusion hoax and the sham impeachment, the Democratic playbook has not changed at all.

Now, a little over 6 weeks from the election, Democrats are leaning on the global crisis to continue their admonitions, all at the expense of American families and businesses desperate for relief.

Democrats have taken no issue in ignoring the coronavirus' effects on the ground in favor of criticizing the President, and no criticism is more dynamic than their collective offense at President Trump calling the virus the "China virus" or the "Wuhan virus."

Democrats would love for the American people to forget the work that the administration has done to tackle the virus, including shutting down travel for China in the early days of the virus. Instead of applauding the move, Democrats and Joe Biden accused the Trump administration and President Trump of fanning the flames of hate, fear, and xenophobia, when his actual actions kept others from getting it and kept it from spreading because it was coming from China.

For the last 3 years, Democrats have repeatedly claimed that Russia must have something on Donald Trump. The real question is, frankly, during a presidential election, what does the Chinese Communist Party have on Joe Biden?

Democrats would also love for the American people to forget that many viruses are named for where they originated. Take the Spanish flu, the Middle East Respiratory Syndrome, Ebola, and German measles. Because the Democrats seem to be so bankrupt on this floor of bringing bills and real solutions forward, maybe the next 2 weeks we are up here, we are going to have one on the German measles and the Middle East Respiratory Syndrome.

That is all we are doing, wasting the people's time with this right here. If you want to work on politics, go outside the Capitol, not here on the floor of this House.

President Trump and Republicans have made it clear where the blame of this virus begins. It begins and ends with the Chinese Communist Party and their refusal to acknowledge the problem they had and let it go into all the world. Refusing to acknowledge that fact is wrong, and failing to address it in the House, in favor of political messaging bills like this, is nothing more than political attempts to take down this President.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

Mr. CICILLINE. Madam Speaker, last March, as the COVID-19 pandemic first began to affect our day-to-day lives, the FBI warned that we could soon see a rise in hate crimes committed against Asian Americans.

In this moment, President Trump could have tried to bring Americans together. That is not the path he chose.

Instead, the President has poured gasoline on the fire, using terms like “kung flu” and “China virus.” The White House has stoked racial tensions and fed into our country’s worst xenophobic impulses.

From March until June of this year, our country saw more than 2,100 reported hate crimes targeting Asian Americans. More than 3 in 10 Asian Americans now say that they have been the subject of slurs or racist jokes since the start of this pandemic.

These slurs and jokes aren’t just words. They are actions designed to make Asian Americans feel less than equal, and they have no place in this country. But that is the reality of life in Donald Trump’s America.

This administration has tried to turn back the clock on racial equality. This administration has demeaned, belittled, and ostracized nearly every minority community.

Today, the House is saying no more. We will not stand by as this administration attacks innocent men, women, and children of Asian descent.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this excellent resolution.

□ 0930

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. POSEY).

Mr. POSEY. Madam Speaker, I was hopeful that this resolution would lead us to common ground. None of us here believes in discriminating against our fellow Asian-American neighbors.

On March 23, President Trump said the Asian-American community ought to be “totally protected” in light of the xenophobic attacks during the coronavirus pandemic. “It is very important that we totally protect our Asian-American community in the United States and all around the world,” President Trump tweeted.

“They’re amazing people, and the spreading of the virus is not their fault in any way, shape, or form,” he said. “They’re working closely with us to get rid of it,” the President added. “We will prevail together.”

I have restauranteurs in my district who suffered from bullies because of their heritage, so I asked my staff to prepare a resolution to echo the President’s sentiments. My staff reported to me that such a resolution already existed, H. Res. 908, ostensibly to protect Asian Americans.

On April 7, I signed onto what I considered to be a good faith effort to protect Asian Americans. I am more than saddened to see that this resolution and today’s debate is being used for nothing more than to malign and vilify the President of the United States, just as the President and congressional Republicans have been called domestic enemies in the last couple of days. I would hope for more, but, sadly, this body has chosen to take the low road.

This debate has devolved into finger-pointing, name-calling, and scoring political points. Rather than reaching a high watermark for bringing us all together, it has further ripped apart the fabric of America. I am deeply disappointed and will not be a party to today’s partisan exercise that is more about scoring political points than rebuilding America.

We should be working together to help all Americans recover, to investigate COVID-19, which has resulted in hundreds of thousands of deaths around the world, trillions lost and trillions more spent responding to COVID. Lives and dreams have been shattered.

We have a duty to all Americans to find a cure, to get to the bottom of just how this pandemic started, and to do what we can to prevent it from happening ever again in the future.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY).

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Madam Speaker, today I rise in support of H. Res. 908, condemning all forms of anti-Asian sentiment related to COVID-19.

Since this pandemic began, there have been thousands and thousands of reports of discrimination and xenophobic attacks against Asian Americans in the United States, including in my district, which has one of the highest concentrations of Asian Americans in the country.

As an Asian American myself, this is deeply personal and offensive to me. When people, including those in the White House, refer to COVID-19 as the Chinese virus or the kung-flu, they encourage bigotry or discrimination against Asian Americans.

To put it simply, promoting anti-Asian-American sentiment or anti-Asian sentiment as related to COVID-19 is un-American, which is why I am proud to cosponsor this resolution and encourage my colleagues to vote “yes.”

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

Madam Speaker, again, we all know racism is wrong, but that is not what this is about. This is just another effort of the Democrats to attack the President.

The third whereas in the resolution, the gentlemen just spoke about this. The third whereas in the resolution says you perpetuate anti-Asian bias if you use the terms “Chinese virus” or “Wuhan virus.” Well, someone should have told the media this.

CNN called it the Wuhan virus. MSNBC called it the Chinese coronavirus. ABC and CBS called it China’s coronavirus. CNBC called it the China coronavirus. So someone should have told the media that you couldn’t use these terms.

Frankly, someone should have told the Democrats a few months ago that a few months later the mob, the cancel culture, would say this is a term you can’t use, because the Democrats used it on their committee notice.

In the January 29, 2020, committee notice, House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Asia, the Pacific, and Nonproliferation, Congressman BARRETT, the chairman, says in the subject line of the hearing for the following week: “Subject: The Wuhan coronavirus.”

Someone should have told the Democrats you can’t use that term, but in the new woke world you can’t state the truth.

And as Mr. COLLINS pointed out:

Did the virus start in China? Yes.

Did the virus start in Wuhan, China? Yes.

Did China lie to the United States about the severity and the origins of this virus? Yes.

Did China lie to the world about the virus? Yes, they did.

Did the World Health Organization lie to the United States? Yes, they did.

Did the World Health Organization lie to the rest of the world?

The answer to every single one of those questions is yes. But you can’t say that, not in this world, not in the politically correct cancel culture. You can’t state the truth.

You can’t state that the Chinese Government launched a disinformation campaign to cover up its role in exacerbating the spread of COVID-19.

You can’t say the coverup included punishing doctors, limiting the access of journalists, censoring the internet, spreading disinformation, and withholding information from the entire international community. You can’t say that.

You can’t say a Chinese Government official publicly and falsely claimed that the United States Army brought it to Wuhan, the Chinese Government failed to institute a full-scale public response, and underreporting of COVID-19 cases and deaths propelled the virus on the course that it has been on. You can’t say all that. You could a few months ago. You could have a few months ago, but you can’t today. That is the cancel culture world. That is how the mob operates today.

You used to be able to say, as Mr. COLLINS pointed out, the West Nile virus, the Zika virus, German measles, Spanish flu. Not today. Not today. They will attack you if you don’t say it

the way they want you to say it, and this is dangerous. You can't say China virus today, and tomorrow who knows what it will be.

But, like I said, a few months ago, even the Democrat committee chairman used the very term that is in their resolution they are saying you can't use today because somehow it is anti-Asian bias. I think it has more to do with the fact that we are 7 weeks before an election, and this is one more way to go after the President.

But we should all remember, this is dangerous when you start saying certain things can't be said. If you don't say it the way we, the politically correct, the cancel culture mob wants you to say it, you have to be quiet.

Silence is the biggest threat to the First Amendment, and that is what we are seeing. And they want to just say—this is broader, this is bigger.

I would say look at the sports world. Look at the sports world. Drew Brees says you should stand for the national anthem; he gets attacked.

Mike Gundy, football coach at Oklahoma State, goes fishing with his kids and wears what the mob says is the wrong T-shirt; he almost loses his job. He wore a T-shirt that had a conservative news outlet on the T-shirt. Oh, my goodness.

You can't coach football if you wear the wrong T-shirt with your kids, according to the mob. You can't say a term today that just a few months ago they used on their committee notice. You can't say it today because that is what the mob says.

James Harden says "Back the Blue" on a mask. He has to answer for that.

Last week, two high school football players—on 9/11—ran on the field with a Back the Blue flag and a flag supporting our firefighters, and they get suspended because today the mob says that is not okay.

We need to understand the cancel culture restricting, limiting, telling you what you can and can't say is so darn dangerous, and it will never stop, because the mob never—it never quits.

You don't believe me? Two weeks ago—2 weeks ago—the mayor of this city, our Nation's Capital, has a proposal to remove and relocate the Washington Monument and the Jefferson Memorial. This is how ridiculous—this is how ridiculous it gets.

And maybe I will just finish with this. Maybe the most ridiculous thing is the last clause, the last page of their resolution. The last page says: "recommits United States leadership in building more inclusive, diverse, and tolerant societies . . . to combat misinformation. . . ."

Now, think about this for a second. If you state the truth, the virus started in China, you are a bad guy. You are not allowed to state the truth. This resolution says that is misinformation.

The very misinformation that happened was China misinforming the world, lying to the world. You are not allowed to talk about that. You have

to do what—this resolution says you have to do it the politically correct, the woke way, the cancel culture way, and that is why this is so darn wrong, so darn wrong.

I hope we don't continue to travel down this road. This is scary where the left wants to take the country, so dangerous for the First Amendment and free speech rights.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. KIM).

Mr. KIM. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of this resolution and in strong opposition to the rise of hate crimes and acts of racism toward Americans of Asian descent.

We all know that these are divisive times. They are tough times. Hateful language, petty name-calling, and acts of violence are not the way for us to get through these tough times. This resolution allows Congress to come together to speak with one voice, that hate targeted at the Asian-American community has no place in this country and must be condemned.

I am especially proud to speak here today with so many of my AAPI colleagues. Many of us have been the victims of these hateful and harmful actions. We have seen firsthand the vitriol of racism. We have felt the sting of the distrustful look or a harsh word.

I hope you will join me today in acknowledging the impact of racism and forcefully renouncing it. I hope you will join me here today in calling on unity and calling out division. And I hope you will join me here today in passing a resolution that can remind us that even in the darkest times we are strongest when we reject hate and embrace America's diversity.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS), the chairman of the Freedom Caucus.

Mr. BIGGS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I join in condemning racial discrimination of all kinds. It should never be tolerated. I wish we had the perfect society and everybody recognized everybody in a colorblind way, but what this bill does today is it doesn't address that.

When I heard the chairman of the Judiciary Committee just refer to calling the virus that originated in China the Wuhan prefecture, when I heard him say that this is somehow equivalent to the Chinese Immigration Exclusion Act or somehow equivalent to the Japanese internment camp experience that we had where over 100,000 Japanese were removed from their homes and taken to camps, I said: This really is the woke culture on steroids. This has gone beyond.

If this would have been a condemnation of anti-Asian discrimination, I probably would have been right there signing this. I lived in northeast Asia for 2 years. I speak Japanese. I have

traveled extensively in Asia. This doesn't address that. What it does is says: You know what, we want to do something when we are about 6 weeks out from an election. That is what this resolution is about. You can't tell the truth here.

Let's just recite some of the things we know:

The West Nile virus, that is because that virus emerged from the West Nile district of Uganda, 1930.

The Saint Louis encephalitis virus broke out around St. Louis in 1933.

The Japanese encephalitis virus broke out in Japan in 1870.

□ 0945

Coxsackie, New York State; Marburg, Germany; Hendra, Australia, all have viruses named after them.

You will always have the ignorant who act out on racial animus. We condemn that. But let's tell the truth. The Middle East Respiratory Syndrome virus in 2012. We call that "MERS."

This week we learned from Chinese virologist Dr. Li-Meng Yan that not only did this virus originate in China, but it may have been manufactured and released intentionally by the Chinese Communist Party.

So when the media refers to this as the "Wuhan virus" or the "China virus," and other officials, including folks from this party over here, it is not because they have an existing racist sentiment, but it is rather to describe its origination as has been done historically.

This resolution today is even more than a measure to appease the woke and tolerant and politically correct leftists. It is an attack on President Trump and all who support President Trump.

It is a crying shame that you can't take the actual issue that you want to address and address it. You have to expand it that way for political purposes. I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and also for his tremendous leadership. And also, I acknowledge Representative MENG for spearheading this important resolution.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 908 to condemn all forms of anti-Asian hate speech related to COVID-19.

Now, this pandemic is leading to an alarming rate of hateful speech directed at people of Asian and Pacific Islander descent in the United States. And the truth is, as an African American, I know what hate and racism is and I know the violence that results.

And the facts are: Since March, there have been over 2,500 reported cases of anti-Asian discrimination related to COVID-19, including over 1,100 cases in my home State of California.

At the same time, by no accident or coincidence, the White House continues to refer to COVID-19 as the

“China virus” and “kung flu” trying to shift attention and blame away from this administration’s inadequate response and poor leadership. They would rather scapegoat Asian Americans, exacerbating anti-Asian hate and violence.

Congress needs to send a clear message that we will stand with our AAPI community, especially during these challenging times, to fight bigotry and racism within our country.

Hate speech does lead to violence and discrimination. That is the truth.

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

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO).

Mr. TAKANO. Madam Speaker, I rise today to condemn the xenophobic anti-Asian rhetoric that President Trump and his allies have been using to distract us from their woefully inadequate response to COVID-19.

By referring to COVID-19 almost exclusively as the “China virus,” the President is fueling racism and inspiring violent attacks on Asian Americans and Asian immigrants. Rather than condemning this divisive language and unifying our Nation in response to the pandemic, my Republican colleagues are blindly following suit.

This partisanship is so pervasive that Congresswoman MENG’s simple resolution condemning this anti-Asian sentiment could not be passed unanimously out of this Chamber. This is a disgrace. A disgrace.

The COVID-19 pandemic has become a defining moment in our Nation’s history. Instead of unifying to confront this disease head-on, Republicans have instead weaponized this to revive the racist blemishes of the past.

Madam Speaker, I urge passage of this resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. KELLY of Illinois). Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

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

Was it a disgrace a few months ago when the Democratic chairman called it the “Wuhan coronavirus,” or is it just a disgrace now when we are less than 7 weeks before an election and you guys want to continue to attack the President? Which is it? Because it can’t be a disgrace just now when you used the exact same language that the Democrat chairman, the Democrat staff used for their subcommittee hearing.

So you can get all fired up and start yelling at us, but the truth is you guys used it, the same terms you are now saying, oh, are so bad in this resolution.

The hypocrisy from the left and the mob of what you can say today and can’t say tomorrow is ridiculous, and the American people see it. They see it. They know this is complete BS. They

know it is completely about the election, which is 7 weeks away.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARRINGTON).

Mr. ARRINGTON. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman, my dear friend from Ohio, for yielding.

I am listening to my colleagues and the recent speaker. Where is that passion, where is that indignation over the violent mobs that are terrorizing our communities, that are assaulting our law enforcement officers?

People are being killed in cold blood in once great American cities, and not nigh a word is said in this great Chamber about what is happening to our fellow Americans whose rights are being trampled. Instead, they want to hyperventilate over this pettiness.

We know what it is about, and the American people know what it is about, Madam Speaker. They know good and well this is about scoring political points. They have seen it over and over, day in and day out for the last 2 years under the Pelosi leadership of this great representative body; obstruction, more political theater, and just dividing us.

This is dividing our country. This is opportunism like I have never seen before. You can’t refer to a virus by its place of origin? We have been doing that for time immemorial. And now we can’t call it the “Chinese virus,” somehow that is offensive?

This is about dividing our country. This is about stoking the flames of racial dissension. It is un-American. It is unacceptable for our leaders to do what is happening today. I trust the American people; they are watching this.

This is the stark contrast in leadership that we have been talking about. Do you want more of this, America?

Do you want more resolutions to condemn calling the virus the “Wuhan virus?” Or do you want to condemn what is happening in Portland, in Seattle, and the rise in crime and the mass exodus by our police officers, who feel that they have jeopardized their livelihoods and their lives? We have disrespected them. We have demonized them.

What are we doing in this Chamber? God save the Union. God have mercy that we can’t just come together, solve a few problems, I don’t know, like the unprecedented crisis that we are facing to get our fellow American citizens and families back on their feet. To hold China accountable for what they have done.

There are real problems to solve, and I want to work with my colleagues. And they know we condemn racism. They know we don’t stand for making light of something so serious. But they are seizing on this political opportunistic moment. It is the wrong time. They are on the wrong side of history here, Madam Speaker. And the ultimate judge of what happens today in this Chamber and what has happened over the last 2 years will be in the

hands of we the people. And that is my faith, that is my confidence.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. CASE).

Mr. CASE. Madam Speaker, and back to the subject of the resolution on the floor, which is discrimination against any and all Americans on the basis of their race.

As the proud Representative of the State and district with the highest percentage of Asian Americans in this country, I rise today in strong support of H. Res. 908 to condemn any and all forms of anti-Asian discrimination during and beyond this terrible pandemic.

Our country confronts not only the novel coronavirus but also a virus of racism and hate. We cannot allow the one to feed off the other.

On behalf of all Americans, we have a moral responsibility to call out and condemn this wave of racist hate speech, harassment, discrimination, and physical violence driven by fear, disinformation, and even purposeful exploitation.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this resolution without reservation and speak out against racism against any group in any form at any time.

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

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MALINOWSKI).

Mr. MALINOWSKI. Madam Speaker, after 9/11, President Bush never once called terrorism a Muslim virus or an Arab virus or a Saudi virus. He made clear that the enemy was not the place where the terrorists came from or the people who lived there, but terrorism itself. He did that because it was right and because he knew that equating the evil of al-Qaida with an entire faith or nationality or country was exactly what our enemies wanted.

So today, when prominent people in our country, whether they are Republicans or Democrats, or anybody in the media, encourage Americans to call COVID the “China virus,” language that seems to blame this pandemic on a country and a people, they are not only doing something wrong, something that has already encouraged violence and discrimination against Asian Americans, they are playing right into the hands of a Chinese Communist Party that wants Asian Americans to feel unwanted and unsafe in America.

Now, if you want to blame this on the Chinese Government, sign me up. If you want to blame them or anybody else for lying to the American people, sign me up. But if you are going to give this virus a nationality, you are doing something wrong. And if you don’t see the difference between those two things, then you don’t understand what is going on in this country in this moment of division, this moment of danger that we face.

Madam Speaker, I am proud to support this resolution condemning anti-

Asian rhetoric in any form. I ask my colleagues to vote for it, and I urge them to live up to it.

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

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. CISNEROS).

Mr. CISNEROS. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of this resolution condemning all forms of anti-Asian sentiment related to COVID-19.

The AAPI community in the 39th District has been an integral part of fighting the coronavirus. They are first responders, essential workers, educators, and small business owners.

Yet there have been too many stories in my district and across the country of racism, discrimination, and physical and verbal assault towards Asian Americans.

I had the opportunity to hear some of these stories during one of my town halls, including the emotional encounter of a constituent from Brea, California. This young woman was unable to pick up her mother's prescription drugs due to racist aggressive remarks she received that were directed towards her. She left, running away in tears.

This resolution will assure that cases like hers are justly investigated and receive the attention they deserve.

I thank my colleague Representative MENG for her leadership, and I urge my colleagues to vote in support of this resolution to ensure protection, safety, and respect for our AAPI community.

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

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN).

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding the time.

Madam Speaker, on this Constitution Day we will do well to heed the words of Dr. King when he reminded us that the ultimate measure of the person is not where the person stands in times of comfort and convenience, but where do you stand in times of challenge and controversy?

Where do you stand when racism and anti-Semitism and anti-Asian sentiments are emanating from the highest office in the land?

Where do you stand?

□ 1000

I stand with the business owner who is losing business, and some have gone out of business because of this kind of hateful violence emanating from words.

I stand with the mother who has to console her child who comes home from school and who has been bullied. I stand with the child who has been bullied who comes home crying.

I stand with the people of my congressional district and across this land who happen to be of Asian ancestry.

I stand against racism.

It is easy to say: "I am against racism. I condemn racism." But when will

you condemn the racist? When will you condemn the racist when it is emanating from the highest office in the land?

This is Constitution Day.

I close with these words from Emily Dickinson. The truest measure of the person, I have reminded you, but Dickinson reminded us that: "A word is dead when it is said, some say. I say it just begins to live that day."

These words live; they take on meanings; they impact people; and they cause harms.

It is time for us to take a stand.

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

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

Madam Speaker, the import of this resolution could not be more clear. Anti-Asian sentiment will not be tolerated. Anti-Semitism will not be tolerated. Discrimination against anyone will not be tolerated.

When language comes consistently from the White House, from other places that stoke anti-Asian sentiment, that stoke racism, this cannot be tolerated. And this House must declare that we will not tolerate it.

This House must be on record against the use of language designed to stoke racism, against the use of language designed to pick out a particular ethnic group—in this case Asians, but it is the same as if it picked out a different ethnic group.

No ethnic group should be the target of such obloquy, of such racism, of such opposition from the White House. None.

It is unconscionable that we have to stand here and oppose the White House stoking anti-Asian sentiment. It is unconscionable that the White House would do such a thing. But if it does such a thing, then it is incumbent on this House to denounce it.

It is incumbent on this House to make sure that the American people know that we do not stand with anyone, whether in the White House or anyplace else, who stokes deliberately anti-Asian sentiment.

We cannot abide, we must not abide, the use of public office, the use of public facilities, the use of the public microphone to stoke anti-Asian sentiment, no more than we would tolerate it if it were stoking anti-Black sentiment or anti-Semitic sentiment.

None of this is tolerable. We must not permit this.

So, I say again, it cannot be allowed that, on the floor of this House, we do not denounce the use of public resources, the use of the White House, the use of public resources to stoke anti-Asian sentiment.

Mr. JORDAN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. NADLER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio for a question.

Mr. JORDAN. Was The Washington Post on January 26, 2020, to use your words, stoking anti-Asian bias when

they used the word "Chinese coronavirus"? Was The New York Times on February 20, 2020, stoking anti-Asian bias when they used the term "Wuhan coronavirus" in their headline?

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, reclaiming my time.

They learned their lesson. They stopped using such terms. They learned their lesson.

They understood what this House should understand. They understood that the use of such terms stokes racism, stokes anti-Asian sentiment, and they stopped using the term because they learned the lesson.

All we are saying is the White House should learn the same lesson, and they should stop using the term. And for that matter, Members of this House should stop using the term because it deliberately stokes anti-Asian sentiment.

The Washington Post learned that lesson and ceased using such terms. The Washington Post learned the lesson.

We are not saying that everyone knew this initially, but it is clear. It is now clear.

The Washington Post learned its lesson and stopped using such terms. The New York Times learned its lesson when they realized that it was stoking anti-Asian sentiment and stopped using this term.

We are saying that the White House and Members of this House and anyone else should learn the same lesson and not stoke anti-Asian sentiment by continuing the use of terms that we know stoke anti-Asian sentiment.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. BERA).

Mr. BERA. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 908, led by my colleague Representative GRACE MENG.

I do feel compelled, though, to respond to my colleague on the other side of the aisle, Mr. JORDAN. I was that subcommittee chairman. We held the first coronavirus hearing in this new pandemic addressing the issues.

Yes, we did identify it by its geographic origin as the Wuhan coronavirus. We also learned that as soon as we started to see instances of racism, violence against Asian Americans, that was a mistake. We stopped using that term. That is what we do as adults.

We are not here to instigate racism. We are not here to instigate violence against any ethnic group.

What we are here to do is actually defeat this pandemic.

In that hearing, what we talked about is it is fine doing a travel ban from a country. That would buy us some time. But we also rightfully identified that that travel ban wasn't going to prevent the virus from coming to the United States. It wasn't going to protect us. We had to get ready.

We squandered that time.

Look, this is a virus. It doesn't understand a country of origin. It doesn't know whether you are a Democrat or Republican, what religion or God you worship. It is a virus.

It is shameful for Members of this body or anyone to continue to use language that potentially incites violence against any of our fellow citizens. That is what this resolution is about. Let's actually learn from that.

I don't call it by its geographic origin. It now has a name. At that time, it didn't have a name. It is called SARS-CoV2 or COVID-19.

We ought to call it by its name. We should not willfully or intentionally use language that potentially incites violence against any of our fellow citizens, that incites racism. We should be better than that.

Let's show the American public that we can actually learn, and let's lead by example. That is what we should be doing in the House of Representatives.

Again, we called it by its area of origin because the virus didn't have a name. We have learned from that. We don't do that. And we shouldn't intentionally use terminology that would incite violence against any ethnic group, religious group, or any of our fellow citizens.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

Madam Speaker, what we should also do is denounce violence, all the violence, we see in our urban areas.

The Democrats were given that opportunity just 2 months ago when the Attorney General of the United States asked them: Why won't you speak out against the violence in our cities? Why won't you speak out against what the mob is doing in our cities?

Guess what we got from them? We got silence.

Let's speak out against the violence we have seen for over 100 days in Portland and so many of our other great cities.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), the minority leader, the leader of our great Conference.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The gentleman makes a very good point. Are we here condemning two sheriffs from California getting shot while sitting in their car? No.

Are we here talking about the innocent lives that are being killed night after night in Chicago or other cities? No.

Are we here, in the last hours before this body rushes to the airport to leave, to debate the help that we need for COVID, for those who are unemployed, or the small businesses that are going to continue to lay off somebody or are wondering whether they can survive the next day, or for the schools wondering if they will have the resources they need, or the States? No, we are not doing that.

We are not doing any of that. But I will make this one promise to you: If

the majority was on the other side, we would have already done that.

Madam Speaker, Democrats are neglecting the real issues.

Month after month, they have refused to end our dependence on China or even acknowledge that the Chinese Communist Party is a national security threat.

I have read it in the paper. We have heard it out in the public domain that the Communist Chinese Party wants to influence the election even. They have picked a side.

Now, in January, Democrats were too busy impeaching the President to pay attention to what was happening in Wuhan.

There is a common denominator here. Let's just go through the calendar.

In January, they were too busy with impeaching.

In February, they backed out of what should have been a bipartisan China Task Force. They actually said yes. The Washington Post actually had the article written. The members were already chosen. But the hour came, and the Democrats thought that was wrong.

Then, let's move to May. Speaker PELOSI said focusing on China is a diversion. I look forward to hearing what the Speaker says about this resolution. Is that a diversion from solving the COVID relief that we need?

In June, Chairman SMITH of the Committee on Armed Services on this very floor, just over at that mic, said this about China: It is not actually their job to tell the American people about the coronavirus.

Seriously? Those were the words that were spoken by the chair of the Armed Services Committee.

In July, Chairman SCHIFF—remember who he is and what role he has. He is the chairman of the Committee on Intelligence. He said it was an escalation for the Trump administration to close down the Chinese consulate that was, according to the Secretary of State, the hub of spying and IP theft in Houston. He was the only one who thought that.

And now, today, while Democrats deny the real threat of Communist China, they are delaying a coronavirus relief package because they despise the President.

I heard a Member here, Madam Speaker, who said we are adults, so we think differently. You know what adults do? They give adult supervision, and they focus on things that are important.

We only have a few hours left before people leave. I know Madam Speaker told us before August that we will not leave unless we get a COVID relief package.

I am not sure if I should believe her then or believe her now, because I know people are going to leave in a few short hours.

I know, as the majority, you have the power to schedule what comes to the

floor. That was one of my jobs. So this is what they picked? This is what we are doing? Seriously?

My question to the Democrats is simple: Is debating a nonbinding resolution the best use of our hour? Apparently, you have made that decision. You thought long and hard long before we came to this moment in time. You spent hours on this.

I will promise you this: There is no kitchen in America that thinks this is the priority.

What makes today's resolution so harmful is it does not stop discrimination. It simply spreads disinformation.

At the heart of this resolution is an absurd notion that referring to the virus as the Wuhan virus or the China virus is the same as contributing to violence against Asian Americans, which I will tell you nobody on this side of the aisle supports.

In fact, we have heard time and again—I just heard from my colleague on the other side. The Democrat-led Foreign Affairs Committee held a hearing titled "The Wuhan Coronavirus" in February.

□ 1015

Should we put an ethics complaint? Are Democrats saying that their own committee members are encouraging discrimination against Asian Americans?

Likewise, CNN, The Washington Post, NPR, The Guardian, all other major media outlets were referring to COVID-19 as the Wuhan coronavirus long before most Americans knew what it was.

Now, let's put this in contrast, because you are wasting our time; you are spending hours on it. You think it is the most important thing, when someone is sitting there in the unemployment line or a small business is questioning whether they can stay open. So let's take this moment in time on this floor talking about it.

Republicans condemn crime and discrimination in all forms. Listen to what the President said in March: "spreading of the virus is not their fault in any way, shape, or form." But I guess you can't take his word for it, so let's waste another hour on this floor on a nonbinding resolution.

Madam Speaker, I wonder—because every Member who comes here works hard to get here, I wonder the number of times Members in a debate said they would take their time to have nonbinding resolutions on the floor. I wonder the number of promises they made. Because I listened, Madam Speaker, to the Speaker up there when I handed her the gavel on what they said they would focus on.

I have spent a lot of time trying to wonder what one problem this Democrat majority has solved. I have actually asked Democrats: Name me one that you solved.

I haven't read a tweet from probably the most prominent of the new party's chief of staff. They had the same question. They couldn't answer it.

The President's words express what every good and decent American has known from the beginning: Asian Americans are not responsible for COVID-19.

Let me be very clear. Let me state that again. The President's words express what every good and decent American has known from the beginning: Asian Americans are not responsible for COVID-19.

Now, let me tell you everything else every American understands. We have an economic problem. We have people unemployed. We have small businesses questioning whether they can stay open. We have schools that are wondering could they have the money to be able to open again.

But you chose an hour of this time on the last day before we leave to debate a nonbinding resolution. Congratulations. Well done. You fought hard for a majority, and this is what you decided.

Unfortunately, while Democrats waste an hour of the House's time on this ridiculous resolution, the opportunity costs of the inaction are rising. And do you know who is paying the price? The American people.

For months, every reasonable American has understood that America must end our dependency on China; we must move our supply chain out of China for critical needs like medicine.

Do you realize we don't make penicillin? We don't make vitamins here, personal protective equipment that we strive so hard to get, and technology.

The American people want safety and security. They want to return to the American way of life.

I am not sure what this nonbinding resolution does, but I know we have done a lot of them since you have taken the majority.

Unfortunately, the Chinese Communist Party is trying to hack our vaccine research at this very moment. That is why I introduced legislation earlier this summer to sanction these cybercriminals. My bill had real consequences.

And you know what is so unique? I introduced the bill because there were reports out there that Russia, China, Iran wanted to hack our universities, our businesses to get that vaccine, not to work with us, but to steal it.

Do you know what happens when they do that? It slows the process down.

Do you know what happens when it slows the process down? It takes longer before people have a safe vaccine that would cure this virus.

It is very interesting. That moment on the floor, the day after I introduced it, we actually—the FBI found two Chinese who were doing this, coming into our country, slowing the process down.

We had the opportunity to have a motion to recommit on this floor. Nobody in America thought that bill would be partisan. It would only sanction those people who were caught, about right and wrong, about the safety, the security, a safe and effective

vaccine being slowed down because of a foreign country coming in. So, as one, we had an opportunity to do something about it.

Do you know what happened? The Democrats voted against it and defeated it. Not only did they defeat it, let me tell you, again, what the chairman of the Armed Services Committee said about it. He stood up at that microphone. He literally said it is not actually their job to tell the American people about the virus, referring to China, while they are hacking our own companies working to provide a safe and effective vaccine.

You wouldn't spend 1 minute on that, but you are spending an hour on this. Sadly, this is not an isolated incident.

Madam Speaker, the majority won't even work with the Republicans to protect our vaccine research from hackers, and they will attack the very companies that are working around the clock to provide that safe and effective vaccine for the American people.

They won't work with Republicans to restore American manufacturing to rebuild the American medical supply right here, but they will call the House back into session to debate conspiracy theories about the post office.

And while we were here in that emergency meeting—and, Madam Speaker, I should probably talk about it, because there were a lot of Democrats who didn't come even though it was an emergency meeting called by the Speaker. I think it was one-third of all of them did not come.

But while we were here, that one moment, the one opportunity that the Republicans had, we offered a motion, a motion to recommit, to put up funding for COVID relief. Once again, the Democrats did the exact same thing.

Instead of stopping the hackers from China, what they said no to, instead of giving another COVID relief bill that opportunity—because we were in an emergency, it was the only time we were coming back, even though, Madam Speaker, the Speaker said we would not leave—they voted it down. They voted it down, the only window that we had.

They won't even work with Republicans on what was supposed to be a bipartisan China task force, but they wasted an hour on a nonbinding resolution.

Is this how you expect to manage the Chamber? Is this why you took the majority, to waste the American people's time?

Madam Speaker, it is time for us to stop acting like the House of resolutions and start acting like the House of Representatives.

Make no mistake: China aims to displace America as the world's economic superpower. If they succeed, we will have more than viruses to worry about.

The stakes are too high for petty partisanship. If we want safety, if we want independence, we know what we have to do. We have to rebuild our economy, bring back our supply chain, protect

our vaccine research and, yes, end our dependency on China.

Our President is doing that. House Republicans have made a commitment to America to do just that. We have done it time and again, bringing the idea to the floor. Unfortunately, the majority has thought otherwise.

Madam Speaker, I make this promise to you: If the sides change, if we have the opportunity and the privilege to determine what comes to this floor, we will not waste America's time in a time of crisis. We will not tell people they will not leave and then let them go. We will not have Members call it an emergency meeting and let them stay home.

We believe Congress is essential. We believe the American public expects that.

Madam Speaker, we have a COVID crisis. We have an economy crisis. We have a dependency on China that harms us when it comes to our health issues. We have hackers from foreign nations trying to slow a safe and effective vaccine. We have schoolkids that continue to learn from home, not in school. We have veterans who want to be able to pick their own doctors. We have an infrastructure that is crumbling, but a 5-year plan to make a difference. These are all the problems that, if the majority would switch, would be addressed.

But no, today, on our last day this week, we will once again have a nonbinding resolution.

I hope you fought hard for this majority. I hope you spent a lot of time and a lot of hours deciding what would come to the floor. But if this is what it is, you have fallen well short of what America expects of this Chamber.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

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

Ms. PELOSI. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for the recognition, but I also thank Mr. NADLER, as chairman of the Judiciary Committee, for bringing this important statement of our American values to the floor of the House. I thank him and our colleagues from the Senate, Senators KAMALA HARRIS, TAMMY DUCKWORTH, and MAZIE HIRONO, three Asian-American Members of the United States Senate who were so instrumental in advancing this important, as I said, statement of American values.

And yes, it is a good use of time for us in the House of Representatives to state our values, to remove all doubt that people in our country are respected, and that we are not using a pandemic to have people—I will go into that in a moment.

But let me just say this. Before the distinguished leader spoke, the gentleman on the other side said: Where are you when you are talking about violence, this or that?

We are there. We support peaceful demonstrations. We participate in them. They are part of the essence of our democracy. That does not include looting, starting fires, or rioting. They should be prosecuted. That is lawlessness. I am very proud that Joe Biden has presented the clarity of that, making a distinction that I don't think our colleagues quite understand but the American people do.

In a poll released today, it said that the American people support congressional Democrats over President Trump in terms of dealing with the issue of crime in our country, for all of their misrepresentation.

It is interesting to hear the revisionist history that the distinguished leader put on the floor of this House when he asked us what have we done. It is a very long list, and I will go into some of it.

But I want to say to him, when you had the majority and the Presidency, the one thing that you did was pass a tax bill that put \$2 trillion of debt onto our children and giving 83 percent of the benefits to the top 1 percent in our country. And yet you resent the fact that we want to invest more money in making it safe for our children to go back to school; more money into crushing the virus, which is what we do in the HEROES Act; and that we want to help our heroes. That is why it is called that.

Our State and local employees, our State and local governments that provide services to the American people, our healthcare workers, our first responders, our police and fire, our transportation, our sanitation workers, our food providers, all of those people working make life go on for us; without them, we couldn't. And our teachers, our teachers, our teachers, the custodians of our children for a good part of their day and of their lives.

□ 1030

Yet the disdain that the Republicans have for our heroes is clear because that is the obstacle to our bringing the coronavirus legislation to the floor that is so needed. I hope that we can reach agreement on that.

So when they talk about accomplishment, you had a President and you had two Houses of government. What did you do but take care of the top 1 percent to the tune of 83 percent of the bill that would put \$2 trillion of debt to our children and their future?

In terms of China, I have taken second place to no one in this body in my opposition to China for three decades. Sometimes I take pride in being called the most disliked American in China for my opposition to China; their trade policies which have been a rip-off of the American worker, and have fought them for decades, whether it is stealing our intellectual property, barriers to our products going into China and other violations; trying to stop their proliferation of weapons technologies of mass destruction to rogue countries,

and delivery systems to make delivery possible of those weapons; to their human rights policies in Tibet and Hong Kong and now with the Uighurs and, again, all over China. So I have been on it every single day for over 30 years.

I need no pontificating from the leader on the other side who seems to have newly arrived at this issue in order to deflect attention from the fact that the Russians are trying to, once again, infiltrate and jeopardize the security of our elections. Whoever interferes with our elections must be dealt with, whatever country it is; but all of a sudden it is all about China and not about Russia. I think the American people should decide who the next President of the United States is, not Vladimir Putin.

So we come here today, and I say this about the legislation: We have had four bills that have been overwhelmingly bipartisan on COVID. Our first one on March 4 was testing, testing, testing; and still we do not have a commitment from this administration that we can crush the virus by testing, tracing, treatment, mask wearing, sanitation, ventilation, and separation—still. The solution is as plain as the nose on your face, which should be covered with a mask.

Yet the President said he didn't want to cause panic, but he doesn't mind causing panic that will result in some terrible things happening to the Asian-American community in our country.

He has brought about great angst as he shines a bright light on the injustices experienced by so many, including the surge of violence and discrimination being experienced by the Asian American/Pacific Islander community.

So I thank the Asian Pacific American Caucus Chair, JUDY CHU; the Congressional Hispanic Caucus Chair, JOAQUIN CASTRO; and the Congressional Black Caucus Chair, KAREN BASS, for their leadership on this important resolution and this very necessary use of our time to condemn and combat anti-Asian sentiment. GRACE MENG has led this drumbeat for justice for a generation. Together with the other leaders she has brought this legislation to the floor, and I salute her.

As the resolution states—and we have all seen—at the same time that the coronavirus pandemic has broken out, so too has a disturbing epidemic of hate and discrimination against the AAPI community erupted. You may not have noticed it. You may have tried to ignore it, but it, in fact, exists.

According to the Stop AAPI Hate Reporting Center, more than 2,500 recorded incidents of anti-Asian hate have been perpetrated against the AAPI community since March. These include both physical and verbal attacks, commuters spat on, racial slurs lobbed at passersby, community members shunned, store owners having businesses vandalized, and even little children being pushed and shoved, and families insulted in places of business. Many of these incidents represent civil

rights violations, and that is a value for us to protect.

It is particularly unconscionable that more than 2 million members of the AAPI community are fighting on the front lines against the COVID-19 virus, yet instead of being celebrated as heroes, they are fighting violence and bigotry.

In February, during one of my visits to San Francisco's Chinatown—which I am overwhelmingly proud to represent—I was heartbroken to witness the devastating impact that fear, stigma, and misinformation are continuing to have on its families and businesses.

Nearly half of recorded incidents of anti-Asian hate, according to the Stop AAPI Hate Reporting Center, have occurred in California.

For many of the bay area who remember the systemic injustices and discrimination perpetrated against generations of Asian Americans, this resurgence is a traumatic reminder of the lingering specter of xenophobia.

Sadly, this bigotry is being fueled by some in Washington, D.C.—I thought there would be almost unanimous consent to condemn violence against Asian Americans—even from the White House itself, which uses dangerous, false, and offensive terms to describe the coronavirus.

The World Health Organization and the CDC, the Centers for Disease Control, have explicitly warned against linking infectious diseases to a specific ethnicity because of the stigmatizing effects which have serious impact on health and defeating the virus. As the CDC chief medical officer said, stigma is the enemy of public health.

Anti-AAPI bigotry violates our bedrock American values and undermines our fight against the coronavirus, and it must end.

That is why we must do our part to combat hate, and that is why I am proud to support this resolution and am proud to bring it to the floor as an appropriate and excellent statement of values and good use of our time, instead of giving tax breaks to the wealthiest people in our country at the expense of our children and their future.

It calls on public officials to condemn and denounce any and all anti-Asian sentiment in any form, and it recognizes that the health and safety of all Americans, no matter their background, must be of the utmost priority. We are none of us safe until all of us are safe.

It condemns all manifestations of expressions of racism, xenophobia, discrimination, anti-Asian sentiment, scapegoating, and ethnic or religious intolerance.

It calls on Federal law enforcement officials working with State and local officials to investigate and collect data on hate crimes and bring perpetrators to justice.

It recommits our leaders to diversity and inclusion, including in our response to COVID-19.

This resolution has the support of hundreds of organizations, including from the medical and scientific communities.

Now I know science doesn't mean much to you because you are anti-science, but the scientific community, the American College of Physicians, recently wrote a letter of support for this resolution, stating:

It is an essential step to support the health and safety of our Nation during a national crisis.

Hate crimes directed against individuals based on individuals' race, ethnic origin, ancestry, primary language, cultural background or nationality are a true public health threat.

He goes on to say:

It is imperative that physicians, and all people, speak out against hate and discrimination, especially during this national crisis caused by COVID-19.

At this challenging time, our Nation's focus should be on respecting the dignity of everyone. That should always be the case. We cannot allow prejudice and discrimination to divide us.

So let me just close by adding this: we had a tremendous opportunity, as I said, we passed four bills that were overwhelmingly bipartisan. The CARES Act has done some good things for our country. It also gave an enormous, practically \$150 billion, tax break to the wealthiest in our country and made it retroactive.

What did that have to do with the coronavirus, making a tax break for the wealthy retroactive?

They can't pass a bill without doing something at the high end and then worrying when we want to help working class families in our country.

Anyway, our counter to that bill was called the Take Responsibility Act. Those two bills came together. We were able to find our common ground, even though we had to swallow some bitter pills in order to help America's working families as well as small businesses in our country.

Why does it have to be so hard?

Because there is an anti-science attitude in this Congress and in this administration. There is an anti-governance; there is contempt of science; and there is disdain for State and local government which does so much for our country.

Don't take it from me. The chairman of the Fed is saying that it recognizes that State and local government are an important part of our economy.

Don't take it from me that we cannot open our economy unless we crush this virus. That is exactly what the Fed chairman said yesterday: it is essential to do this.

But it takes money, it takes respect for science, and respect for the advice of scientific leaders in our country that has been absent. Instead, they play a blame game.

Who pays the price?

The Asian-American community in our country.

That is why it is essential for us to follow GRACE MENG's lead and that of

the Hispanic, Asian-Pacific, and Black Caucus leadership today.

I thank, again, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee for his leadership in bringing this important legislation to the floor. It is one of many.

We have many bills that we have taken up and we will take up next week as we try to work together to find our common ground. One thing that we are working on right now is to keep government open, because while they may have an anti-governance attitude, we know that we have to make our compromises to keep government open.

So, Madam Speaker, I thank you for the opportunity to use my Speaker's 1 minute to salute the leadership and thank the sponsors of this legislation. You bring luster to the House of Representatives when you enable us to associate ourselves with the great values of our country and to respect the dignity and worth of everyone in our country. It has never been more important than in this time of great crisis in our country.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. I want to remind all Members to address their remarks to the Chair.

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

Madam Speaker, the Speaker of the House said that the Russians are trying to jeopardize the security of our election. So are the Democrats.

Democrats are trying to win the election after the election. Democrats in Pennsylvania have filed a lawsuit that says you can fix errors on absentee ballots after the ballot has been returned to the Board of Elections. I don't even know what this means.

Can you vote in a race you didn't vote in?

Can you change a vote?

What does that mean, you can fix errors after you have already submitted the ballot?

In Nevada, Democrats passed a law that says you can accept mail-in ballots 3 days after the election, even if the postmark date on the ballot on the envelope can't be distinguished.

They are trying to win the election after the election. That is scary.

The Speaker said that the White House is using dangerous and offensive language. The premise of the resolution in front of us is language can cause people to take action, and if you use the term "China virus" or "Wuhan virus", somehow that will lead to bias against Asian-American people; even though they used the terms "China virus" and "Wuhan virus". Everyone in the mainstream media used it. They used it in the committee hearing notice.

Even though all that is there, they now say, oh, if you use those terms it will lead to anti-Asian bias.

But they don't talk about the language they use and the left uses, the language the Speaker uses and how that may create an environment that

will lead to violence. The Speaker of the House called the President of the United States an enemy of the state and said his supporters in Congress—Republicans—are enemies of the state.

They don't talk about that. No. China virus can lead people to take action, but, no, not when the Speaker of the House calls the President of the United States and Republican Members of Congress enemies of the state.

Two years ago a Democrat Member of Congress, the chair of a committee said this 2 years ago this summer: If you see somebody in the Trump Cabinet, you create a crowd, you push back on them, you tell them they are not welcome anymore anywhere.

She encouraged her constituents to approach people in the Trump administration, harass them, and tell them they are not welcome anymore anywhere.

She encouraged direct action. That is far different from using the term "China virus" which they used and which they had in a committee notice.

□ 1045

This individual Member of Congress said, "Go harass people in the Trump Cabinet."

The Speaker of the House calls Republicans "enemies of the State." And that is all fine by them.

But, oh, you say, "the virus started in Wuhan, China," and somehow you are terrible.

This is the crazy world the left is in today. The crazy world they are in today.

And, again, as said earlier by the gentleman from Texas and by others, I think the American people see right through this baloney, see right through it. This is ridiculous.

I hope we get our senses and start—as the Republican minority leader said—I hope we would actually start spending more of our time on issues of more value to the American people.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I thank our distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, and I thank and applaud the gentlewoman from New York for her outstanding leadership and championing the rights of all Americans.

Madam Speaker, from the unwarranted, unwanted allegations of hysterectomies in immigrant women around the Nation in detention centers, to the President of the United States taking to the bully pit to be able to call COVID-19 and the coronavirus the "China virus," we are finding ourselves in the midst of confusion that is hurting the American people—hurting them in two ways:

One, over 6 million COVID-19 infections in the United States, and now, predictions of upwards of 250,000 dead.

Every one of them we, as Members of the United States Congress, should mourn because families, sadly, are having to bury family members having not seen them in their last days.

What good is it to use that word—the “Wuhan” virus? That is not the scientific term. And out of that, we have created a hostile situation for our Asian-American friends, for Asian Americans who have been at the front lines fighting on behalf of this Nation.

The use of anti-Asian terminology and rhetoric related to COVID-19, such as the Chinese virus, Wuhan virus, kung flu have perpetrated anti-Asian stigma and is reminiscent of dark and shameful chapters in America’s past where Asian Americans were labeled as the “yellow peril” and interned in relocation camps.

Madam Speaker, more than 23 million Asian American and Pacific Islanders account for 7 percent of the Nation’s population in the United States, but over 2 million Asian American and Pacific Islanders are working on the front lines of this COVID-19 pandemic in healthcare, law enforcement, first responders, transportation, supermarkets, and other service industries. They feel threatened.

For example, in March 2020, an Asian woman wearing a mask was kicked and punched at a New York City subway station by individuals; two children and two adults were stabbed at a wholesale grocery store. This was anti-Asian rhetoric. Finally, let me say, my own constituent, Coco Ma, in Houston, was afraid to go into a grocery store.

Madam Speaker, include an article describing her concern.

[From houstonchronical.com, Apr. 17, 2020]

IN HOUSTON’S NEW NORMAL, A DIFFERENT CURVE EMERGES: OUTWARD RACISM TOWARD ASIAN AMERICANS

(By Olivia P. Tallet)

Coco Ma knows it’s risky to leave her house amid the coronavirus pandemic, as the number of Houston area confirmed cases increases and the peak is yet to come.

The Rice University MBA student, however, doesn’t even do the occasional run to the supermarket because, for her, the risk comes not only with battling against the virus but also against the vitriol aimed at Asian Americans like her, stereotyped as culprits of the pandemic.

“I have that fear . . . I ask my husband, who is white, to pick up the food we order. I’m afraid to go inside myself,” said Ma, aware of the scapegoating impacting Chinese Americans and Asians in general who are mistaken as people from China, where the COVID-19 pandemic was first detected.

Almost 1,500 hate incidents against Asian American and Pacific Islanders in the U.S. have been reported to the STOP AAPI HATE initiative since it began tracking incidents March 19.

“We know that (that) number is only a drop in the bucket. We know that this is really ubiquitous now,” said lawyer Manjusha Kulkarni, executive director of the Asian Pacific Policy and Planning Council and founder of the tracking hate initiative, headquartered in California.

Although the tracking isn’t well known around the country, it has already received reports of incidents in 46 states, including

Texas, said Kulkarni. The majority of the attacks are verbal, but some are also physical.

TO REPORT INCIDENTS

Hate and racist incidents against Asian Americans related to the COVID-19 pandemic can be reported to: Hate is Contagious: racismiscontagious.com; Stop AAPI Hate: asianpacificpolicyandplanningcouncil.org/stop-aapi-hate.

In West Texas, a man stabbed and cut members of a family from Burma, at a supermarket in Midland on March 14. The father and one of his two small children were severely wounded before a store employee subdued the attacker. The man allegedly said he did it because he thought the family was from China and infecting people with the virus. Local media outlets reported that the FBI is investigating the case as a hate crime.

In Houston, a city known for its diversity and tolerance, a woman verbally attacked the owner of the Vietnamese restaurant Vietopia earlier this month in a parking lot in front of the business, screaming expletives and, “You, get out of our country.”

“I felt unwanted here. We were very offended,” said Sammi Tran, co-owner and wife of the victim, who videotaped the incident. “My husband was born here in America. We don’t harm anybody, but this is happening now. I’ve never felt like this before.”

“We go to the supermarket and they look at us as if we were ugly people,” Tran said.

‘Racism Is Contagious’

At over half a million people, Asians make up 8 percent of the population in the Houston metro area. Residents with Chinese heritage represent the third largest subgroup after Indian and Vietnamese. Roughly 70 percent of Asians in the city are U.S. born or naturalized citizens, according to the U.S. Census Bureau.

Statewide, about 1.5 million residents identify as Asians, or 5.2 percent of the population.

In Houston’s Chinatown, the novel coronavirus hit businesses hard in January, well before residents were ordered to stay at home. Rumors spread on social media falsely claiming that an Asian supermarket in the area was shut down by the government due to coronavirus infections.

Although there wasn’t a single COVID-19 case in the state at the time, the rumors quickly propelled a fear of contagion and customers avoided the area, driving losses that reached 70 percent overnight for many Asian American businesses.

Not long afterward, President Donald Trump called the agent of the pandemic “the Chinese virus,” stirring outrage and concern among Asian Americans.

“The community feels under siege. There is a genuine, palpable sense of fear in the Asian American community, they feel that they’re being targeted,” said Texas Representative Gene Wu, a Democrat from Houston. “And this is not a Democratic or Republican issue. I’ve heard this from Democratic and Republican” Asians.

Trump recently said he was not going to use “Chinese virus” anymore, but some of his supporters do.

“China poisoned our people. President Trump has the courage to call it as it is: The Chinese Virus,” the narrator’s voice says over a sinister music clip in a campaign ad currently running on local television stations for Kathaleen Wall, who is in the GOP runoff for the 22nd District of Texas, representing the Sugar Land area.

Asked if she didn’t consider that her ad could negatively impact Asian Americans, she answered in an email: “Leave it to Texas Democrats like Sri Preston Kulkarni to defend the Chinese Communist Party while ten

thousand Americans have died because of the Coronavirus.” Kulkarni is the Democratic candidate running in the November general election for District 22.

Wea H. Lee, chairman of the Asian Southern News Group and the business organization International Trade Center in Houston, said attempts to diminish Asian people and their cultures overlook their success and integration in the country, such as having higher levels of income and education than the U.S. population overall.

“These politicians, the people making this kind of statement, it’s so stupid, they are so naive that they don’t see really what our community looks like,” said Lee.

The Anti Defamation League warns that online forums and posts, some from white supremacist groups, are ridiculing Chinese people in relation to COVID-19 and portraying them as a dirty culture.

A national campaign called “Racism Is Contagious” is using data to raise awareness about the issue and collect reports of abuses. It shows photos of Asians wearing a mask with the message “I am not a Virus,” which has become a viral hashtag.

INVISIBLE STORIES

For many Chinese Americans, the real story buried under the vitriolic noise is that their network of connections with China, Asian doctors and business people is precisely what has helped them help others during the coronavirus crisis.

The North Houston Chinese American community, for example, acquired part of its donation of masks and medical supplies to local healthcare providers via their connections in China, said Yanbo Wang, one of the organizers. They raised over \$14,000 in donations from 98 families and have helped seven nonprofit health providers and organizations.

“We paid for shipments to bring masks that people in China donated to us,” said Wang. The shipment arrived right when those supplies were difficult to find.

Similarly, The Pearland Chinese Association collected and donated masks and other products from many Asian Americans who bought them earlier in the year. Hearing from their families in China about the epidemic gave them an edge to prepare and acquire products before the pandemic was well known in America.

Jie Wu, a board member of the association, said many Asian Americans who work in the Texas Medical Center also let them know early about concerns with medical supplies. She said they mobilized and raised thousands of dollars plus masks, gloves and protective gowns, in what the organization calls “The Love for the Community Initiative.”

Masks were collected among school parents, many of whom worry that the stigma can hurt Asian American children born in the U.S. Some reports nationwide have already pointed to hateful incidents against minors.

Coco Ma, the co-founder of #SnacksForMedStaff initiative, is also concerned about the stereotyping.

“But I also want people to understand that I wanted to start the campaign not to prove who I am (and that) people should not get mad at me” as an Asian person, said Ma. “We Asians are doing this because we care.”

The idea of sending food to medical teams working in hospitals with COVID-19 cases came to Ma while talking on the phone with her mother, who is an administrator at a hospital in China dealing with the pandemic. Initially, she sent snacks to a few healthcare providers, but the initiative grew with people sending her money for a GoFundMe campaign.

Ma, a Houston resident, and her classmate and program partner Kathleen Harcourt,

who is Asian American, have now created a website to make all the #SnacksForMedStaff activities transparent to donors. They have raised around \$12,000 of a \$20,000 goal and have sent food packages to hospital teams in Texas and other four states among the hardest hit by the pandemic.

"We are getting very good feedback from doctors," Ma said. "They feel appreciated."

As the coronavirus is soon expected to peak locally, adding pressure to medical teams, Ma said her initiative will raise the funding goal and provide more packages.

"People are so polarized," said Ma. "Forget about politics, especially during this pandemic. Forget about race. Focus on what is the problem and coming up with a solution. This is about humanity first."

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I support this legislation because we have to stand to cure, to fix COVID-19, not to stigmatize and destroy the opportunity of saving America and doing the right thing by science.

Madam Speaker, as a senior member of the Judiciary and Homeland Security Committees, and the Budget Committee, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 908, which condemns anti-Asian sentiment in all its forms and manifestations, from whatever quarter, and from whomsoever, from the ordinary citizen up to and including the President of the United States.

Since January 2020, there has been a dramatic increase in reports of hate crimes and incidents against those of Asian descent and the danger accelerates as the number of deaths attributable to COVID-19, which currently stands at 197,000, continues to increase and is expected to exceed 250,000 by Election Day on November 3, 2020. The use of anti-Asian terminology and rhetoric related to COVID-19, such as the "Chinese Virus", "Wuhan Virus", and "Kung-flu" have perpetuated anti-Asian stigma and is reminiscent of dark and shameful chapters in America's past where Asian-Americans were escaped as the "yellow peril" and interned in relocation camps.

Madam Speaker, more than 23,000,000 Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders account for 7 percent of the Nation's population in the United States and over 2,000,000 Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders are working on the frontlines of this COVID-19 pandemic in health care, law enforcement, first responders, transportation, supermarkets, and other service industries. Madam Speaker, there are approximately 2 million Asian American owned businesses that generate over \$700 billion in annual revenue and employ nearly 4.5 million workers.

According to a recent study, there were over 400 cases related to COVID-19 anti-Asian discrimination just between February 9, 2020, and March 7, 2020 with Asian Americans being harassed, assaulted, and scapegoated for the COVID-19 pandemic. For example, in March 2020, anti-Asian woman wearing a mask was kicked and punched at a New York City subway station; two children and two adults were stabbed at a wholesale grocery in Midland, Texas; a couple was assaulted and robbed by a group of attackers in Philadelphia; and a 16-year-old boy was sent to the hospital after being attacked by bullies in Los Angeles, California.

According to a report in the Houston Chronicle, during this pandemic a different curve has emerged in the Harris County metroplex, one of outward racism toward Asian Americans,

where the increased use of anti-Asian rhetoric has also resulted in Asian-American businesses being targeted for vandalism.

Madam Speaker, the Secretary General of the United Nations called for international solidarity and an end to any ill-founded discrimination of the outbreak's victims. The World Health Organization (WHO) and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) counsels against that naming COVID-19 by its geographic location or linking it to a specific ethnicity because such linkage perpetuates stigma. For this reason, in 2015, the WHO issued guidance calling on media outlets, scientists, and national authorities to avoid naming infectious diseases for locations.

On February 27, 2020, the Secretary of Health and Human Services stated "ethnicity is not what causes the novel coronavirus" and that it is inappropriate and inaccurate to call COVID-19 the "Chinese virus." On February 28, 2020, Dr. Mitch Wolfe, the Chief Medical Officer of the CDC said, "Stigma is the enemy of public health" and on March 10, 2020, Dr. Robert Redfield, the Director of the CDC, testified that use of the term "Chinese coronavirus" is wrong and inappropriate.

So, I am proud to be an original cosponsor and to strongly support H. Res. 908 introduced by my friend, the gentlelady from New York, Congresswoman MENG. The resolution calls on all public officials to condemn and denounce any and all anti-Asian sentiment in any form and recognizes that the health and safety of all Americans, no matter their background, must be of utmost priority. The resolution condemns all manifestations of expressions of racism, xenophobia, discrimination, anti-Asian sentiment, scapegoating, and ethnic or religious intolerance and calls on Federal law enforcement officials, working with State and local officials to expeditiously investigate and document all credible reports of hate crimes and incidents and threats against the Asian-American community in the United States.

The resolution also calls upon federal, state, and local authorities to so, collect data to document the rise of incidences of hate crimes due to COVID-19; and to take action whenever appropriate to hold the perpetrators of those crimes, incidents, or threats accountable and bring such perpetrators to justice. Finally, and importantly, H. Res. 908 recommitments United States leadership in building more inclusive, diverse, and tolerant communities and combatting misinformation and discrimination that put Asian Americans at risk.

I urge all Members to join me in voting for H. Res. 908 and I thank Congresswoman MENG for introducing this important resolution.

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

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Virginia (Ms. SPANBERGER).

Ms. SPANBERGER. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 908. I rise today in support of my constituents of Asian descent.

Central Virginia is the proud home to a strong and vibrant Asian-American community. And since COVID-19 began, we have seen a disturbing increase in hate crimes directed at the Asian-American community across the country, including in Virginia.

Our neighbors, our fellow Americans, should never be the victims of dis-

crimination, violence or derision. And today, I am proud to stand with them and support this resolution on the floor of the House.

We should all actively and forcefully condemn these acts of hate directed at our friends and our neighbors, at home, across our communities. And today, I am proud to do so with my vote on the floor of the House. A vote that affirms the following:

That we call on public officials to condemn and denounce anti-Asian sentiment;

That we recognize that the health and safety of all Americans of any background should be our priority;

That we condemn the manifestation and the expression of racism, xenophobia, and anti-Asian sentiment;

That we call on Federal law enforcement officials working with State and local officials to expeditiously investigate hate crimes; and

That we recommit the United States' leadership to build a more inclusive, tolerant society.

Madam Speaker, to my colleagues who agree with these principles, I urge them to vote "yes" in support of this resolution and in support of our neighbors. I, for one, will proudly vote "yes."

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

Madam Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on the resolution for all the reasons we have articulated here this morning. I think it is important to go back and just remember, this is not about people of Asian-American descent. This is not about the Chinese people.

It is about the Chinese Communist Party. It is about the Chinese Government, a government that lied to us about the origins of this virus, lied to the world, used the World Health Organization to continue to mislead the United States and the world. That has been where the criticism has been targeted by the President.

But, again, 7 weeks before an election, Democrats don't care about the facts. They care about attacking the President, calling his supporters, as the Speaker of this House did, "enemies of the state," bringing a resolution to the floor of this nature, but not being willing to condemn the violence and the mobs in the streets of our cities and certain places for over 100 days straight, looting and violence and rioting and attacks on our law enforcement officers. Nope, can't. We can't bring a resolution. We can't talk about that. When the Attorney General of the United States asked, the Democrat members of the Committee on the Judiciary won't even speak up then.

Madam Speaker, I hope we defeat this resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, this is an important resolution that will put the House firmly on record against the insidious

form of racism and racial scapegoating that we have seen since the COVID-19 pandemic began.

It is completely unacceptable to use derogatory and prejudicial terms, like “Chinese virus” or “Wuhan virus,” as if they merely describe the factual reality of where the novel coronavirus that causes COVID-19 originated.

First, this logic does nothing to justify the use of the term “kung flu,” another term often used by some to describe COVID-19, a term clearly designed to mock Asians and to associate them unfairly with this disease.

Madam Speaker, the need for this legislation is clear. I urge my colleagues to vote “yes,” and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. MENG. Madam Speaker, as millions across our nation continue to be impacted by the coronavirus, many continue to live in fear following the dramatic increase of threats and attacks against those of Asian descent since the COVID-19 outbreak.

Since January 2020, there has been a significant number of reports of anti-Asian incidents; wherein, due to scapegoating Asian Americans for the spread of COVID-19, many are being threatened, harassed, or assaulted, or have had their businesses vandalized. The upsurge of racial discrimination against Asian Americans has been fueled by misinformation about the coronavirus and usage of anti-Asian rhetoric and terms like “Chinese virus” and “Kung-flu.” All of our nation’s leaders must stop using these racist phrases that instigate hatred and violence. In the midst of the COVID-19 crisis, Asian Americans are left fighting an additional front—that of hate and bigotry.

That is why I introduced a resolution condemning all forms of anti-Asian sentiment as related to COVID-19. We, as leaders of this nation, must coalesce and condemn all manifestations of expressions of racism, xenophobia, discrimination, and anti-Asian sentiment and scapegoating. We must denounce any and all anti-Asian sentiment of any form.

Madam Speaker, during this time of heightened anxiety and fear surrounding COVID-19, we cannot lose sight of protecting the health and safety of every single person—no matter their race, ethnicity, religion, or background. The House must take a strong stand against the sickening intolerance, bigotry, and violence that is leaving a terrible stain on our nation’s history, especially during this moment of an unprecedented public health crisis. The adoption of this resolution is a necessary step to confront the second pandemic of racism and discrimination in this country. I urge my colleagues to join me in this effort to keep all Americans safe.

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of House Resolution 908—Condemning all forms of anti-Asian sentiment as related to COVID-19. I praise my distinguished colleague, Congresswoman GRACE MENG, First Vice-Chair of the Congressional Asian Pacific American Caucus (CAPAC), for her exemplary leadership on this Resolution on behalf of Asian-Americans and Asian and Pacific Islander communities all over the world.

With this Resolution, I am reminded of the talented and brave Asians and Asian-Americans who have helped lead us through

COVID-19. I think of my district’s University of Toledo Medical Center’s molecular specialist, Dr. Ji-Youn Yeo, Ph.D., a Postdoctoral Fellow of South Korean descent. Dr. Yeo’s expertise helped the Center’s coronavirus pathology lab modify its test to keep employees safe during the testing process. First Lady of Maryland, Yumi Hogan, was instrumental in obtaining 500,000 testing kits for Maryland by working with the South Korean Ambassador to the United States, Lee Soo Hyuk. The people of South Korea were able to minimize the devastation of COVID-19 on its own shores and became an example to the world by implementing lessons and procedures learned from its MERS outbreak. These efforts are a significant representation of how Asian communities are helping to combat the corona virus.

To incite anti-Asian sentiments through racism, discrimination, or religious intolerance, especially related to COVID-19, is an insult to the very people who have helped shape our country. At this difficult time as we experience a resurgence of this troubling discrimination, I am reminded of my trailblazing colleagues as they continue the fight against discrimination, and through their efforts, are making our nation a fairer and more just society. One such trailblazer is the distinguished Chairwoman of CAPAC, Congresswoman JUDY CHU, the first Chinese American woman elected to the United States Congress. She has served with great dignity and has been a fierce leader and advocate for Asian Americans. Former Congressman and CAPAC Chair Emeritus, Mike Honda, a statesman who was forced into a Japanese internment camp with his family in Colorado and then thrived to become a Member of the United States House of Representatives. He experienced xenophobia firsthand, and we heartfully thank him for teaching all those who face oppression that they have the ability to overcome and achieve remarkable things. I also recognize our distinguished Chairman of the House Committee on Veterans’ Affairs, Congressman MARK TAKANO. He is a consummate educator and brave leader who became the first openly gay person of color to serve in Congress. These are some of America’s finest patriots.

I had the honor and privilege to serve with Congress’ first female Member of color, Patsy Mink. A third generation Japanese American, she achieved greatness through insurmountable barriers. A fighter for the fundamental belief in equality, Mink co-authored Title IX to ensure that no person, regardless of sex, could be excluded from any education program or activity receiving federal financial assistance. She was ahead of her time and laid a great foundation for Asian Americans and women to follow. Congresswoman MENG’s efforts today proudly honor her memory.

To the current and past Asian American and Pacific Islander Members of Congress, the current 74 bicameral members of the Congressional Asian Pacific American Caucus, and the many Asian Americans who are working every day to make sure America stands tall during COVID-19, I salute them and their service to a grateful nation. I urge support for H. Res. 908.

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker. I rise today to support H. Res. 908, which condemns all forms of anti-Asian sentiment as related to COVID-19. Since the beginning of this pandemic, the Asian American community in Philadelphia

and nationwide has seen an alarming surge in anti-Asian bigotry and in hate crimes. There is no doubt that COVID-19 has resulted in the spread of hate, racism, and xenophobia toward the Asian American community.

As you may already know, the FBI warned at the end of March that they expected to see hate crime incidents against Asian Americans to increase suddenly as the general public associated the coronavirus with the Asian American population. At its peak, there were nearly 100 hate incidents being reported each day. Yet, the President and his Administration failed to address this and fueled this misconception with their rhetoric.

Madam Speaker, words matter. This widespread racism against Asian Americans during this public health crisis is a serious and destructive issue that negatively impacts the lives of millions in our nation. Congress has a duty to address the ongoing anti-Asian sentiment and break the silence, raise awareness, and change the public perception surrounding it.

In my hometown of Philadelphia, we have witnessed far too many hate crimes. Back in February, a young man and woman were physically assaulted by a group of juveniles at a SEPTA station in what appeared to be a racially motivated anti-Asian attack. In March, several Asian American homes were harassed through letters. Later in April, an Asian American-owned restaurant in my Congressional district was vandalized with spray-paint graffiti that included a racial slur. Just last month, an Asian American pregnant mother was attacked on the streets by someone who deliberately mentioned her race during the attack.

The Asian American community has enriched the city of Philadelphia, and our nation, and we must do more to protect them. The prejudice against the Asian American community distracts us from finding real solutions to the pandemic at a time when they are much needed.

Madam Speaker, now, more than ever, it is important to stand in solidarity with the Asian American community. We cannot let the rise in hateful rhetoric and discrimination go unchecked. We must work together to build a more inclusive and diverse society, and this resolution is a step toward achieving that. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this resolution to build on America’s diversity, which has proven to be one of our greatest strengths.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of House Resolution 908, which condemns the anti-Asian rhetoric that has arisen because of the COVID-19 pandemic. Madam Speaker, our Asian friends, neighbors and family members have been unfairly targeted by bigotry in the wake of the COVID-19 pandemic. Using terms like the “China Virus” and “Kung Flu” is offensive to the communities I represent in the Lower East Side and Brooklyn. Our friends and neighbors in these communities are essential workers and small business owners who provided critical services to our community as the pandemic raged across New York City, and continue to play an essential role in our city’s recovery from the virus. Unfortunately, New York City has seen a spike in bias crimes. We cannot let hate crimes go unpunished, let alone condone them.

As the resolution states, there are over 2 million Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders

working on the frontline combatting against the pandemic. We must stand in solidarity with our friends and neighbors by denouncing the vitriol and anti-Asian sentiment. Our response to this pandemic should have been a unifying moment for our country. Instead, the administration has actively sought to inflame racial tensions. Today, we say “no more” to the anti-Asian rhetoric from the White House. I am proud to cosponsor this bill and I want to thank my colleague from New York Representative GRACE MENG, for her leadership on this issue and urge all my colleagues to support its passage.

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of this resolution that condemns all forms of anti-Asian sentiment during this COVID-19 pandemic. This public health crisis has caused significant pain and suffering to communities across our nation, and we are especially concerned about an apparent increase in verbal and physical attacks, as well as discrimination, against Asian Americans.

Our society must clearly state that this xenophobia must not and will not be accepted. Asian Americans are not responsible for the spread of COVID-19, and yet they have been repeatedly harassed, discriminated, and even attacked by some who wrongly believe they are at fault. There are over two thousand reported incidences of coronavirus-related discrimination by the Asian Pacific Policy and Planning Council. We must better protect our vulnerable communities during times of turmoil, and it is even more egregious that many of these same victims are simultaneously fighting this pandemic as doctors, nurses, and other frontline providers.

Therefore, I am proud to support this resolution that explicitly calls on all public officials to condemn and denounce all anti-Asian sentiment in any form. Additionally, I am pleased that this legislation recognizes that the health and safety of all Americans, no matter their background, must be our utmost priority.

On behalf of the constituents of the 30th Congressional District of Texas, I am proud to support this resolution condemning anti-Asian sentiment during this pandemic, and I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 1107, the previous question is ordered on the resolution and the preamble.

The question is on the resolution.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3 of House Resolution 965, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question are postponed.

PREGNANT WORKERS FAIRNESS ACT

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1107, I call up the bill (H.R. 2694) to eliminate discrimination and promote women's health and economic security by ensuring reasonable workplace ac-

commodations for workers whose ability to perform the functions of a job are limited by pregnancy, childbirth, or a related medical condition, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. SPANBERGER). Pursuant to House Resolution 1107, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Education and Labor, 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. 2694

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 “Pregnant Workers Fairness Act”.

SEC. 2. NONDISCRIMINATION WITH REGARD TO REASONABLE ACCOMMODATIONS RELATED TO PREGNANCY.

It shall be an unlawful employment practice for a covered entity to—

(1) *not make reasonable accommodations to the known limitations related to the pregnancy, childbirth, or related medical conditions of a qualified employee, unless such covered entity can demonstrate that the accommodation would impose an undue hardship on the operation of the business of such covered entity;*

(2) *require a qualified employee affected by pregnancy, childbirth, or related medical conditions to accept an accommodation other than any reasonable accommodation arrived at through the interactive process referred to in section 5(7);*

(3) *deny employment opportunities to a qualified employee if such denial is based on the need of the covered entity to make reasonable accommodations to the known limitations related to the pregnancy, childbirth, or related medical conditions of a qualified employee;*

(4) *require a qualified employee to take leave, whether paid or unpaid, if another reasonable accommodation can be provided to the known limitations related to the pregnancy, childbirth, or related medical conditions of a qualified employee; or*

(5) *take adverse action in terms, conditions, or privileges of employment against a qualified employee on account of the employee requesting or using a reasonable accommodation to the known limitations related to the pregnancy, childbirth, or related medical conditions of the employee.*

SEC. 3. REMEDIES AND ENFORCEMENT.

(a) *EMPLOYEES COVERED BY TITLE VII OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964.—*

(1) *IN GENERAL.—The powers, remedies, and procedures provided in sections 705, 706, 707, 709, 710, and 711 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e–4 et seq.) to the Commission, the Attorney General, or any person alleging a violation of title VII of such Act (42 U.S.C. 2000e et seq.) shall be the powers, remedies, and procedures this Act provides to the Commission, the Attorney General, or any person, respectively, alleging an unlawful employment practice in violation of this Act against an employee described in section 5(3)(A) except as provided in paragraphs (2) and (3) of this subsection.*

(2) *COSTS AND FEES.—The powers, remedies, and procedures provided in subsections (b) and (c) of section 722 of the Revised Statutes (42 U.S.C. 1988) shall be the powers, remedies, and procedures this Act provides to the Commission, the Attorney General, or any person alleging such practice.*

(3) *DAMAGES.—The powers, remedies, and procedures provided in section 1977A of the Revised Statutes (42 U.S.C. 1981a), including the limita-*

tions contained in subsection (b)(3) of such section 1977A, shall be the powers, remedies, and procedures this Act provides to the Commission, the Attorney General, or any person alleging such practice (not an employment practice specifically excluded from coverage under section 1977A(a)(1) of the Revised Statutes).

(b) *EMPLOYEES COVERED BY CONGRESSIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY ACT OF 1995.—*

(1) *IN GENERAL.—The powers, remedies, and procedures provided in the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1301 et seq.) to the Board (as defined in section 101 of such Act (2 U.S.C. 1301)) or any person alleging a violation of section 201(a)(1) of such Act (2 U.S.C. 1311(a)(1)) shall be the powers, remedies, and procedures this Act provides to the Board or any person, respectively, alleging an unlawful employment practice in violation of this Act against an employee described in section 5(3)(B), except as provided in paragraphs (2) and (3) of this subsection.*

(2) *COSTS AND FEES.—The powers, remedies, and procedures provided in subsections (b) and (c) of section 722 of the Revised Statutes (42 U.S.C. 1988) shall be the powers, remedies, and procedures this Act provides to the Board or any person alleging such practice.*

(3) *DAMAGES.—The powers, remedies, and procedures provided in section 1977A of the Revised Statutes (42 U.S.C. 1981a), including the limitations contained in subsection (b)(3) of such section 1977A, shall be the powers, remedies, and procedures this Act provides to the Board or any person alleging such practice (not an employment practice specifically excluded from coverage under section 1977A(a)(1) of the Revised Statutes).*

(4) *OTHER APPLICABLE PROVISIONS.—With respect to a claim alleging a practice described in paragraph (1), title III of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1381 et seq.) shall apply in the same manner as such title applies with respect to a claim alleging a violation of section 201(a)(1) of such Act (2 U.S.C. 1311(a)(1)).*

(c) *EMPLOYEES COVERED BY CHAPTER 5 OF TITLE 3, UNITED STATES CODE.—*

(1) *IN GENERAL.—The powers, remedies, and procedures provided in chapter 5 of title 3, United States Code, to the President, the Commission, the Merit Systems Protection Board, or any person alleging a violation of section 411(a)(1) of such title shall be the powers, remedies, and procedures this Act provides to the President, the Commission, the Board, or any person, respectively, alleging an unlawful employment practice in violation of this Act against an employee described in section 5(3)(C), except as provided in paragraphs (2) and (3) of this subsection.*

(2) *COSTS AND FEES.—The powers, remedies, and procedures provided in subsections (b) and (c) of section 722 of the Revised Statutes (42 U.S.C. 1988) shall be the powers, remedies, and procedures this Act provides to the President, the Commission, the Board, or any person alleging such practice.*

(3) *DAMAGES.—The powers, remedies, and procedures provided in section 1977A of the Revised Statutes (42 U.S.C. 1981a), including the limitations contained in subsection (b)(3) of such section 1977A, shall be the powers, remedies, and procedures this Act provides to the President, the Commission, the Board, or any person alleging such practice (not an employment practice specifically excluded from coverage under section 1977A(a)(1) of the Revised Statutes).*

(d) *EMPLOYEES COVERED BY GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEE RIGHTS ACT OF 1991.—*

(1) *IN GENERAL.—The powers, remedies, and procedures provided in sections 302 and 304 of the Government Employee Rights Act of 1991 (42 U.S.C. 2000e–16b; 2000e–16c) to the Commission or any person alleging a violation of section 302(a)(1) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 2000e–16b(a)(1)) shall be the powers, remedies, and procedures*

this Act provides to the Commission or any person, respectively, alleging an unlawful employment practice in violation of this Act against an employee described in section 5(3)(D), except as provided in paragraphs (2) and (3) of this subsection.

(2) **COSTS AND FEES.**—The powers, remedies, and procedures provided in subsections (b) and (c) of section 722 of the Revised Statutes (42 U.S.C. 1988) shall be the powers, remedies, and procedures this Act provides to the Commission or any person alleging such practice.

(3) **DAMAGES.**—The powers, remedies, and procedures provided in section 1977A of the Revised Statutes (42 U.S.C. 1981a), including the limitations contained in subsection (b)(3) of such section 1977A, shall be the powers, remedies, and procedures this Act provides to the Commission or any person alleging such practice (not an employment practice specifically excluded from coverage under section 1977A(a)(1) of the Revised Statutes).

(e) **EMPLOYEES COVERED BY SECTION 717 OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The powers, remedies, and procedures provided in section 717 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e-16) to the Commission, the Attorney General, the Librarian of Congress, or any person alleging a violation of that section shall be the powers, remedies, and procedures this Act provides to the Commission, the Attorney General, the Librarian of Congress, or any person, respectively, alleging an unlawful employment practice in violation of this Act against an employee described in section 5(3)(E), except as provided in paragraphs (2) and (3) of this subsection.

(2) **COSTS AND FEES.**—The powers, remedies, and procedures provided in subsections (b) and (c) of section 722 of the Revised Statutes (42 U.S.C. 1988) shall be the powers, remedies, and procedures this Act provides to the Commission, the Attorney General, the Librarian of Congress, or any person alleging such practice.

(3) **DAMAGES.**—The powers, remedies, and procedures provided in section 1977A of the Revised Statutes (42 U.S.C. 1981a), including the limitations contained in subsection (b)(3) of such section 1977A, shall be the powers, remedies, and procedures this Act provides to the Commission, the Attorney General, the Librarian of Congress, or any person alleging such practice (not an employment practice specifically excluded from coverage under section 1977A(a)(1) of the Revised Statutes).

(f) **PROHIBITION AGAINST RETALIATION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—No person shall discriminate against any employee because such employee has opposed any act or practice made unlawful by this Act or because such employee made a charge, testified, assisted, or participated in any manner in an investigation, proceeding, or hearing under this Act.

(2) **PROHIBITION AGAINST COERCION.**—It shall be unlawful to coerce, intimidate, threaten, or interfere with any individual in the exercise or enjoyment of, or on account of such individual having exercised or enjoyed, or on account of such individual having aided or encouraged any other individual in the exercise or enjoyment of, any right granted or protected by this Act.

(3) **REMEDY.**—The remedies and procedures otherwise provided for under this section shall be available to aggrieved individuals with respect to violations of this subsection.

(g) **LIMITATION.**—Notwithstanding subsections (a)(3), (b)(3), (c)(3), (d)(3), and (e)(3), if an unlawful employment practice involves the provision of a reasonable accommodation pursuant to this Act or regulations implementing this Act, damages may not be awarded under section 1977A of the Revised Statutes (42 U.S.C. 1981a) if the covered entity demonstrates good faith efforts, in consultation with the employee with known limitations related to pregnancy, childbirth, or related medical conditions who has informed the covered entity that accommodation is needed, to identify and make a reasonable ac-

commodation that would provide such employee with an equally effective opportunity and would not cause an undue hardship on the operation of the covered entity.

SEC. 4. RULEMAKING.

Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission shall issue regulations in an accessible format in accordance with subchapter II of chapter 5 of title 5, United States Code, to carry out this Act. Such regulations shall provide examples of reasonable accommodations addressing known limitations related to pregnancy, childbirth, or related medical conditions.

SEC. 5. DEFINITIONS.

As used in this Act—

(1) the term “Commission” means the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission;

(2) the term “covered entity”—

(A) has the meaning given the term “respondent” in section 701(n) of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e(n)); and

(B) includes—

(i) an employer, which means a person engaged in industry affecting commerce who has 15 or more employees as defined in section 701(b) of title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e(b));

(ii) an employing office, as defined in section 101 of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1301) and section 411(c) of title 3, United States Code;

(iii) an entity employing a State employee described in section 304(a) of the Government Employee Rights Act of 1991 (42 U.S.C. 2000e-16(a)); and

(iv) an entity to which section 717(a) of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e-16(a)) applies;

(3) the term “employee” means—

(A) an employee (including an applicant), as defined in section 701(f) of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e(f));

(B) a covered employee (including an applicant), as defined in section 101 of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1301);

(C) a covered employee (including an applicant), as defined in section 411(c) of title 3, United States Code;

(D) a State employee (including an applicant) described in section 304(a) of the Government Employee Rights Act of 1991 (42 U.S.C. 2000e-16(a)); or

(E) an employee (including an applicant) to which section 717(a) of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e-16(a)) applies;

(4) the term “person” has the meaning given such term in section 701(a) of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e(a));

(5) the term “known limitation” means physical or mental condition related to, affected by, or arising out of pregnancy, childbirth, or related medical conditions that the employee or employee’s representative has communicated to the employer whether or not such condition meets the definition of disability specified in section 3 of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12102);

(6) the term “qualified employee” means an employee or applicant who, with or without reasonable accommodation, can perform the essential functions of the employment position, except that an employee or applicant shall be considered qualified if—

(A) any inability to perform an essential function is for a temporary period;

(B) the essential function could be performed in the near future; and

(C) the inability to perform the essential function can be reasonably accommodated; and

(7) the terms “reasonable accommodation” and “undue hardship” have the meanings given such terms in section 101 of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12111) and shall be construed as such terms are construed under such Act and as set forth in the regulations required by this Act, including with regard

to the interactive process that will typically be used to determine an appropriate reasonable accommodation.

SEC. 6. WAIVER OF STATE IMMUNITY.

A State shall not be immune under the 11th Amendment to the Constitution from an action in a Federal or State court of competent jurisdiction for a violation of this Act. In any action against a State for a violation of this Act, remedies (including remedies both at law and in equity) are available for such a violation to the same extent as such remedies are available for such a violation in an action against any public or private entity other than a State.

SEC. 7. RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER LAWS.

Nothing in this Act shall be construed to invalidate or limit the powers, remedies, and procedures under any Federal law or law of any State or political subdivision of any State or jurisdiction that provides greater or equal protection for individuals affected by pregnancy, childbirth, or related medical conditions.

SEC. 8. SEVERABILITY.

If any provision of this Act or the application of that provision to particular persons or circumstances is held invalid or found to be unconstitutional, the remainder of this Act and the application of that provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor.

The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) and the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on H.R. 2694, the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1100

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

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2694, the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act. No one should have to choose between financial security and a healthy pregnancy. Unfortunately, our pregnancy antidiscrimination laws urgently need to be updated to provide reasonable accommodations for workers.

Current Federal law does not clearly guarantee pregnant workers’ rights to reasonable accommodations in the workplace, such as water, seating, bathroom breaks, and lifting restrictions. These basic protections are critical to protecting pregnant workers from the tragic consequences of unsafe working conditions, and they are particularly important today, as early evidence suggests that pregnancy leads to elevated risk of severe illness from COVID-19.

In 2015, the Supreme Court allowed pregnant workers to bring claims for

reasonable accommodations under the Pregnancy Discrimination Act in the landmark case of *Young v. UPS*. However, that decision set an unreasonably high standard for pregnancy discrimination. Under the *Young* standard, workers must prove that the accommodations they were denied were provided to other workers who were similar in their inability to work.

This standard is onerous, in part, because it assumes that workers can access their coworkers' personal health information and establish a comparable group of workers. It also creates a perverse legal framework in which companies that treat all of their workers poorly can treat their pregnant workers poorly as well.

Since the *Young* decision, courts have ruled against pregnant workers seeking accommodations most of the time.

In the absence of Federal action, nearly three dozen States and localities have filled the void by establishing their own protections for pregnant workers. This patchwork approach is bad for workers who are frequently left without strong protections and bad for multistate employers who have to comply with different States' workplace standards.

The Pregnant Workers Fairness Act is a bipartisan proposal that will finally establish clear, nationwide protections that guarantee pregnant workers the basic rights to reasonable accommodations.

It will also grant victims of pregnancy discrimination the same remedies as victims of discrimination on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin under Federal civil rights laws. Similar to the Americans with Disabilities Act, employers are not required to make accommodations if it imposes an undue hardship on the employer's business.

This legislation has broad support across the political spectrum and across our communities. Labor unions, civil rights groups, and the business community, including the Chamber of Commerce, have all endorsed this proposal.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter led by the nonprofit A Better Balance and over 200 worker advocacy organizations calling for Congress to pass the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act.

SEPTEMBER 14, 2020.

Re Pregnant Workers Fairness Act.

DEAR MEMBER OF CONGRESS: As organizations committed to promoting the health and economic security of our nation's families, we urge you to support the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act, a crucial maternal and infant health measure. This bipartisan legislation promotes healthy pregnancies and economic security for pregnant women and their families and strengthens the economy.

In the last few decades, there has been a dramatic demographic shift in the workforce. Not only do women now make up almost half of the workforce, but there are more pregnant workers than ever before and they are working later into their preg-

nancies. The simple reality is that some of these women—especially those in physically demanding jobs—will have a medical need for a temporary job-related accommodation in order to maintain a healthy pregnancy. Yet, too often, instead of providing a pregnant worker with an accommodation, her employer will fire her or push her onto unpaid leave, depriving her of a paycheck and health insurance at a time when she needs them most.

Additionally, pregnancy discrimination affects women across race and ethnicity, but women of color and immigrants may be at particular risk. Latinas, Black women and immigrant women are more likely to hold certain inflexible and physically demanding jobs that can present specific challenges for pregnant workers, such as cashiers, home health aides, food service workers, and cleaners, making reasonable accommodations on the job even more important, and loss of wages and health insurance due to pregnancy discrimination especially challenging. American families and the American economy depend on women's income: we cannot afford to force pregnant women out of work.

In 2015, in *Young v. United Parcel Service*, the Supreme Court held that a failure to make accommodations for pregnant workers with medical needs will sometimes violate the Pregnancy Discrimination Act of 1978 (PDA). Yet, even after *Young*, pregnant workers are still not getting the accommodations they need to stay safe and healthy on the job and employers lack clarity as to their obligations under the law. The Pregnant Workers Fairness Act will provide a clear, predictable rule: employers must provide reasonable accommodations for limitations arising out of pregnancy, childbirth, or related medical conditions, unless this would pose an undue hardship.

The Pregnant Workers Fairness Act is modeled after the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and offers employers and employees a familiar reasonable accommodation framework to follow. Under the ADA, workers with disabilities enjoy clear statutory protections and need not prove how other employees are treated in order to obtain necessary accommodations. Pregnant workers deserve the same clarity and streamlined process and should not have to ascertain how their employer treats others in order to understand their own accommodation rights, as the Supreme Court's ruling currently requires.

Evidence from states and cities that have adopted laws similar to the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act suggests that providing this clarity reduces lawsuits and, most importantly, helps ensure that women can obtain necessary reasonable accommodations in a timely manner, which keeps pregnant women healthy and earning an income when they need it most. No woman should have to choose between providing for her family and maintaining a healthy pregnancy, and the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act would ensure that all women working for covered employers would be protected.

The need for the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act is recognized across ideological and partisan lines. Thirty states and D.C. have adopted pregnant worker fairness measures with broad, and often unanimous, bipartisan support. Twenty-five of those laws have passed within the last seven years. These states include: Alaska, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Hawaii, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Maine, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Nebraska, New Mexico, Nevada, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oregon, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, West Virginia, Vermont, Virginia, and Wash-

ington. Lawmakers have concluded that accommodating pregnant workers who need it is a measured approach grounded in family values and basic fairness.

The Pregnant Workers Fairness Act is necessary because it promotes long-term economic security and workplace fairness. When accommodations allow pregnant women to continue to work, they can maintain income and seniority, while forced leave sets new mothers back with lost wages and missed advancement opportunities. When pregnant women are fired, not only do they and their families lose critical income, but they must fight extra hard to re-enter a job market that is especially brutal on the unemployed and on pregnant women.

The Pregnant Workers Fairness Act is vital because it supports healthy pregnancies. The choice between risking a job and risking the health of a pregnancy is one no one should have to make. Women who cannot perform some aspects of their usual duties without risking their own health or the health of their pregnancy, but whose families cannot afford to lose their income, may continue working under dangerous conditions. There are health consequences to pushing women out of the workforce as well. Stress from job loss can increase the risk of having a premature baby and/or a baby with low birth weight. In addition, women who are not forced to use their leave during pregnancy may have more leave available to take following childbirth, which in turn facilitates breastfeeding, bonding with and caring for a new child, and recovering from childbirth.

For all of these reasons, we urge you to support the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act.

We also welcome the opportunity to provide you with additional information.

Sincerely,

A Better Balance, American Civil Liberties Union, National Partnership for Women & Families, National Women's Law Center, 1,000 Days, 9to5, 9to5 California, 9to5 Colorado, 9to5 Georgia, 9to5 Wisconsin, Advocates for Youth, AFL-CIO, African American Ministers In Action, Alianza Nacional de Campesinas, All-Options, American Association of University Women (AAUW), American Association of University Women, Indianapolis (AAUW), American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees (AFSCME), American Federation of Teachers, Asian Pacific American Labor Alliance, Association of Asian Pacific Community, Health Organizations (AAPCHO), Association of Maternal & Child Health Programs, Association of Women's Health, Obstetric and Neonatal Nurses.

Black Mamas Matter Alliance, Breastfeeding Mother, Building Pathways, California Breastfeeding Coalition, California Women's Law Center, California Work & Family Coalition, Casa de Esperanza: National Latin@ Network, for Healthy Families and Communities, Center for American Progress, Center for Parental Leave Leadership, Center for Public Policy Priorities, Center for Reproductive Rights, Centro de Trabajadores Unidos (United Workers Center), Child Care Law Center, Child Welfare League of America, Chinese Progressive Association (San Francisco), Church World Service, Citizen Action of NY, CLASP, Clearinghouse on Women's Issues, Closing the Women's Health Gap, Coalition on Human Needs, Coalition of Labor Union Women, Coalition of Labor Union Women, Philadelphia Chapter, Communications Workers of America (CWA), Congregation of Our Lady of the Good Shepherd, U.S. Provinces.

DC Jobs with Justice, Disability Rights Education and Defense Fund (DREDF), Principles Center for Public Witness, Economic

Policy Institute, EMC Strategies, Equal Pay Today, Equal Rights Advocates, Family Equality, Family Values@ Work, Farmworker Justice, Feminist Majority Foundation, Friends Committee on National Legislation, Futures Without Violence, Gender Justice, Grassroots Maternal and Child Health, Leadership Initiative, Hadassah, The Women's Zionist Organization of America, Inc., Healthy and Free Tennessee, Healthy Mothers/Healthy Babies Coalition of Georgia, Healthy Work Campaign, Center for Social Epidemiology, HER Development, Hoosier Action, Illuminate Colorado, In Our Own Voice: National Black Women's Reproductive Justice Agenda, Indiana AFL-CIO.

Indiana Breastfeeding Coalition, Indiana Catholic Conference, Indiana Chapter of Unite Here Local 23, Indiana Coalition Against Domestic Violence, Indiana Friends Committee on Legislation, Indiana Institute for Working Families, Indiana Statewide Independent Living Council, Indianapolis Urban League, Indy Chamber, Interfaith Worker Justice, International Union, United Automobile, Aerospace & Agricultural Implement Workers of America (UAW), Jewish Women International Jobs With Justice, Justice for Migrant Women, Kansas Breastfeeding Coalition, Inc., Kentucky Equal Justice Center, KWH Law Center for Social Justice and Change, Labor Council for Latin American Advancement (LCLAA), Labor Project, LatinoJustice PRLDEF, Legal Aid at Work, Legal Momentum, The Women's Legal Defense and Education Fund, Legal Voice, Louisiana Partnership for Children and Families.

Main Street Alliance, Maine Women's Lobby, Majaica, LLC, Make the Road New York, MANA, A National Latina Organization March of Dimes, Marion County Commission on Youth, Inc. Massachusetts Coalition for Occupational Safety & Health, Metro-Detroit Chapter of the Coalition of Labor Union Women (CLUW), Michigan Immigrant Rights Center MOBB United for Social Change, MomsRising, Monroe County NOW, MS Black Women's Roundtable, Mujeres Unidas y Activas, NAACP, NARAL Pro-Choice America, NARAL Pro-Choice Colorado, National Advocacy Center of the Sisters of the Good Shepherd, National Advocates for Pregnant Women, National Asian Pacific American Women's Forum (NAPAWF), National Center for Law and Economic Justice, National Center for Lesbian Rights, National Center for Transgender Equality, National Coalition Against Domestic Violence, National Consumers League.

National Council for Occupational Safety and Health (COSH), National Council of Jewish Women, National Council of Jewish Women—California, National Domestic Workers Alliance, National Education Association, National Employment Law Project, National Employment Lawyers Association, National Health Law Program, National Immigration Law Center, National Network to End Domestic Violence, National Organization for Women, National Partnership for Women and Families, National Resource Center on Domestic Violence, National WIC Association, NC National Organization for Women (NC NOW), Nebraska Appleseed, NETWORK Lobby for Catholic Social Justice, New Working Majority, NJ Citizen Action; NJ Time to Care Coalition, North Carolina Justice Center, Oxfam America, PA NOW, Parent Voices CA, Path Ways PA, PhilaPOSH.

Planned Parenthood Federation of America, Prevent Child Abuse NC, Physicians for Reproductive Health, Poligon Education Fund, PowHer New York, Pride at Work, Public Citizen, Quetzal, Restaurant Opportunities Centers United, RESULTS, RICLUW,

San Francisco CLUW Chapter, Service Employees International Union, SEIU 32BJ, Sexuality Information and Education Council of the United States (SIECUS), SisterReach, Shriver Center on Poverty Law, Silver in the City (Indianapolis, IN), Solutions for Breastfeeding, Southern CA Coalition for Occupational Safety & Health, Southwest Pennsylvania National Organization for Women, Southwest Women's Law Center, TASH, Technology Concepts Group International, LLC, The Greenlining Institute.

The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, The Little Timmy Project, The Ohio Women's Public Policy Network, The Zonta Club of Greater Queens, TIME'S UP Now, Ujima Inc: The National Center on Violence Against Women in the Black Community, Ultra Violet, UnidosUS, United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America, United Food and Commercial Workers, International Union (UFCW), United Food and Commercial Workers Local 227, Union for Reform Judaism, United for Respect, United State of Women, United States Breastfeeding Committee, United Steelworkers, United Way of Kentucky, University of Illinois at Chicago, School of Public Health, Division of Environmental & Occupational Health Sciences, Vision y Compromiso, Voices for Children in Nebraska, Voices for Progress, Warehouse Worker Resource Center, Western Center on Law and Poverty.

William E. Morris Institute for Justice, Arizona, Women4Change, Women's Achievement Network and Development Alliance, Women & Girls Foundation, Women Employed, Women of Reform Judaism, Women's Center for Education and Career Advancement, Women's Employment Rights Clinic Golden Gate University, Women's Foundation of California, Women's Fund of Greater Chattanooga, Women's Fund of Rhode Island, Women's Law Project, Women's March, Women's Rights and Empowerment Network, Work Equity, Workers' Center of Central New York, Worker Justice Center of New York, Worksafe, Workplace Fairness, YWCA Greater Cincinnati, YWCA Mahoning Valley, YWCA McLean County, YWCA New Hampshire, YWCA Northwestern Illinois, YWCA of Van Wert County, YWCA USA, ZERO TO THREE.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I want to thank Mr. NADLER and Mr. KATKO for their leadership on this legislation.

I urge my colleagues to support the bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 2694, the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act.

House Republicans have long supported protections in Federal law for all workers, but especially pregnant workers, and we believe employers should provide reasonable accommodations for pregnant workers, empowering them to achieve their highest potential.

I speak not only as a concerned Congresswoman on this issue but also as a mother and a grandmother. Discrimination of any type should not be tolerated, and no one should ever be denied an opportunity because of unlawful discrimination.

However, there are already important protections under Federal law to

prevent workplace discrimination, including Federal laws that rightfully protect pregnant workers.

Take the Pregnancy Discrimination Act and the Americans with Disabilities Act, for example. These Federal laws ensure workers are not being unlawfully discriminated against and receive reasonable accommodations related to pregnancy, childbirth, or related medical conditions.

My Republican colleagues and I agree with the underlying goal of H.R. 2694. That is why Republican Members on the Education and Labor Committee negotiated in good faith with Chairman SCOTT to make important and necessary improvements to the bill, and I thank Chairman SCOTT for his willingness to do so.

H.R. 2694, as introduced, did not require a pregnant worker, in order to be eligible for an accommodation, to be able to perform the essential functions of the job with a reasonable accommodation. This is a sensible provision now included in the bill with additional language that a temporary limitation, which prevents performance of an essential function, may qualify for a reasonable accommodation.

Further, a definition of "known limitations" related to pregnancy, childbirth, or related medical conditions was also initially excluded, but the bill now includes such a definition and a requirement that employees communicate the known limitation to the employer. This provision will help workers and their employers understand their rights and responsibilities more clearly.

Additionally, the original version of H.R. 2694 appeared to allow employees a unilateral veto over offered accommodations, but the bill now clarifies that reasonable accommodations will typically be determined through a balance and interactive dialogue between workers and employers, similar to the process implemented under the ADA.

The bill also now includes a provision ensuring that if an employer makes a good faith effort to determine a reasonable accommodation through the interactive process with the employee, the employer is not liable for damages.

Finally, H.R. 2694, as introduced, did not limit its application to employers with 15 or more employees, as do title VII of the Civil Rights Act and the ADA. The bill now includes a 15-employee threshold.

These bipartisan changes were considered and incorporated in the bill passed out of the committee in January. Unfortunately, despite the necessary improvements made to the original bill, an important issue remains unresolved. Namely, the legislation before us today does not currently include a longstanding provision from the Civil Rights Act that protects religious organizations from being forced to make employment decisions that conflict with their faith.

To address this omission, Republicans offered an amendment to include

this narrow but longstanding provision when the bill was considered by the committee. The Civil Rights Act protection, which already exists under current law, ensures religious organizations are not forced to make employment decisions that conflict with their faith. Unfortunately, committee Democrats defeated this amendment on a party-line vote.

The purpose of America's non-discrimination laws, and the agencies enforcing them, is to give all Americans equal opportunities to succeed. That being said, overzealous government intervention often causes more harm than good. In the case of H.R. 2694, by failing to include a longstanding Civil Rights Act provision, we are doing just that. As it is currently written, H.R. 2694 will create legal risks for religious organizations and their religiously backed employment decisions.

Last year, a Democrat-invited witness at the committee hearing on H.R. 2694 highlighted Kentucky's recently enacted pregnancy accommodation law as a template for Congress to follow.

Madam Speaker, I would like to read that again. Last year, a Democrat-invited witness at the committee hearing on H.R. 2694 highlighted Kentucky's recently enacted pregnancy accommodation law as a template for Congress to follow. Kentucky's law includes a religious organization protection very similar to the one found in the Civil Rights Act and incorporated in the Republican-sponsored amendment.

At least 16 States and the District of Columbia in their pregnancy discrimination or pregnancy accommodation laws also include a provision similar to the Civil Rights Act religious organization protection. Even if certain Members believe including such a provision in H.R. 2694 is somehow unnecessary, it would do no harm to include the protection and, in doing so, address the concerns I have raised. I remain perplexed why Chairman NADLER and Chairman SCOTT continue to oppose the current law protection.

The First Amendment guarantees all Americans the freedom of religion, and for over 240 years, Supreme Court decisions and laws written by Congress have maintained strong protections for religious liberty. H.R. 2694 should do so as well.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), the sponsor of this legislation and the chairman of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, pregnancy is not a disability, but sometimes pregnant workers need an easy fix, such as a stool or an extra bathroom break, to stay on the job.

These accommodations are short in duration and typically cost very little to provide, but they can mean the difference between keeping your job or putting your pregnancy at risk. But for

as long as women have been in the workforce, instead of being accommodated, they have been fired or forced out on leave when they become pregnant.

These policies have become even more pronounced during the COVID-19 pandemic. We have seen a wave of employers firing pregnant workers rather than finding ways for them to safely return to work.

These policies, as they too often do, are falling disproportionately on women of color and low-wage, hourly workers who suddenly find themselves without a paycheck, without health insurance, and pregnant in the middle of a global pandemic.

The bipartisan Pregnant Workers Fairness Act will fix how pregnancy accommodation is treated under the Pregnancy Discrimination Act.

Courts have said that employers must provide an accommodation to a pregnant employee if they accommodate nonpregnant employees similar in their inability or ability to work. That means pregnant workers must have perfect knowledge of the medical and employment histories of every other employee in their workplace, which is nearly impossible.

In fact, a recent study by A Better Balance found that in over two-thirds of cases, courts denied an accommodation because pregnant workers could not meet this test.

I include in the RECORD a letter in support of this bill from A Better Balance.

SEPTEMBER 11, 2020.

Re The Pregnant Workers Fairness Act (H.R. 2694).

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of A Better Balance, I write to express our strong support for the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act ("PWFA"; H.R. 2694). This legislation will ensure pregnant workers, particularly low-income workers and women of color, are not forced to choose between their paycheck and a healthy pregnancy. The bill will require employers to provide reasonable accommodations for pregnant workers unless doing so would impose an undue hardship on the employer, similar to the accommodation standard already in place for workers with disabilities.

Nearly forty-two years after the passage of the Pregnancy Discrimination Act, pregnant workers still face rampant discrimination on the job and treatment as second-class citizens, as I explained in detail in my Congressional testimony before the House Education & Labor Civil Rights and Human Services Subcommittee in October 2019 as well as A Better Balance's May 2019 report, *Long Overdue*. We urge you to support healthy pregnancies, protect pregnant workers' livelihoods, and end the systemic devaluation of women of color and vote YES on the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act and NO on any Motion to Recommit in connection with this legislation.

A Better Balance is a national non-profit legal organization that advocates for women and families so they can care for themselves and their loved ones without sacrificing their financial security. Since our founding, we have seen day in and day out the injustices that pregnant workers continue to face because they need modest, temporary pregnancy accommodations and have led the

movement at the federal, state, and local level to ensure pregnant workers can receive the accommodations they need to remain healthy and working. As I wrote in my 2012 Op-Ed in *The New York Times* "Pregnant and Pushed Out of Job," which sparked the PWFA's introduction in Congress, "For many women, a choice between working under unhealthy conditions and not working is no choice at all."

Through our free, national legal helpline, we have spoken with hundreds of pregnant workers, disproportionately women of color, who have been fired or forced out for needing accommodations, often stripping them of their health insurance when they need it most, driving them into poverty, and at times, even homelessness. Other women we have assisted were denied accommodations but needed to keep working to support themselves and their families and faced devastating health consequences, including miscarriage, preterm birth, birth complications, and other maternal health effects.

In the past few months alone, we have heard from women across the country who continue to face termination or are forced out for needing pregnancy accommodations. A retail store employee from Missouri who is pregnant and due in November 2020 called us after she was forced to quit her job because her employer refused to let her carry a water bottle on the retail floor even though she was experiencing severe dehydration due to hot temperatures in the store this summer. A massage therapist from Pennsylvania called us in June 2020 requesting to return to work on a part-time basis on the advice of her OB-GYN after experiencing cramping in her uterus. Her employer responded that they would not accommodate her and cut off all communication with her after that, forcing her out of work just three months before she was due to give birth. A nurse we spoke with from Pennsylvania who was six months pregnant requested to avoid assignment to the COVID-19 unit. Though her hospital was not overwhelmed by the pandemic, had many empty beds, and other workers were being sent home, her employer refused her request and made heartless comments mocking her need for accommodation. She decided not to jeopardize her health and lost pay for missing those shifts as a result. She also worried about being called to the COVID unit shift constantly.

Without the law on their side, these women had little legal recourse because they lived in a state without a state-level pregnant workers fairness law. On the other hand, when a pregnant worker in upstate New York—where a state pregnancy accommodation is already in place—requested to telecommute in June 2020 due to underlying health issues, she was quickly able to engage her employer in a good faith interactive process and her employer approved her request, allowing her to stay attached to the workforce and maintain a healthy pregnancy amidst the pandemic. The COVID-19 pandemic has certainly shone a spotlight on the critical need for clarity around pregnancy accommodations but let us be clear: the need for this law preceded our current public health crisis and will remain in place beyond the pandemic.

CURRENT FEDERAL LAW IS FAILING PREGNANT WORKERS: THE PREGNANT WORKERS FAIRNESS ACT IS THE SOLUTION

Gaps in federal law mean many pregnant workers in need of accommodation are without legal protection in non-PWFA states. As we explained in our report *Long Overdue*, "While the P[regnancy] D[iscrimination] A[ct] bans pregnancy discrimination, it requires employers to make accommodations only if they accommodate other workers, or

if an employee unearths evidence of discrimination. The Americans with Disabilities Act requires employers to provide reasonable accommodations to workers with disabilities, which can include some pregnancy-related disabilities. However, pregnancy itself is not a disability, leaving a gap wherein many employers are in no way obligated to accommodate pregnant workers in need of immediate relief to stay healthy and on the job.”

Original analysis we conducted for Long Overdue found that even though the 2015 Supreme Court *Young v. UPS* case set a new legal standard for evaluating pregnancy accommodation cases under the Pregnancy Discrimination Act, in over two-thirds of cases decided since *Young* employers were permitted to deny pregnancy workers accommodations under the Pregnancy Discrimination Act. That statistic, as devastating as it is, does not account for the vast majority of pregnant workers who do not have the resources to vindicate their rights in court. Beyond being resource strapped, most pregnant workers we hear from do not have the desire to engage in time-consuming and stressful litigation. They want to be able to receive an accommodation so they can continue working at the jobs they care about while maintaining a healthy pregnancy.

THE PREGNANT WORKERS FAIRNESS ACT IS A CRITICAL ECONOMIC SECURITY, MATERNAL HEALTH, AND RACIAL JUSTICE MEASURE

Pregnant workers that are fired or pushed out for needing accommodations face significant economic hardship. In addition to losing their livelihood, many of these workers lose their health benefits at a time when they need them most, forcing them to switch providers, delay medical care, and/or face staggering health care costs associated with pregnancy and childbirth. We worked with one woman who was eight months pregnant and whose hours were cut after she needed an accommodation which meant she also lost her health insurance. As a result, she asked her doctor if they could induce her labor early so that she would not be left facing exorbitant medical bills. In the long term, being pushed out for needing pregnancy accommodations also exacerbates the gender wage gap, as it means losing out on many types of benefits such as 401K and retirement contributions, social security contributions, pensions, as well as opportunities for promotion and growth.

Most pregnant workers may not need accommodations. However, for those who do, reasonable accommodations can avert significant health risks. For instance, in a Health Impact Assessment of state level pregnant workers fairness legislation, the Louisville, Kentucky Department of Public Health and Wellness concluded, “Accommodating pregnant workers, upon their request, is critical for reducing poor health outcomes . . . Improving birth outcomes makes a sustainable impact for a lifetime of better health.” The report noted that those poor health outcomes can include miscarriage, preterm birth, low birth weight, preeclampsia (a serious condition and leading cause of maternal mortality), among other issues. According to the March of Dimes, in the U.S., nearly 1 in 10 babies are born pre-term and the preterm birth rate among Black women is nearly fifty percent higher than it is for all other women. Preterm birth/low birthweight is a leading cause of infant mortality in America. The Pregnant Workers Fairness Act is a key measure to reduce poor maternal and infant health outcomes.

Pregnancy accommodations are one of myriad solutions needed to address the Black maternal health crisis. Systemic racism

has led to the shameful reality that Black women in this country are three to four times likelier to die from pregnancy-related causes than white women, and Black babies are more than two times as likely to die in the first year of life than white babies. At the same time, we know Black women also face devastating health consequences when they are unable to obtain needed pregnancy accommodations to maintain their health and the health of their pregnancies. When Tasha Murell, a Black woman who worked at a warehouse in Tennessee, received a doctor’s note saying she needed a lifting restriction and complained of extreme stomach pain, she was forced to continue lifting on the job. One day, she told a supervisor she was in pain and asked to leave early. Her manager said no. Tragically, she had a miscarriage the next day. Tasha was not alone. Three more of her co-workers, also Black, miscarried after supervisors dismissed their requests for reprieve from heavy lifting. As Cherisse Scott, CEO of Memphis-based Sister Reach, explained “It doesn’t surprise me that this is the culture of that workplace. I think it’s important to look at the fact that since we arrived here in chains, we [African-American women] were regarded as producers to fuel a labor force that couldn’t care less for us. . .” The Pregnant Workers Fairness Act will ensure pregnant workers and their health are valued and that Black mothers, especially, are not treated as expendable on the job.

THE PREGNANT WORKERS FAIRNESS ACT IS A BIPARTISAN BILL THAT HAS THE SUPPORT OF THIS COUNTRY’S LARGEST BUSINESS GROUPS

The Pregnant Workers Fairness Act is not a partisan bill. Not only does it have strong bipartisan support in Congress, but thirty states and five cities including Tennessee, Kentucky, South Carolina, West Virginia, Illinois, Nebraska, and Utah already have laws requiring employers to provide accommodations for pregnant employees. All of the laws passed in recent years are highly similar to the federal legislation, and all passed with bipartisan, and often unanimous, support. Many, including Tennessee’s and Kentucky’s, were championed by Republican legislators.

Pregnant workers are a vital part of our economy. Three-quarters of women will be both pregnant and employed at some point during their lives. Ensuring pregnant workers can remain healthy and attached to the workforce is an issue of critical importance, especially as this country faces an unprecedented economic crisis. That is why leading business groups like the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, Society for Human Resources Management, many major corporations, and local chambers around the country including, Greater Louisville Inc., one of Kentucky’s leading chambers of commerce, support this measure. The PWF Act will provide much needed clarity in the law which will lead to informal and upfront resolutions between employers and employees and help prevent problems before they start. Furthermore, accommodations are short term and low cost. The Pregnant Workers Fairness Act will help employers retain valuable employees and reduce high turnover and training costs. The reasonable accommodation framework is also borrowed from the American with Disabilities framework so employers are already familiar with the standard. Furthermore, keeping pregnant workers employed saves taxpayers money in the form of unemployment insurance and other public benefits.

THE PREGNANT WORKERS FAIRNESS ACT USES A FAMILIAR FRAMEWORK THAT PROVIDES KEY PROTECTIONS TO PREGNANT WORKERS AND CLARITY TO EMPLOYERS

The Pregnant Workers Fairness Act has several key provisions that will address the inequality pregnant workers continue to face at work. Employers, including private employers with fifteen or more employees, will be required to provide reasonable accommodations to qualified employees absent undue hardship on the employer. Both the term “reasonable accommodation” and “undue hardship” have the same definition as outlined in the American with Disabilities Act. Similar to the Americans with Disabilities Act, employers and employees must engage in an interactive process in order to determine an appropriate accommodation. In order to prevent employers from pushing pregnant employees out on leave when they need an accommodation, the bill specifies that an employer cannot require a pregnant employee to take leave if another reasonable accommodation can be provided. The bill also includes clear anti-retaliation language such that employers cannot punish pregnant workers for requesting or using an accommodation. This is critical as many pregnant workers often do not ask for accommodations because they are afraid they will face repercussions for requesting or needing an accommodation.

Critically, the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act is also very clear that a pregnant worker need not have a disability as defined by the Americans with Disabilities Act in order to merit accommodations under the law. Rather, the bill indicates that pregnant workers with “known limitations related to pregnancy, childbirth, and related medical conditions” are entitled to reasonable accommodations. “Known limitations” is defined as a “physical or mental condition related to, affected by, or arising out of pregnancy, childbirth, or related medical conditions that the employee or employee’s representative has communicated to the employer whether or not such condition meets the definition of disability” as set forth in the Americans with Disabilities Act. This addresses two of the challenges the Americans with Disabilities Act has presented for pregnant workers: first, because pregnancy is not itself a disability under current disability law, a pregnant worker who has no complications but seeks an accommodation in order to avoid a complication, will not be able to get an accommodation under the Americans with Disabilities Act. Second, even though Congress expanded the Americans with Disabilities Act in 2008, courts have interpreted the ADA Amendments Act in a way that did little to expand coverage even for those pregnant workers with serious health complications. As one court concluded in 2018, “Although the 2008 amendments broadened the ADA’s definition of disability, these changes only have had a modest impact when applied to pregnancy-related conditions.”

Now, more than ever, the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act is an urgent maternal health, racial justice, and economic security measure to keep pregnant workers healthy and earning a paycheck. We cannot delay justice and fairness for pregnant workers any longer. For the sake of this country’s pregnant workers and our nation’s families, we implore Congress to put aside its many differences and pass this legislation with a strong bipartisan vote. We ask every Member of Congress to vote YES on the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act. It is long overdue.

Sincerely,

DINA BAKST,
Co-Founder & Co-President,
A Better Balance.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, that is why the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act moves away from proving discrimination and creates an affirmative right to accommodation. Using the framework and language of the Americans with Disabilities Act, the bill requires employers to provide reasonable accommodations to pregnant workers, as long as the accommodation does not impose an undue hardship on the employer.

Courts know exactly how to interpret that language. Employers know exactly what their responsibilities will be. But most importantly, women will have the certainty they can safely stay on the job.

That is why over 200 organizations have endorsed the legislation and why 30 States have passed pregnancy accommodations laws similar to the PWFA.

Providing reasonable accommodations to pregnant workers helps businesses, workers, and families. Passing this bill is long overdue.

I thank Mr. KATKO for working with his Conference on this bill and Chairman SCOTT, Chairwoman BONAMICI, Eunice Ikene, and the committee staff for shepherding the bill to the floor today.

I urge a "yes" vote.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. KATKO), the lead Republican sponsor of the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act.

Mr. KATKO. Madam Speaker, I am a Republican, and I rise in strong support of the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act.

I was proud to join Chairman NADLER and Representatives HERRERA BEUTLER, MCBATH, and SCOTT in introducing this bill.

Simply put, no mother-to-be or mother in this country should have to choose between being a parent and keeping her job.

Unfortunately, current Federal law lacks adequate protections to ensure pregnant workers are able to remain healthy in the workplace. With 30 States having already passed laws to provide these protections, the need and support for a Federal standard is clear.

This bipartisan bill provides pregnant workers with an affirmative right to reasonable accommodations in the workplace, while creating a clear and navigable standard for employees to follow.

These accommodations, as simple as providing an employee with extra restroom breaks or a stool to sit on, should not be controversial.

The arguments against this bill made by some Members of my own party are based on inaccuracies and wrongfully detract from the importance of this commonsense policy.

Reflecting the widespread support for this legislation, the bill has received numerous endorsements from the busi-

ness community, as well as over 180 women's health, labor, and civil rights organizations.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter of support from a coalition of business groups, including the Chamber of Commerce, the Society for Human Resource Management, and the National Retail Federation.

SEPTEMBER 14, 2020.

TO MEMBERS OF THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES: We urge Congress to pass the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act (H.R. 2694). This bill would provide pregnant employees with important workplace protections while also making sure employers have clear and flexible options to ensure pregnant employees can remain at work for as long as they wish to do so.

The Pregnant Workers Fairness Act (PWFA), as passed by the House Education and Labor Committee, is a balanced approach that clarifies an employer's obligation to accommodate the known limitations of employees and job applicants that accompany pregnancy. The PWFA uses an interactive, reasonable accommodation process similar to the Americans with Disabilities Act and specifies a pregnant employee may take leave only after the employer and employee have exhausted the possibility of other reasonable accommodations.

This bipartisan bill is a strong reminder that through good faith negotiations, legislative solutions to important workplace questions and problems can be found. We believe that Congress should pass the PWFA with no changes.

Sincerely,

H.R. POLICY ASSOCIATION,
INTERNATIONAL FRANCHISE
ASSOCIATION,
NATIONAL RETAIL
FEDERATION,
RETAIL INDUSTRY LEADERS
ASSOCIATION,
SOCIETY FOR HUMAN
RESOURCE MANAGEMENT,
U.S. CHAMBER OF
COMMERCE.

Mr. KATKO. Madam Speaker, an excerpt from that says that this bipartisan bill is a strong reminder that through good faith negotiations, legislative solutions to important workplace questions and problems can be found.

It is high time for our Nation to provide women in the workforce with the basic rights and respect they deserve. I strongly urge my colleagues to support passage of this important legislation.

□ 1115

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, at the sole subcommittee hearing on H.R. 2694 and at the committee markup, Democrat members encouraged the committee to follow the examples of States that had enacted pregnancy accommodation laws. However, the majority of these States have laws that are different from H.R. 2694 because they do include important protections for religious organizations.

At least 16 States and the District of Columbia have pregnancy discrimination or pregnancy accommodations laws that include a religious organization protection similar to section 702 of

the Civil Rights Act. The States include Arkansas, Hawaii, Iowa, Maine, Nebraska, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Wisconsin, and Wyoming. It is a broad range of States in the country.

Our attitude is the States can do this, and we already have very, very good protections at the Federal level. Unless we are going to follow the example of the States and include this very important section 702 of the Civil Rights Act, then maybe we should leave this up to the States. We should be following their example and put that provision in this bill.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, section 702 is not repealed by this law, and according to the Congressional Research Service, which studied this issue, all in all, State statutes providing for pregnancy accommodation generally incorporate generalized longstanding religious exemptions. In most cases, exemptions allow religious institutions to favor co-religionists. States typically do not enact separate or specialized religious exemptions for pregnancy accommodation laws.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI), the chair of the Subcommittee on Civil Rights and Human Services.

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2694, the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act.

As a mom and a policymaker, I know how important it is to protect the economic security of pregnant workers and working families; yet 41 years after the passage of the Pregnancy Discrimination Act, Federal law falls short of guaranteeing that all pregnant workers have reasonable workplace accommodations to protect their health and the health of their baby.

Reasonable accommodations can range from providing seating, water, and light duty to excusing pregnant workers from tasks that involve dangerous substances. But when pregnant workers do not have access to the accommodations they need, they are at risk of losing their job, being denied a promotion, or not being hired in the first place.

Unfortunately, pregnant workers suffer workplace discrimination at alarming rates. According to a survey from the National Partnership for Women and Families, more than 60 percent of the women have experienced pregnancy discrimination on the job. Women of color are overrepresented in low-wage, physically demanding jobs and are, therefore, disproportionately harmed by a lack of access to reasonable accommodation.

Last year, I chaired an Education and Labor Committee hearing on pregnancy discrimination. We heard very

compelling testimony demonstrating that far too many pregnant workers are denied access to reasonable workplace accommodations despite the existing Federal law providing for equal treatment on the job.

Now my home State of Oregon is helping to lead the way by passing bipartisan legislation that requires reasonable accommodations for pregnant workers. The new law has protected pregnant women and also provided certainty to the business community. But we need to make sure that all pregnant workers, regardless of where they live, can access the protections they need to stay safe and healthy in the workplace.

The bipartisan Pregnant Workers Fairness Act is our opportunity to address pregnancy discrimination and protect the health, well-being, and economic security of pregnant and parenting workers and their families. By clarifying the right of pregnant workers to fair treatment in the workplace, we will finally guarantee that pregnant workers get the accommodations they need without facing fear of discrimination or retaliation.

Madam Speaker, I thank Chairman SCOTT and Chairman NADLER for their leadership. I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan bill.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from the National Women's Law Center in support of this legislation.

SEPTEMBER 11, 2020.

DEAR MEMBER OF CONGRESS: On behalf of the National Women's Law Center, we urge you to pass the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act (H.R. 2694) and vote no on any motion to recommit. The National Women's Law Center ("the Center") has worked for over 45 years to advance and protect women's equality and opportunity—and since its founding has fought for the rights of pregnant women in the workplace. For the last eight years, the Center has been a leader in advocating for the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act, and for pregnancy accommodation protections in states across the country. The Pregnant Workers Fairness Act would clarify the law for employers and employees alike, requiring employers to make reasonable accommodations for limitations arising out of pregnancy, childbirth, and related medical conditions, just as they already do for disabilities. Providing accommodations ensures that women can work safely while pregnant instead of being pushed out of work at a time when their families need their income the most.

Even before the COVID-19 pandemic, pregnant workers were all too often denied medically needed accommodations—including simple accommodations like a stool to sit on during a long shift or a bottle of water at a workstation. As the United States enters the sixth month of COVID-19 lockdown, the need for clarity regarding employers' obligations to provide accommodations for pregnant workers has only increased. Across the country, as new information emerges about the risks COVID-19 poses during pregnancy, pregnant workers are urgently seeking, and far too often being denied, accommodations like proper personal protective equipment, telework, moving to a less crowded work area or changing start times so as not to risk riding public transit during peak hours. The Pregnant Workers Fairness Act uses an already-familiar framework modeled on the

Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) to ensure that when such a request is made, employers and employees can engage in an interactive process to determine whether the employee's pregnancy related limitations can be reasonably accommodated without an undue hardship to the employer. This will help ensure that employees are not forced to choose between a paycheck and a healthy pregnancy.

The Pregnant Workers Fairness Act will close gaps and clarify ambiguities in the law that have left too many pregnant workers unprotected for too long. The Pregnancy Discrimination Act (PDA), passed in 1978, guarantees the right not to be treated adversely at work because of pregnancy, childbirth, or related medical conditions, and the right to be treated at least as well as other employees "not so affected but similar in their ability or inability to work." Unfortunately, many courts interpreted the PDA narrowly and allowed employers to refuse to accommodate workers with medical needs arising out of pregnancy, even when they routinely accommodated other physical limitations. In *Young v. UPS*, the Supreme Court held that when an employer accommodates workers who are similar to pregnant workers in their ability to work, it cannot refuse to accommodate pregnant workers who need it simply because it "is more expensive or less convenient" to accommodate pregnant women too. The *Young* decision was an important victory for pregnant workers, but the standard it set out still left many important questions unanswered and created uncertainty for employers and employees about when exactly the PDA requires pregnancy accommodations. In addition, the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requires employers to make reasonable accommodations for employees with disabilities. However, courts have consistently held that pregnancy is not a disability. The Pregnant Workers Fairness Act would fill the holes left in these protections with a common-ground and common-sense approach that ensures pregnant workers are accommodated when the accommodations they need are reasonable and do not pose an undue hardship to employers.

Accommodating pregnant workers is not only good for working women and families, it is good for business. Moreover, today, women make up about half the workforce. More women are continuing to work while they are pregnant, through later stages of pregnancy. For example, two-thirds of women who had their first child between 2006 and 2008 worked during pregnancy, and 88 percent of these first-time mothers worked into their last trimester. When employers accommodate pregnant workers, businesses reap the benefits of avoiding the costs of turnover and keeping experienced employees on the job. And since pregnancy is temporary, pregnancy accommodations are, by definition, short-term; many of these accommodations are low and no cost.

The time is now to pass the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act. Thirty states and the District of Columbia have enacted provisions explicitly granting pregnant employees the right to accommodations at work, from Massachusetts, New York, and California, to South Carolina, Utah, Nebraska, West Virginia and Tennessee. Millions of pregnant workers have benefited from these protections, but a pregnant employee's ability to work safely should not depend on where she lives.

We strongly urge you to support pregnant workers by voting for the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act and rejecting any motion to recommit. If you have any questions, please contact me.

Sincerely,

EMILY J. MARTIN,

*Vice President for
Education & Work-
place Justice, Na-
tional Women's Law
Center.*

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, at the Rules Committee hearing on H.R. 2694 earlier this week, the bill's sponsor, Chairman NADLER, said it is not necessary to incorporate into H.R. 2694 the Civil Rights Act's provision that protects religious organizations. He stated that because H.R. 2694 does not repeal this provision, it will still be effective if H.R. 2694 becomes law.

Color me skeptical; I strongly disagree. H.R. 2694 will create legal jeopardy for religious organizations, as I have previously stated.

But for the sake of argument, let's assume the provision is superfluous. What would be the harm in including the Civil Rights Act provision in H.R. 2694? At worst, the provision will be duplicative with the Civil Rights Act, causing no harm to workers or employers.

Let's remember that the Americans with Disability Act of 1990, better known as the ADA, includes a religious organization protection similar to the one in the Civil Rights Act of 1964. The ADA provision has caused no harm.

My conclusion is that the key sponsors of H.R. 2694 are saying the quiet part out loud in their opposition to the religious organization protection in the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

At the Rules Committee hearing this week, Chairman SCOTT said the religious organization protection should not be included in H.R. 2694 because it is overinclusive and would provide too much protection. Is the chairman saying that the existing Civil Rights Act protection for religious organizations should also be repealed? Again, this is a provision that has been in law for 55 years.

As I have stated previously, the long-standing Civil Rights Act religious organization protection should be added to H.R. 2694. At worst, it would do no harm, and, at best, it will prevent a religious organization from being required to violate its faith.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. ADAMS), the chair of the Subcommittee on Workforce Protections.

Ms. ADAMS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his incredible support as chair of the Education and Labor Committee.

Madam Speaker, over 40 years ago, after the Pregnancy Discrimination Act provided civil rights protections to pregnant people, it is shameful that we still must address this issue today.

Every year, roughly 250,000 people in America are denied basic accommodations to continue their work once pregnant; and when these simple temporary

adjustments in their work activities are denied, many face being fired or are forced to take unpaid leave simply to protect their health and the health of their pregnancy.

This discrimination can take many forms, but its impacts can be deadly. And, of course, these burdens fall disproportionately on people and women of color who are overrepresented in low-wage jobs that are physically demanding, lack adequate workforce protections, or both. This is also one of the key reasons why I founded the Black Maternal Health Caucus with Congresswoman LAUREN UNDERWOOD last year.

I am pleased that the House is taking up the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act today, which will create a clear set of rules for employers to follow that requires them to provide accommodations for pregnant workers to continue to work and support their families.

So today we are sending the message that nowhere in America—nowhere in America—should you have to worry about the health of your pregnancy because your employer won't accommodate you. Today we will tell millions of Americans that pregnancy won't prevent them from taking their dreams as far as they can take them.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from the Maternal Health Coalition, a group of public health professionals, clinicians, and maternal health organizations outlining their support for this legislation.

SEPTEMBER 11, 2020.

Re Support the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: As organizations dedicated to ending racial injustice and systemic racism, including dismantling the racism that contributes to this country's Black maternal health crisis, we write in strong support of the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act (H.R. 2694). Congress must do all it can to end the prejudice Black pregnant workers and pregnant workers of color continue to face in the workplace. This includes making sure when pregnant workers voice a need for reasonable accommodations that those needs are met rather than penalized and that the workplace is an environment where pregnant workers of color do not fear asking for accommodations.

The Black Maternal Health crisis remains frighteningly persistent and requires immediate attention and multi-faceted solutions. Black women experience maternal mortality rates three to four times higher than white women. The circumstances surrounding this alarming statistic can often be attributed to a lack of access to care, including due to inflexible workplaces, and deep biases in racial understanding. Various social determinants such as health, education, and economic status drastically influence the outcomes of pregnancy for Black women leading to severe pregnancy-related complications. As the Black Mamas Matter Alliance has pointed out "Health is determined in part by our access to social and economic opportunities, the resources and supports that are available in the places where we live, and the safety of our workplaces . . . however, disparities in these conditions of daily life give some people better opportunities to be healthy than others." Black pregnant workers along with Latinx and immigrant women are disproportionately likely to work in physically de-

manding jobs that may lead to workers needing modest accommodations to ensure a healthy pregnancy. Too often, however, those requests are refused or ignored, forcing pregnant workers of color to disproportionately contend with unsafe working conditions.

Black mothers have among the highest labor force participation rates in the country and 80 percent of Black mothers are their family's primary breadwinner." Yet, historically, Black women have been exploited in the workplace, and that exploitation continues to this day. Though Black women only comprise 14.3 percent of the population, nearly thirty percent of pregnancy discrimination complaints are filed by Black women." This is because of the multiple forms of discrimination Black workers and other workers of color too often face in the workplace. As scholar Nina Banks has noted, "The legacy of black women's employment in industries that lack worker protections has continued today since black women are concentrated in low-paying, inflexible service occupations ..." Black women in low wage jobs working during pregnancy face little support from employers when safeguards do not address pregnancy related accommodations. Faced with the threat of termination, loss of health insurance, or other benefits, Black pregnant people are often forced to keep working which can compromise their health and the health of their pregnancy.

The Pregnant Workers Fairness Act will positively impact Black women's health and economic security. When Black pregnant people must continue working without accommodations, they risk miscarriage, excessive bleeding, and other devastating health consequences. Black women have the highest incidence of preterm birth and yet we know that workplace accommodations such as reducing heavy lifting, bending, or excessive standing can help prevent preterm birth, the leading cause of infant mortality in this country.

Black women are also at higher risk of preeclampsia, which is one of the leading causes of maternal mortality. We are still learning about how to prevent this dangerous medical condition, yet we know that simply allowing workers to take bathroom breaks can prevent urinary tract infections which are "strongly associated with preeclampsia." Similarly, ensuring pregnant workers can drink a sufficient amount of water can also help pregnant workers maintain their blood pressure, which is critically important since hypertensive disorders (high blood pressure) are also a leading cause of maternal morbidity and mortality. By putting a national pregnancy accommodation standard in place, the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act has the potential to improve some of the most serious health consequences Black pregnant people experience. Furthermore, the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act will help remove one of the many barriers Black pregnant people face at work by ensuring they are afforded immediate relief under the law, and not thrown into financial dire straits for needing pregnancy accommodations.

Congress has the opportunity to pass legislation to support rather than subjugate Black pregnant workers and workers of color. We urge every member of the House of Representatives to support the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act and by extension, the health and economic wellbeing of Black pregnant workers and pregnant workers of color.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,

Black Mamas Matter Alliance, A Better Balance, American Civil Liberties Union,

American College of Nurse-Midwives, Association of Maternal & Child Health Programs, Association of Women's Health, Obstetric and Neonatal Nurses, California WIC Association, California Breastfeeding Coalition, Children's HealthWatch, Center for American Progress, Center for Reproductive Rights, Community Catalyst, Families USA, Healthy Mothers, Healthy Babies Coalition of Georgia, Healthy Women, Human Rights Watch, In Our Own Voice: National Black Women's Reproductive Justice Agenda, Majaica, LLC, March for Moms, March of Dimes, National Asian Pacific American Women's Forum (NAPAWF), National Black Nurses Association, National Birth Equity Collaborative, National Institute for Reproductive Health, National Network of Abortion Funds.

National Partnership for Women & Families, National Women's Health Network, National Women's Law Center, Nurse-Family Partnership, Nutrition First—WIC Association of Washington State, National WIC Association, Ohio Black Maternal Health Caucus, Pennsylvania WIC Association, Perinatal Health Equity Foundation, Physicians for Reproductive Health, Planned Parenthood Federation of America, Raising Women's Voices for the Health Care We Need, Shriver Center on Poverty Law, SisterLove Inc., Sister Reach, Society for Maternal-Fetal Medicine, Tara Hansen Foundation, The Afiya Center, URGE: Unite for Reproductive & Gender Equity, U.S. Breastfeeding Committee, WIC Association of NYS, Inc., Wisconsin WIC Association, YWCA of Greater Atlanta, ZERO TO THREE.

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

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

Ms. WILD. Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from business leaders in support of the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act. These businesses range from Patagonia to Chobani to Mastercard to Johnson & Johnson.

SEPTEMBER 15, 2020.

DEAR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS: Women's labor force participation is critical to the strength of our companies, the growth of our economy and the financial security of most modern families. The private sector and our nation's elected leaders must work together to ensure that working women and families have the protections and opportunities they need to participate fully and equally in the workplace. Twenty leading companies from across states and industries have come together in support of pregnant workers and their families by calling on Congress to pass H.R. 2694, the bipartisan Pregnant Workers Fairness Act, without delay.

More than 40 years ago, Congress passed the Pregnancy Discrimination Act of 1978, which made it illegal to discriminate against most working people on the basis of pregnancy, childbirth or related medical conditions. Since that time, 30 states and the District of Columbia now require certain employers to provide accommodations to pregnant employees at work. It's now time to clarify and strengthen existing federal protections for pregnant workers by passing the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act. This bill would ensure that pregnant workers who need reasonable accommodations can receive them and continue to do their jobs.

As a business community, we strive to create more equitable workplaces and better

support pregnant workers and their families every day. We urge the passage of the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act as an important advancement toward ensuring the health, safety and productivity of our modern workforce—and the workforce of tomorrow.

Signed:

Adobe, San Jose, California; Amalgamated Bank, New York, New York; BASF Corporation, Florham Park, New Jersey; Care.com, Inc., Waltham, Massachusetts; Chobani, Norwich, New York; Cigna Corp., Bloomfield, Connecticut; Expedia Group, Seattle, Washington; Facebook, Menlo Park, California; Gap Inc., San Francisco, California; H&M USA, New York, New York; ICM Partners, Los Angeles, California; Johnson & Johnson, New Brunswick, New Jersey; L'Oréal USA, New York, New York; Levi Strauss & Co., San Francisco, California; Mastercard, Purchase, New York; Microsoft Corporation, Redmond, Washington; Navient, LLC., Wilmington, Delaware; Patagonia, Ventura, California; PayPal, San Jose, California; Postmates, San Francisco, California; Salesforce, San Francisco, California; Spotify, New York, New York; Square, Inc., San Francisco, California; U.S. Women's Chamber of Commerce, Washington, District of Columbia.

The Sustainable Food Policy Alliance:

Danone North America PBC, White Plains, New York; Mars, Incorporated, McLean, Virginia; Nestle USA, Arlington, Virginia; Unilever United States, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey.

Ms. WILD. Madam Speaker, as a former lawyer who worked long hours during two pregnancies, it is outrageous to me that, in 2020, 100 years after women finally secured the power to vote, current law does not explicitly guarantee every pregnant worker the right to a reasonable accommodation at work.

I had the luxury of a desk and chair and an office door that closed—not all workers do.

Currently, in order to get an accommodation, a pregnant worker must show that other nonpregnant employees are similarly accommodated. It is beyond absurd. Because the challenges of pregnancy are so unique, it is often difficult to find comparable nonpregnant workers who received similar accommodations.

Fatigue, vomiting, back pain, and frequent urination are more than just nuisances; these are symptoms that can make it impossible to work without accommodation. And that is without mentioning the more serious conditions related to pregnancy.

The Pregnant Workers Fairness Act secures for women basic rights to earn a living without jeopardizing their health or the baby's.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. WILD).

Ms. WILD. Madam Speaker, it protects workers with known limitations related to childbirth, because it is time that we recognize that mental health conditions like postpartum depression are real and tangible medical conditions.

Madam Speaker, I thank leadership, the ACLU, and the Chamber of Commerce for endorsing this bill. I urge a "yes" vote.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. SCHRIER), a distinguished member of the Education and Labor Committee.

Ms. SCHRIER. Madam Speaker, I had a high-risk pregnancy, complicated by both advanced maternal age and 24 years of type 1 diabetes. I worked until 2 days before my C-section, and I am so grateful that my employer allowed for minor accommodations which allowed me to continue to work.

Women are half of our workforce, and 75 percent of those women will become pregnant at some point. Supporting women during their pregnancies is just as important as prenatal care, immunizations, affordable childcare, and public education. We can do that by passing this bill, as well as supporting programs like WIC that help new and expectant parents to provide the proper nutrition and developmental supports to their babies.

We all benefit from healthy pregnancy outcomes.

It costs us all when a baby is born prematurely and requires months in intensive care.

It costs us all when a fetus is exposed to toxins in utero because we couldn't protect the mother from an unhealthy environment and that child then suffers a lifetime of damage that will require public support.

It costs us all when half of our workforce may lose or leave their jobs because pregnant women and mothers are not welcomed or supported in the workplace.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from over 40 public health organizations, clinicians, and maternal health providers who support this bill.

SEPTEMBER 14, 2020.

Re Support the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The undersigned public health professionals, health care clinicians, and maternal health organizations dedicated to the health and well-being of mothers, infants, and families enthusiastically support the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act (H.R. 2694). Modeled after the Americans with Disabilities Act, the bill would require employers to provide reasonable, temporary workplace accommodations to pregnant workers as long as the accommodation does not impose an undue hardship on the employer. This bill is critically important because no one should have to choose between having a healthy pregnancy and a paycheck.

Three-quarters of women will be pregnant and employed at some point in their lives. Most pregnant workers can expect a routine pregnancy and healthy birth. However, health care professionals have consistently recommended that some pregnant individuals make adjustments in their work activities to sustain a healthy pregnancy and prevent adverse pregnancy outcomes, including preterm birth or miscarriage. These medi-

cally necessary workplace accommodations can include allowing additional bathroom breaks, opportunities to stay hydrated, lifting restrictions, or access to a chair or stool to decrease time spent standing.

Unfortunately, too many pregnant workers, particularly pregnant people of color, face barriers to incorporating even these small changes to their workdays. Workplace accommodations help safeguard a healthy pregnancy or prevent harm to a higher-risk pregnancy. Across the country, pregnant workers continue to be denied simple, no-cost or low-cost, temporary adjustments in their work settings or activities and instead risk being fired or forced to take unpaid leave to preserve the health of their pregnancy. Low-wage pregnant workers in physically demanding jobs, which are disproportionately occupied by people of color, feel the impact most acutely. This impossible choice forces many pregnant workers to continue working without accommodations, putting women and their pregnancies at risk of long-lasting and severe health consequences.

The Pregnant Workers Fairness Act is a measured approach to a serious problem. As public health professionals, health care clinicians, and maternal health organizations, we understand the importance of reasonable workplace accommodations to ensure that pregnant persons can continue to provide for their families and have safe and healthy pregnancies. We collectively urge swift passage of the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act.

Sincerely,

1,000 Days; American College of Nurse-Midwives; American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists; Association of Maternal & Child Health Programs; Association of Women's Health, Obstetric and Neonatal Nurses; Black Mamas Matter Alliance; California Breastfeeding Coalition; California WIC Association; Center for Reproductive Rights; Children's HealthWatch.

Families USA; Healthy Mothers, Healthy Babies Coalition of Georgia; HealthyWomen; Human Rights Watch; In Our Own Voice; National Black Women's Reproductive Justice Agenda; Majaica, LLC; March for Moms; March of Dimes; National Black Nurses Association; National Birth Equity Collaborative; National Institute for Reproductive Health.

National Network of Abortion Funds; National WIC Association; National Women's Health Network; Nutrition First—WIC Association of Washington State; Pennsylvania WIC Association; Perinatal Health Equity Foundation; Physicians for Reproductive Health; Planned Parenthood Federation of America; Raising Women's Voices for the Health Care We Need; Shriver Center on Poverty Law.

SisterReach; Society for Maternal-Fetal Medicine; Tara Hansen Foundation; The Afiya Center; URGE: Unite for Reproductive & Gender Equity; U.S. Breastfeeding Committee; WIC Association of NYS, Inc.; Wisconsin WIC Association; YWCA of Greater Atlanta; ZERO TO THREE.

Ms. SCHRIER. Madam Speaker, the bipartisan Pregnant Workers Fairness Act simply ensures that reasonable accommodations are made to help pregnant women work safely, and, in turn, the economy is stronger, family outcomes are better, and children can start life strong and healthy. Everyone wins.

□ 1130

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia has 15 minutes remaining, and the gentlewoman from North Carolina has 18½ minutes remaining.

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

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the bill, and I submit for the RECORD this letter from the National Partnership for Women & Families, a nonprofit, nonpartisan advocacy organization committed to improving the lives of women and families by achieving equity for all women.

SEPTEMBER 15, 2020.

The National Partnership for Women & Families is a non-profit, non-partisan advocacy organization committed to improving the lives of women and families by achieving equity for all women. Since our creation as the Women's Legal Defense Fund in 1971, we have fought for every significant advance for equal opportunity in the workplace, including the Pregnancy Discrimination Act of 1978 and the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 (FMLA). We write today in strong support for H.R. 2694, the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act. This bipartisan legislation will support pregnant workers on the job, improving women's and families' economic security and promoting healthier pregnancies.

More than 40 years ago, Congress passed the Pregnancy Discrimination Act of 1978, outlawing discrimination on the basis of pregnancy, childbirth or related medical conditions. Yet pregnancy discrimination is still widespread and impacts pregnant workers across industry, race, ethnicity and jurisdiction. Nearly 31,000 pregnancy discrimination charges were filed with the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) and state-level fair employment practice agencies between 2010 and 2015, and the reality of pregnancy discrimination is likely much worse than illustrated by EEOC charges. As a result of this discrimination, too many women must choose between their paychecks and a healthy pregnancy. That's not a choice anyone should have to make.

The Pregnant Workers Fairness Act would create a clear policy standard requiring employers to provide reasonable accommodations to pregnant workers. Support for a law like the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act is nearly universal and bipartisan. Eighty-nine percent of voters favor this bill, including 69 percent of voters who strongly favor it. Just this Congress, twenty-eight leading private sector employers endorsed the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act in an open letter to Congress.

More than 85 percent of women will become mothers at some point in their working lives. And sometimes, an accommodation is needed in order for a pregnant worker to continue performing their job. Those accommodations are often small changes to their work environment such as additional bathroom breaks, a stool to sit on or the ability to have a water bottle at their work station. Although minor, these accommodations allow pregnant workers to stay in the workforce and continue to provide for themselves and their families. When pregnant workers are fired, demoted, or forced into unpaid leave, they and their families lose critical

income, and they may struggle to re-enter a job market that is particularly harsh for people who are currently or were recently pregnant.

Pregnancy discrimination affects women across race and ethnicity, but women of color and immigrants are at particular risk. They are disproportionately likely to work in jobs and industries where accommodations during pregnancy are not often provided (such as home health aides, food service workers, package handlers and cleaners). Black women are much more likely than white women to file pregnancy discrimination charges; they are also at a higher risk for pregnancy-related complications like pre-term labor, preeclampsia and hypertensive disorders, making reasonable accommodations on the job even more important, and loss of wages and health insurance due to pregnancy discrimination especially challenging.

To date, thirty-one states including the District of Columbia and four cities have passed laws requiring employers to provide reasonable accommodations to pregnant workers. But the ability to maintain a healthy pregnancy and keep a job should not depend on where a pregnant person works. Women are a crucial part of the workforce and their participation matters for the growth of our economy and for the stability and wellbeing of families nationwide. The Pregnant Workers Fairness Act would strengthen existing federal protections, ensure more equitable workplaces and allow women to remain in the workforce and maintain their economic stability while having the accommodations necessary for healthy pregnancies. It is time to clarify and strengthen existing federal protections for pregnant workers by passing the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act.

Sincerely,

DEBRA L. NESS,
President, National Partnership for
Women & Families.

Ms. DELAURO. The bipartisan Pregnant Workers Fairness Act is vital for women like Regina Scates, a firefighter in Connecticut. She was placed on unrequested, unpaid leave when she got pregnant, even though she was still capable of performing light duty work. She was left to ask: "How am I going to be able to feed my family?"

Today, 88 percent of first-time mothers work in the third trimester, yet an estimated 250,000 requests for reasonable accommodations go unheard and unapproved. And women of color are disproportionately impacted, being overrepresented in low-wage jobs where accommodations during pregnancy are not often provided, like healthcare aides and food service workers.

So we seek to build on the 1978 Pregnancy Discrimination Act, the first social policy ever to be enacted into law to provide protection to working mothers. And we must.

Decisions from the Supreme Court have made it exceedingly difficult for women to get reasonable accommodations under current law even when the adjustments could be as small as a chair and the stakes could be as enormous as a miscarriage or preterm birth.

It is modeled after the Americans with Disabilities Act. It establishes a clear-cut right to reasonable accommodations for all public sector employ-

ees and all private sector employees at companies with more than 15 workers.

This is not just an economic question. It is a moral question. Like many of you, I was horrified by reports that doctors at ICE detention centers performed hysterectomies on women without their consent. It is unimaginable. It is inhumane and diminishes, dehumanizes and disrespects women.

To all who preach a culture of life, to all who champion the dignity of work, I say let us seize the opportunity before us to protect life.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Connecticut.

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Speaker, to all who preach a culture of life, to all who champion the dignity of work, I say, Let us seize this opportunity before us to protect life, to respect women, to protect pregnant women at work and to do so with the strength, not of just words, but with the strength of the law. Let us pass this bipartisan bill.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Georgia (Mrs. MCBATH), a distinguished member of the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mrs. MCBATH. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for bringing this vital legislation to the floor.

The Pregnant Workers Fairness Act will ensure that no woman is unfairly fired or forced to risk the health of themselves or their pregnancy just to earn a paycheck. Our mothers deserve these Federal protections.

We want all to support our working mothers. Allowing them simple accommodations can ensure that they are able to continue working and provide a living for themselves and for their families.

Twenty-seven States have already passed laws that require certain employers to provide accommodations to pregnant women. It is time for federal action to ensure that all pregnant women are protected from discrimination and continue to support their families. This legislation is supported by both women's health groups and the business community.

I have here a letter from the U.S. Chamber of Commerce voicing strong support for this legislation, and I submit this letter for the RECORD.

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

September 14, 2020.

TO THE MEMBERS OF THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES: The U.S. Chamber of Commerce strongly supports H.R. 2694, the "Pregnant Workers Fairness Act (PWFA)." As reported by the Committee on Education and Labor, this bipartisan compromise would protect the interests of both pregnant employees and their employers. The Chamber

will consider including votes on this legislation in our How They Voted scorecard.

Employers currently face great uncertainty about whether, and how, they are required to accommodate pregnant workers. The revised PWFA would clarify an employer's obligation to accommodate a pregnant employee or applicant with a known limitation that interferes with her ability to perform some essential functions of her position.

The PWFA takes advantage of the widely known and accepted interactive process associated with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) that is used to find reasonable accommodations for employees covered by the ADA, and also carries forward the 15-or-more-employee threshold from the ADA.

The Chamber worked extensively with advocates for this bill to find bipartisan agreement. This important bill is a reminder that through good faith negotiations, legislative solutions to important questions and problems can be achieved. We urge the House to pass the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act.

Sincerely,

JACK HOWARD.

Ms. MCBATH. Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this legislation.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY), the chair of the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his leadership.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of this bill. As a member of the New York City Council, I became the first woman in history to give birth while in office as a council member. There had been many men who had become fathers, but I was the first woman. So I know firsthand how physically draining and stressful it is to work while pregnant.

Some of the only good news coming out of the COVID-19 lockdown is that there has been a dramatic drop in the number of premature births.

In Denmark, the rate of babies born preterm dropped by 90 percent during the lockdown. So the accommodations in this bill can keep mothers and babies safe. It is strongly pro-family.

This bill is an incredible step in the right direction. Once we ratify the Equal Rights Amendment, we will have an anchor in the Constitution to pass even more robust protections for women and families.

I urge a strong "yes." It is long overdue.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ).

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act, a bipartisan proposal that finally secures clear protections for pregnant workers.

In the year 2020, Federal protections for pregnant workers are stuck in the 1950s.

Current law does not explicitly guarantee all pregnant workers the right to reasonable accommodations so they can work without jeopardizing their pregnancies. Reasonable accommodations like a glass of water or a place to sit. These are sensible and, quite frankly, simple requests.

I was pregnant with my twins and then again with my youngest daughter when I served in the State legislature. While there were obstacles, I could ask for accommodations and did so without fear, but it was still a struggle to secure them, even for a State legislator.

Unfortunately, this is the case for many pregnant workers.

We know that COVID-19 has only exacerbated health inequalities for women, especially women of color. In fact, the most common low-paid jobs for women, like nurses and home health aides, are on the pandemic front lines.

Pregnant women across this country are literally putting their lives on the line. Yet, too often, instead of providing a pregnant worker with an accommodation routinely given to other workers, her employer will fire her, depriving her of a paycheck and health insurance at a time when she needs them most.

Pregnant workers must never have to choose between maintaining a healthy pregnancy and losing their jobs, especially now when both their health and economic security are crucial.

The demand for the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act even stretches across religious, ideological and party lines.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter on behalf of faith-based organizations in support of this vital legislation.

SEPTEMBER 11, 2020.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the undersigned religious and faith-based organizations representing a diversity of faith traditions and communities across the nation, we write today in support of healthy workplace environments and conditions for pregnant workers. We urge you to pass the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act (H.R. 2694). People of faith across the ideological spectrum understand that prioritizing the health and safety of pregnant workers should not be a partisan issue. The Pregnant Workers Fairness Act would ensure that pregnant workers can continue safely working to support their families during a pregnancy. The bill requires employers to make the same sort of accommodations for pregnant workers as are already in place for workers with disabilities.

Our faith traditions affirm the dignity of pregnant individuals and the moral imperative of ensuring their safety. We also affirm the dignity of work and the obligation to treat workers justly. It is immoral for an employer to force a worker to choose between a healthy pregnancy and earning a living. By passing the bipartisan Pregnant Workers Fairness Act (H.R. 2694), Congress will ensure that workers who are pregnant will be treated fairly in the workforce and can continue earning income to support themselves and their families. Efforts to distract from the central goal of ensuring preg-

nant workers can maintain their health and the health of their pregnancies by inserting unnecessary, harmful, and politically divisive language into this bill undermines our obligation to protect pregnant workers across our country.

While many pregnant individuals continue working throughout their pregnancies without incident, there are instances when minor accommodations are necessary at the workplace to ensure the safety of the expecting mother and the baby. All too often, requests for simple workplace accommodations like a stool to sit, a water bottle, or a bathroom break are denied. Within the COVID-19 context, such critical accommodations might include proper protective equipment, telework, or staggered work schedules that offer employees commute times which avoid crowded public transportation and increased exposure. Currently, pregnant workers may continue to work without necessary accommodations because they fear losing their jobs and need the income, thus endangering their health or the health of their pregnancy. Without these protections, it is not uncommon for pregnant workers to be let go or forced out onto unpaid leave for requesting accommodations. Many others must quit their job to avoid risking the health of their pregnancy.

Passing the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act is a moral and economic imperative; two-thirds of women who had their first child between 2006 and 2008 worked during pregnancy, and 88 percent of these first-time mothers worked into their last trimester. Keeping these women healthy and in the workforce is paramount to family economic security. Nearly 25 million mothers with children under 18 are in the workforce, making up nearly 1 in 6 of all workers. And about 3 in 4 mothers in the workforce are working full time. Millions of families rely on their earnings. In 2017, 41 percent of mothers were the sole or primary breadwinners in their families, while 23.2 percent of mothers were co-breadwinners. Whole families suffer when pregnant workers are forced out of a job.

The undersigned religious and faith-based groups are united in support of the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act. We strongly urge you to vote for the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act, and to vote against any motion to recommit that may be offered.

Sincerely, the undersigned:

Ameinu, Arizona Jews for Justice, Aytzim: Ecological Judaism, Bend the Arc: Jewish Action, Catholic Labor Network, Church World Service, Columban Center for Advocacy and Outreach, Congregation of Our Lady of Charity of the Good Shepherd, U.S. Provinces, Faith Action Network, Faith Action Network—Washington State, Franciscan Action Network, Friends Committee on National Legislation, Keshet, Jewish Alliance for Law and Social Action.

Jewish Family & Children's Service of Greater Boston, Jewish Women International, Justice Revival, National Advocacy Center of the Sisters of the Good Shepherd, National Council of Churches, National Council of Jewish Women, Network of Jewish Human Service Agencies, NETWORK Lobby for Catholic Social Justice, Pax Christi USA, T'ruah: The Rabbinic Call for Human Rights, United Church of Christ, Justice and Witness Ministries, Union for Reform Judaism, Uri L'Tzedek, Women of Reform Judaism.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. People of faith and across the ideological spectrum recognize that prioritizing the health and safety of pregnant workers should not be a partisan issue.

It is past time for workplaces to accommodate our families and protect pregnant workers. They are the ones

who keep our economy and communities running.

I urge my colleagues to vote “yes” on this long overdue legislation.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Ms. TLAIB).

Ms. TLAIB. Madam Speaker, I submit for the RECORD a letter of support for this legislation from the March of Dimes.

SEPTEMBER 11, 2020.

Re Support the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the March of Dimes, one of the leading non-profit organization fighting for the health of all moms and babies and promotes the health of women, children and families across the life course, we enthusiastically support the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act (H.R. 2694). Modeled after the Americans with Disabilities Act, the bill would require employers to provide reasonable, temporary workplace accommodations to pregnant workers as long as the accommodation does not impose an undue hardship on the employer. This bill is critically important because no one should have to choose between having a healthy pregnancy and a paycheck.

Three-quarters of women will be pregnant and employed at some point in their lives. Most pregnant workers can expect a normal pregnancy and healthy birth. However, healthcare providers have consistently recommended that some pregnant women make adjustments in their work activities to sustain a healthy pregnancy and prevent adverse pregnancy outcomes, including preterm birth or miscarriage. Workplace accommodations are medically necessary and can include allowing additional bathroom breaks, opportunities to stay hydrated, lifting restrictions, or access to a chair or stool to decrease time spent standing.

Unfortunately, too many pregnant workers, particularly pregnant women of color, face barriers to incorporating even these small changes to their workdays. Workplace accommodations help safeguard a healthy pregnancy or prevent harm to a higher-risk pregnancy. Across the country, pregnant workers continue to be denied simple, no-cost or low-cost, temporary adjustments in their work settings or activities and instead risk being fired or forced to take unpaid leave to preserve the health of their pregnancy. Low-wage pregnant workers in physically demanding jobs, which are disproportionately occupied by people of color, feel the impact most acutely. This impossible choice forces many pregnant workers to continue working without accommodations, putting both mother and baby at risk of longlasting and severe health consequences.

One of the main predictors of a healthy pregnancy is early and consistent prenatal care. Getting early and regular prenatal care can help ensure a healthy, full-term pregnancy. The costs of a healthy birth tend to be around \$5,000, whereas the costs associated with a premature or complicated birth range closer to \$76,000. Prenatal checkups are crucial and necessary, so that providers can answer any questions, check on the overall health of mom and baby, and spot complications early when there is a greater chance to prevent them. If there is a possibility of a loss of employment, it would impact family resources and threaten the ability to afford vital prenatal care and healthcare costs when most needed.

Pregnancy affects every system of the body, so pregnant workers may need work-

place accommodations to mitigate complications before they arise. During the second and third trimester, additional stress requires that the lungs work harder to provide oxygen as the heart supplies blood throughout the body and for the fetus. Some pregnant people have chronic health diseases, such as diabetes and cardiovascular disease, and need to take extra precautions to manage the condition. Moreover, additional stress during pregnancy may be caused by physical discomfort and other changes in daily life. Some of this stress may cause serious health problems, like high blood pressure, which could lead to problems like preeclampsia and premature birth, conditions that impact Black women at far higher rates than white women and contribute to this country's Black maternal health crisis. Therefore, it is imperative that pregnant workers are protected and provided the necessary and reasonable accommodations, to ensure that they are able to continue working and maintain healthy pregnancies.

The Pregnant Workers Fairness Act is a measured approach to a serious problem. March of Dimes understands the importance of reasonable workplace accommodations to ensure that women can continue to provide for their families and have safe and healthy pregnancies. We urge swift passage of the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act.

Sincerely,

ARIEL GONZÁLEZ, ESQ.,
MA,
Senior Vice President,
Public Policy & Government
Affairs,
March of Dimes.

Ms. TLAIB. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act.

In my district and across the country, pregnancy discrimination persists, especially against people of color and immigrant women.

When companies refuse to accommodate for pregnancy-related needs, it doesn't just hurt the person being discriminated against, it hurts the entire family, especially when nearly half of working women are the sole or primary provider for their families.

It is time to put families first over corporate greed. We must ensure that no pregnant person is forced to quit, coerced into taking unpaid leave, or fired because their employer refuses to accommodate them.

We must protect the more than 85 percent of women who will become mothers at some point in their working lives.

On behalf of all the beautiful mothers in my district, #13DistrictStrong, I thank Chairman NADLER and Chairman SCOTT for their leadership, and I urge support for this bill.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. NEGUSE).

Mr. NEGUSE. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act.

I thank Chairman NADLER for introducing this vital bill, and I also thank Chairman SCOTT for his incredible leadership and his work in getting it to the floor.

Ending discrimination against pregnant workers is a critical component in closing the economic divide between men and women in our country.

Before coming to Congress, I ran Colorado's Consumer Protection Agency, which included our State civil rights division, and I saw up close in the complaints that we adjudicated the unfortunate reality is that women are often denied even the simplest of workplace accommodations because they are pregnant, and too often women are forced out or not considered for hire due to their pregnancy. This must end. And we have an incredible opportunity to do precisely that by getting this bill across the finish line today.

I am a proud supporter of the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act, and I would encourage every Member of this body to vote “aye” on this critical legislation.

Madam Speaker, I submit for the RECORD a letter from the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, a 1.4 million-member organization highlighting their support for this critical legislation.

INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD
OF TEAMSTERS,
September 11, 2020.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the 1.4 million members of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, I urge you to support H.R. 2694, the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act when it comes to the floor in the next week. The Teamsters Union is proud to support this important legislation which would promote healthy pregnancies and economic security for pregnant women.

In the last few decades, there has been a demographic shift in the workplace. Women now make up almost half of the workforce. There are more pregnant workers than ever before and they are working later into their pregnancies. Yet, too often, instead of providing a pregnant worker with an accommodation, her employer will fire her or push her onto unpaid leave, depriving her of a paycheck and health insurance at a time when she needs them most.

While pregnancy discrimination affects women across race, ethnicity and economic status, women of color and low-wage workers are disproportionately impacted. Women of color are more likely to hold certain inflexible and physically demanding jobs that can present specific challenges for pregnant workers, making reasonable accommodations on the job even more important.

In 2018, the New York Times ran a front page article detailing the tragic loss experienced by a number of women working at a Verizon fulfillment center/warehouse in Memphis, TN, operated by XPO Logistics and previously operated by New Breed Logistics. New Breed and XPO should be quite familiar at this point, as they have garnered considerable press attention in recent weeks. Postmaster General Louis DeJoy was CEO of New Breed and served on the XPO Board during the time at which these tragedies took place.

The women who worked at the Memphis warehouse generally spent twelve hour shifts moving boxes full of Verizon cell phones and other devices. Upon becoming pregnant, all had asked for reasonable accommodations, including light duty. Three of the women said that they even brought in doctors' notes recommending less-taxing workloads and

shorter shifts, but supervisors disregarded the letters.

Certainly, some of these women considered leaving their jobs with New Breed/XPO, or taking unpaid leave to protect theirs and their unborn child's health, but at an average hourly wage of \$11/hr, unpaid leave and elective terms of unemployment are entirely unrealistic.

In response to the New York Times article and additional coverage by the Los Angeles Times and the PBS Newshour, nearly 100 members of Congress submitted a letter to the House Committee on Education and Labor urging investigation into the disturbing treatment of workers at the Memphis facility. With pressure mounting, XPO solicited the counsel of an outside expert to draft an internal policy to address the needs of pregnant workers. This was a step in the right direction, but it should not take congressional action and national press coverage to compel an employer to do the right thing. Make no mistake, this new XPO policy only exists because of the workers in Memphis who stood up and spoke out.

Unfortunately, XPO's new policy has zero chance of helping women at the Memphis facility. Two months after announcing the policy, XPO Logistics abruptly announced that it would shut down the warehouse where all of the women featured in the New York Times article had worked. This action creates a chilling effect on other workers who might choose to access reasonable accommodations at XPO. What pregnant worker is going to feel comfortable asking for reasonable accommodation when the end result of speaking up might be job loss? Key among its many protections is that H.R. 2694 would prohibit retaliation against pregnant workers who request accommodation.

The Pregnant Workers Fairness Act will provide a clear, predictable rule: employers must provide reasonable accommodations for limitations arising out of pregnancy, childbirth, or related medical conditions, unless this would pose an undue hardship. No woman should have to choose between providing for her family and maintaining a healthy pregnancy. The Pregnant Workers Fairness Act would ensure that all women working for covered employers would be protected.

The Teamsters Union is proud to stand with XPO workers and all pregnant workers demanding change. I urge you to stand up to unscrupulous employers like XPO and swiftly enact H.R. 2694, the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act.

Sincerely,

JAMES P. HOFFA,
General President.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

It is a great disappointment to me that I will be voting against this legislation before us today. My Republican colleagues and I have long been committed to policies and laws that empower all Americans to achieve success, and this includes protections in Federal law for pregnant workers. We agree that discrimination of any type should not be tolerated, and no one should ever be denied an opportunity because of unlawful discrimination. I will repeat that, Madam Speaker. We agree that discrimination of any type should not be tolerated, and no one should ever be denied an opportunity because of unlawful discrimination.

After meaningful and necessary bipartisan improvements were made to

H.R. 2694 during the committee markup, it is unfortunate today's legislation falls short in protecting one of our Nation's most treasured rights, freedom of religion, the first right mentioned in the Bill of Rights.

Democrats' refusal to include a commonsense provision that protects religious organizations from being forced to make employment decisions that conflict with their faith is short-sighted, disappointing, and easy to fix.

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

□ 1145

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

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter in support of the legislation from the National WIC Association, that is Women, Infants, and Children Association, in favor of the legislation, and another letter from the ACLU, the American Civil Liberties Union.

NATIONAL WIC ASSOCIATION LETTER IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 2694, PREGNANT WORKERS FAIRNESS ACT

On behalf of the National WIC Association, the 12,000 WIC state and local service provider agencies we represent, and the over six million mothers, babies, and young children our members serve, we enthusiastically support passage of the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act (H.R. 2694). The accommodations established by this bill are urgently needed to assure healthy pregnancies for working mothers served by WIC.

WIC providers serve approximately half of all babies born in the United States with nutrition support and counseling throughout pregnancy, the postpartum period, and early childhood. WIC's nutrition intervention has successfully supported positive birth outcomes by reducing preterm birth and other complications that can lead to lifelong health conditions and significant healthcare costs. Nutrition—including adequate hydration—is vital for the health of a pregnancy, but additional protections are needed to address the factors that influence pregnancy and birth outcomes beyond nutrition.

This bill wisely extends the workplace accommodations framework—first developed in the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)—to ensure that employers are taking reasonable steps to minimize risks to employees' pregnancies. Simple modifications to the workplace such as a stool to sit on, relief from heavy lifting, or a water bottle to carry can contribute to the health of the pregnancy without taking drastic action that inhibits the pregnant worker's economic security, such as unpaid leave or termination. This balanced and effective approach, already familiar to employers from the ADA context, will work in tandem with other medical and nutrition precautions to ensure positive birth outcomes and healthy infants.

Women now constitute the majority of the American workforce. Three-quarters of working women are expected to be both pregnant and employed during their adult lives. Without a clear legal standard, pregnant workers may be forced to choose between keeping a roof over their head, putting food on the table, and the health of their pregnancy. This burden is even more acute for the approximately twenty percent of working women—a total of 15.2 million women—who live in households that earn less than 185 percent of the federal poverty line, which

is the income threshold for WIC participation. Of these 15.2 million women, 59 percent (approximately nine million) are working part-time.

No pregnant worker should have to choose between the health of their pregnancy and their livelihood. As direct-service providers that support almost two million pregnant and postpartum women, the WIC community strongly supports efforts that advance sensible policy to safeguard the health of pregnancies. The Pregnant Workers Fairness Act is a thoughtful solution that will complement WIC's tireless efforts to support expectant mothers as they seek a healthy start for their babies. We urge swift passage of this critical legislation.

Sincerely,

REV. DOUGLAS GREENAWAY,
President & CEO,
National WIC Association.

SEPTEMBER 11, 2020.

Re Vote YES for the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act (H.R. 2694).

DEAR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS: On behalf of the American Civil Liberties Union, and our more than 8 million members, supporters, and activists, we write to express our support for H.R. 2694, the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act. This critical legislation would combat an all-too-common form of pregnancy discrimination while also providing employers much-needed clarity on their obligations under the law. We urge all members of the House of Representatives to vote in favor of this measured, bipartisan, and long-overdue legislation and to oppose the motion to recommit.

The ACLU has long fought to advance women's equality and opportunity by challenging laws and policies that discriminate against women in the workplace and by dismantling the stereotypes that constrain women's full engagement and participation at work. Although the Pregnancy Discrimination Act has played a critical role over the past 40 years in securing women's place in the workforce, too many women continue to be marginalized at work because of their decision to become pregnant and have children. This kind of discriminatory treatment has become most obvious when pregnant workers—predominantly women in physically demanding or male-dominated jobs, low-wage workers, and women of color—request temporary accommodations to address a medical need and instead are terminated or placed on unpaid leave, causing devastating economic harm. The Pregnant Workers Fairness Act would address this problem by requiring employers with fifteen or more employees to provide reasonable and temporary accommodations to pregnant workers if doing so would not impose an undue hardship on the business.

PREGNANCY DISCRIMINATION, THE PDA, AND
YOUNG V. UPS, INC.

Pregnancy and childbirth are often locus points for discrimination against women in the workforce. Policies excluding or forcing the discharge of pregnant women from the workplace were common in the 1970s and reflected the stereotype that a woman's primary or sole duties were to be a homemaker and raise children. The adoption of the Pregnancy Discrimination Act (PDA) in 1978, an amendment to Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, established that discrimination because of "pregnancy, childbirth, and related medical conditions" was a form of discrimination "because of sex." It was intended to dismantle the stereotype, and the policies based on it, that viewed pregnant women's labor force participation as contingent, temporary, and dispensable without regard to their individual capacity to do the job in question.

The PDA also required employers to treat pregnant workers the same as other temporarily disabled workers because Congress recognized that working women contributed to their families' economic stability and should not have to choose between a career and continuing a pregnancy. Despite the PDA, pregnancy discrimination persists, and for many years courts routinely ruled against workers who brought pregnancy accommodation cases where they alleged discrimination when an employer provided a job modification to an employee temporarily unable to work but failed to do the same for a pregnant worker.

In *Young v. United Parcel Service, Inc.*, the Supreme Court granted certiorari to resolve a split in the Circuits and for the first time addressed the PDA's application in the context of an employee who needed an accommodation due to pregnancy. The Court concluded that the statute's mandate applied with equal force in these circumstances and articulated a modified analysis for failure-to-accommodate cases. The Court also offered a new pretext analysis that plaintiffs may rely on when litigating claims under the PDA's second clause. Since *Young*, the reflexive approval of employer policies favoring workers with occupational injuries has largely disappeared. However, the bright-line deference to employer policies, and the overbroad reading of such policies as "pregnancy-blind," has been replaced, in many instances, with an unduly demanding standard for plaintiffs in making a showing of differential treatment—even at the initial pleading stage, prior to having the benefit of discovery. This trend undermines *Young*'s intent of demanding that employers justify failures to accommodate pregnancy. Instead, they impose unwarranted—and often insurmountable—burdens of proof on pregnant workers that increasingly confer "least favored nation" status on the protected trait of pregnancy. The stories of clients the ACLU has represented—both as direct counsel and as lead amicus—illustrate the harm:

Lochren v. Suffolk County: Sandra Lochren and five other police officers sued the Suffolk County Police Department (SCPD) for refusing to temporarily reassign pregnant officers to deskwork and other non-patrol jobs, even though it did so for officers injured on the job. But for those officers who opted to keep working patrol,

SCPD also failed to provide bulletproof vests or gun belts that would fit pregnant officers. Their only safe option was to go on unpaid long before their due dates.

Cole v. SavaSeniorCare: When Jaimie Cole, a certified nursing assistant, was in her third trimester, she developed a high risk of preeclampsia, a condition that can lead to preterm labor or even death. Her doctor advised her not to do any heavy lifting. Cole's job required her to regularly help patients in and out of bed and assist with bathing, so she asked for a temporary light duty assignment. Instead, her employer sent her home without pay for the rest of her pregnancy.

Myers v. Hope Healthcare Center: Asia Myers, a certified nursing assistant, experienced complications early in her pregnancy and was told by her doctor that she could continue to work, but should not do any lifting on the job. Although her employer had a history of providing light duty to workers with temporary lifting restrictions, Myers was told not to return to work until her restrictions were lifted. She was out of work for over a month with no income or health insurance coverage.

Hicks v. City of Tuscaloosa: Stephanie Hicks, a narcotics investigator with the Tuscaloosa Police Department in Alabama, wanted to breastfeed her new baby, but her bulletproof vest was restrictive, painful, and

prone to causing infection in her breasts. She asked for a desk job but her employer refused, even though it routinely granted desk jobs to officers unable to fulfill all of their patrol duties. Instead, it offered her an ill-fitting vest that put her at risk.

Legg v. Ulster County: Corrections Officer Ann Marie Legg was denied light duty during her pregnancy, even though Ulster County gave such assignments to guards injured on the job. In her third trimester, Legg had to intervene in a fight, prompting her to go on leave rather than face future risks.

Allen v. AT&T Mobility: Cynthia Allen lost her job because she accumulated too many "points" under AT&T Mobility's punitive attendance policy due to pregnancy-related symptoms such as nausea. The policy makes accommodation for late arrivals, early departures, and absences due to thirteen enumerated reasons, some medical and some not, but none due to pregnancy and pregnancy-related symptoms.

Durham v. Rural/Metro Corp.: Michelle Durham was an EMT in Alabama whose job often required her to lift patients on stretchers into an ambulance. When she became pregnant, her health care provider imposed a restriction on heavy lifting. Durham asked Rural/Metro for a temporary modified duty assignment during her pregnancy, but was rejected, despite the company's policy of giving such assignments to others. She was told her only option was to take unpaid leave.

It is indisputable that *Young* was an important step forward to combat pregnancy discrimination. Yet, too many pregnant workers continue to face insurmountable obstacles in HR offices, where employers misunderstand their obligations under the PDA, and in courtrooms across the country, where judges use *Young* to hinder access to needed accommodations. Despite the clear mandates of the PDA, the current legal landscape leaves exposed and unprotected those pregnant workers who want to continue working while maintaining a healthy pregnancy.

Similarly, many pregnant workers have not found protection or recourse under the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 because absent complications, pregnancy is not considered a disability that substantially limits a major life activity. This legal reality means that many of the symptoms of a normal pregnancy that can disrupt a worker's ability to do her job such as extreme fatigue, morning sickness, or limitations on her mobility are not entitled to accommodation. Moreover, many pregnant workers seek accommodation precisely because they wish to avoid the conditions that might disable them or endanger their pregnancy. Yet because the ADA is so expansive with respect to other conditions that qualify as disabilities, the population of non-pregnant workers entitled to reasonable accommodation is exponentially larger than when the PDA was enacted more than 40 years ago. Accordingly, without such express entitlement to accommodation, pregnant workers face an untenable "least favored nation" status in the workplace.

The simple solution to this no-win situation is the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act. This legislation, modeled after the ADA and using a framework familiar to most employers, takes a thoughtful and measured approach to balancing the needs of working people and employers by requiring businesses with fifteen or more employees to provide workers with temporary, reasonable accommodation for known limitations related to pregnancy, childbirth, or related medical conditions if doing so would not place an undue hardship on business. It also prohibits employers from forcing a pregnant employee to take a leave of absence if a reasonable accommodation can be provided; prevents em-

ployers from denying job opportunities to an applicant or employee because of the individual's need for a reasonable accommodation; prevents an employer from forcing an applicant or employee to accept a specific accommodation; and prohibits retaliation against individuals who seek to use PWFA to protect their rights.

At a time when women constitute nearly 60 percent of the workforce and contribute significantly to their families' economic well-being, passage of PWFA is a dire necessity. When a pregnant worker is forced to quit, coerced into taking unpaid leave, or fired because her employer refuses to provide a temporary job modification, the economic impact can be severe; if she is the sole or primary breadwinner for her children, as nearly half of working women are, her entire family will be without an income when they most need it. She further may be denied unemployment benefits because she is considered to have left her job voluntarily. She may have few if any additional resources on which to rely. PWFA ensures that women would not face such devastating consequences. Instead, it treats pregnancy for what it is—a normal condition of employment.

PWFA promotes women's health. Accommodations make a difference in physically demanding jobs (requiring long hours, standing, lifting heavy objects, etc.) where the risk of preterm delivery and low birth weight are significant. The failure to provide accommodations can be linked to miscarriages and premature babies who suffer from a variety of ailments. This bill would be an important contribution in the fight to improve maternal health and mortality.

There is also a strong business case for PWFA. Providing pregnant employees with reasonable accommodations increases worker productivity, retention, and morale, and reduces health care costs associated with pregnancy complications. PWFA can also reduce litigation costs by providing greater clarity regarding an employer's legal obligations to pregnant workers. In fact, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce stated that PWFA would establish "clear guidelines and a balanced process that works for employers and employees alike." Additionally, a group of leading private sector employers expressed their support for PWFA and noted "women's labor force participation is critical to the strength of our companies, the growth of our economy and the financial security of most modern families."

Finally, 30 states across the political and ideological spectrum have recognized the benefits of providing reasonable accommodations to pregnant workers. Congress should ensure that all pregnant workers, not just some, have the protections they need.

It is time for Congress to act and pass the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act.

Sincerely,

RONALD NEWMAN,
National Political Director.

GILLIAN THOMAS,
Senior Staff Attorney.

VANIA LEVEILLE,
Senior Legislative Counsel.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, as I am sure each person in this Chamber can agree, it is simply unacceptable that many pregnant workers have to choose between their paycheck and a healthy pregnancy because they cannot access reasonable accommodations to continue working safely.

As my colleagues have pointed out, most accommodations, which can include water, seating, and more frequent restroom breaks, are not complex or costly. Yet without these simple accommodations, health risks to pregnant workers can be significant and potentially tragic.

The COVID-19 pandemic poses increased risks for pregnant workers at a time when pregnant women comprise 62 percent of frontline workers, including more than 75 percent of healthcare workers.

Passing the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act today, we can take a strong bipartisan step to guarantee that all pregnant workers have access to basic workplace protections.

Madam Speaker, once again, I urge my colleagues to support the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. HAALAND. Madam Speaker, today we act so that women will no longer experience the fear of not knowing if they can maintain their family's financial security while they are pregnant.

As the number of women who work as the primary breadwinners in their households continues to rise, this financial insecurity rises as well.

While growing up, my mother was forced out of the Navy because she was pregnant. Although times have changed, mothers are still being forced out of their employment due to the absence of reasonable accommodations. I know first-hand the pressures of being that single source of income for my household, and I have seen how Black and Latina workers are overrepresented in low-wage, physically demanding jobs that need pregnancy accommodations for them to stay safe.

More than a decade ago, the Americans with Disabilities Act was amended to better implement the principle that physical or mental disabilities should be met with reasonable accommodations.

Pregnancy is not considered a disability under the ADA, however, enabling employers to deny reasonable accommodations like allowing pregnant employees to sit on a stool rather than stand during a long shift.

This bill would correct that, and I would like to include in the RECORD a letter from the Consortium for Citizens with Disabilities addressed to Chairman SCOTT and Ranking Member FOXX in support of the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act.

New Mexico is one of thirty states that have enacted laws to protect access to reasonable accommodations for pregnant workers so they have safe working conditions and, if they are denied that, the right to receive lost pay and compensatory damages.

Millions of pregnant workers in these states have benefited from these protections, but a pregnant employee's ability to work safely should not depend on where in this country she lives.

The Pregnant Workers' Fairness Act, which is endorsed by nearly 200 worker advocates, civil rights groups and the business community, will hold every employer in our country, across state lines, to these same standards.

As we hear horrific stories of immigrant women forced to have hysterectomies and lose their ability to have children, we are re-

mindful that the health, safety and wellbeing of all women is not something we can turn a blind eye to, whether those women work in boardrooms, on a factory floor, or in a hospital.

I support this legislation because no expectant mother should have to risk her health or that of her unborn child to stay financially stable.

I urge my colleagues to vote yes on this historic bill.

SEPTEMBER 11, 2020.

Re Support for Pregnant Workers Fairness Act, H.R. 2694.

Hon. BOBBY SCOTT,
Chairman, Committee on Education and Labor,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. VIRGINIA FOXX,
Ranking Member, Committee on Education and Labor,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN SCOTT AND RANKING MEMBER FOXX: As co-chairs of the Consortium for Citizens with Disabilities (CCD) Rights Task Force, we write in strong support of the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act, H.R. 2694. CCD is the largest coalition of national organizations working together to advocate for federal public policy that ensures the self-determination, independence, empowerment, integration and inclusion of children and adults with disabilities in all aspects of society.

The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)'s mandate that covered employers make reasonable accommodations to ensure equal opportunity for applicants and employees with disabilities has been tremendously important in helping people with disabilities secure and maintain employment. While the ADA does not cover pregnancy itself as a disability, in light of the ADA Amendments Act, which lowered the standard for demonstrating a disability from what the courts had previously applied, many pregnant workers who experience pregnancy-related complications should be covered as people with disabilities and entitled to reasonable accommodations under the ADA. Yet many courts have continued to interpret the ADA's coverage narrowly, and in practice, large numbers of pregnant workers are not offered reasonable accommodations. Furthermore, a clear pregnancy accommodation standard will help prevent pregnancy-related complications before they arise. Such accommodations should be provided to pregnant workers so that they can remain in the workforce and not lose their employment simply because they experience pregnancy-related limitations.

The accommodation requirement of H.R. 2694 is limited, as is the ADA's accommodation requirement, to those accommodations that are reasonable and would not impose an undue hardship. That standard takes into account the needs of employers while also ensuring that pregnant workers can stay on the job with reasonable accommodations. This protection is critical not only for pregnant workers but for our national economy.

The Pregnant Workers Fairness Act is particularly important to people with disabilities. Many people with disabilities who did not require accommodations before becoming pregnant experience new complications due to how pregnancy impacts their disabilities, and need accommodations once they become pregnant. These workers are sometimes told that they are not entitled to accommodations because the employer views the need for accommodation as related to pregnancy rather than to the worker's underlying disability.

We thank the Committee for moving the bill forward and urge all members of the

House of Representatives to vote for the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act and oppose any motion to recommit.

Sincerely,

JENNIFER MATHIS,
Bazelon Center for
Mental Health Law.
STEPHEN LIEBERMAN,
United Spinal Association.

ALLISON NICHOL,
Epilepsy Foundation,
Co-chairs, CCD
Rights Task Force.

KELLY BUCKLAND,
National Council on
Independent Living.

SAMANTHA CRANE,
Autistic Self Advocacy
Network.

Mr. COHEN. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act. This meaningful legislation will protect pregnant workers who have suffered because of insufficient workplace protections, a story far too familiar to many workers who call Memphis home.

Two years ago, I was shocked to read of the disturbing workplace abuses in an XPO warehouse in Memphis. Warehouse workers were denied minor and reasonable accommodations like less taxing workloads and shortened work shifts. As a result, several women suffered miscarriages, some of which happened while they were still on the warehouse floor.

I, along with Congresswoman DELAURO and ninety-five of my colleagues, wrote to the Education and Labor Committee to urge the 115th Congress to take decisive action and consider the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act.

The 116th Congress has rightly given this bill the attention it deserves, and this bill will give pregnant workers the protections that are past-due. No employee should be forced to choose between their job and their health. I appreciated the opportunity to participate in the Education and Labor Committee's Subcommittee hearing on this bill, and I am pleased to support the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act's consideration today.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, as a senior member of the Judiciary, Homeland Security, and Budget Committees, the Democratic Working Women Task Force, and as co-sponsor, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2694, the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act (PWFA), which would ensure that pregnant workers can continue to do their jobs and support their families by requiring employers to make workplace adjustments for those workers who need them due to pregnancy, childbirth, and related medical conditions, like breastfeeding.

The Pregnant Workers Fairness Act would establish that private sector employers with more than 15 employees and public sector employers must make reasonable accommodations for pregnant employees, job applicants, and individuals with known limitations related to pregnancy, childbirth, or related medical conditions.

Similar to the Americans with Disabilities Act, employers are not required to make an accommodation if it imposes an undue hardship on an employer's business.

Pregnant workers and individuals with known limitations related to pregnancy, childbirth, or related medical conditions cannot be denied employment opportunities, retaliated against for requesting a reasonable accommodation, or forced take paid or unpaid leave if

another reasonable accommodation is available.

Workers denied a reasonable accommodation under the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act will have the same rights and remedies as those established under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, including recovery of lost pay, compensatory damages, and reasonable attorneys' fees.

While the Pregnancy Discrimination Act (PDA) and the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) provide some protections for pregnant workers, there is currently no federal law that explicitly and affirmatively guarantees all pregnant workers the right to a reasonable accommodation so they can continue working without jeopardizing their pregnancy.

The Supreme Court's landmark decision in *Young v. United Parcel Service*, 575 U.S. ___, No. 12–1226, 135 S.Ct. 1338 (2015) allowed pregnant workers to bring reasonable accommodation discrimination claims under the PDA.

But pregnant workers are still being denied accommodations because the *Young* decision set an unreasonably high standard for proving discrimination, requiring workers to prove that their employers accommodated non-pregnant workers with similar limitations.

As a result, in two-thirds of cases after *Young*, courts ruled against pregnant workers who were seeking accommodations under the PDA.

Providing accommodations ensures that women can work safely while pregnant instead of getting pushed out of work at a time when they may need their income the most.

The Pregnant Workers Fairness Act is especially important considering that many pregnant workers hold physically demanding or hazardous jobs, and thus may be especially likely to need reasonable accommodations at some point during their pregnancy.

Madam Speaker, research shows that pregnant workers are likely to hold jobs that involve standing and making continuous movements, which can raise specific challenges during pregnancy.

Such physically demanding work—including jobs that require prolonged standing, long work hours, irregular work schedules, heavy lifting, or high physical activity—carries an increased risk of pre-term delivery and low birth weight.

Twenty-one (20.9) percent of pregnant workers are employed in low-wage jobs, which are particularly likely to be physically demanding.

Pregnant black and Latina women are disproportionately represented in low-wage jobs, which means as a result, these workers are especially likely to stand, walk or run continuously during work, and therefore may be more likely to need an accommodation at some point during pregnancy to continue to work safely.

Three in ten pregnant workers are employed in four of the occupations that make up the backbone of our communities: elementary school teachers, nurses and home health aides.

Employers can accommodate pregnant workers because pregnant women make up a small share of the workforce, even in the occupations where they are most likely to work, which means that only a very small share of an employer's workforce is likely to require pregnancy accommodations in any given year

since less than two percent of all workers in the U.S. are pregnant each year.

Not all pregnant workers require any form of accommodation at work, so only a fraction of that small fraction will need accommodations.

For example, pregnant women are most likely to work as elementary and middle school teachers but only three percent (3.2 percent) of all elementary and middle school teachers are pregnant women.

But workers employed in four of the ten most common occupations for pregnant workers—retail salesperson; waiter or waitress; nursing, psychiatric and home health aide; and cashier—who report continuously standing on the job would particularly benefit from this legislation.

Madam Speaker, prolonged standing at work has been shown to more than triple the odds of pregnant women taking leave during pregnancy or becoming unemployed.

Another four of the ten most common occupations for pregnant workers—waiter or waitress; nursing, psychiatric and home health aide; cashier; and secretaries and administrative assistants—involve making repetitive motions continuously on the job which have been shown to increase the likelihood of pregnant women taking sick leave.

Pregnant workers in low-wage jobs are particularly in need of this legislation granting them the clear legal right to receive accommodations because, in addition to the physically demanding nature of their jobs, they often face inflexible workplace cultures that make it difficult to informally address pregnancy-related needs.

For instance, workplace flexibility—such as the ability to alter start and end times or take time off for a doctor's appointment—is extremely limited for workers in low-wage jobs.

Over 40 percent of full-time workers in low-wage jobs report that their employers do not permit them to decide when to take breaks; between two-thirds and three-quarters of full-time workers in low-wage jobs report that they are unable to choose their start and quit times; and roughly half report having very little or no control over the scheduling of hours more generally.

The second most common occupation for pregnant Latinas—maids and housekeeping cleaners—is especially physically demanding because, according to the data, 80 percent of maids and housekeeping cleaners stood continuously, 38 percent were exposed to disease daily, and 70 percent walked or ran continuously on the job.

Occupations that have seen the most growth among pregnant women in the past decade expose many workers to disease or infection daily; depending on the disease, this can pose particular challenges to some pregnant workers at some points during pregnancy.

When pregnant workers are exposed to some diseases, they face particular risks; pregnant women with rubella are at risk for miscarriage or stillbirth and their developing fetuses are at risk for severe birth defects.

Madam Speaker, no one should have to choose between a paycheck and a healthy pregnancy, which is why they should have clear rights to reasonable accommodations on the job to ensure they are not forced off the job at the moment they can least afford it.

I urge all Members to join me in voting for H.R. 2694, the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act.

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2694, the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act, a critical effort that I have cosponsored. Despite almost four decades since the passage of the Pregnancy Discrimination Act, women continue to face significant challenges in the workplace during their pregnancies.

This is especially concerning for those working jobs that require physical activity, for which temporary modifications to limit risks to expectant mothers should be considered. Instead, employers have often refused to accommodate pregnant workers, forcing them to choose between their health or economic security. This is unacceptable—employers should not be permitted to discriminate against pregnant individuals who are requesting reasonable workplace accommodations.

Therefore, I am pleased to support the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act, which will require that employers make these reasonable accommodations for pregnant workers. This legislation will also benefit those who are employed and expecting, but it is especially critical for the more than 1 in 5 pregnant workers who are employed in a low-paid job with physically demanding work and minimal flexibility. The Pregnant Workers Fairness Act will make possible for accommodations that include the modification of no-food-or-drink policy to prevent contractions from lack of hydration, reassignment of heavy lifting duties, and provision of additional personal protective equipment, staggered workplace schedules, or telework during COVID–19.

As representatives of Americans from all corners of our country, we have a responsibility to protect the health and economic livelihood of our expectant mothers and the well-being of their families. On behalf of my home state of Texas, I urge my colleagues to support the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act.

Ms. GARCIA of Texas. Madam Speaker, for far too long, pregnant workers in our country have lacked reasonable accommodations at their workplaces. They need to keep their jobs to ensure economic security for themselves and their families. Yet, without reasonable accommodations they could risk their health and safety. I am proud to cosponsor the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act, which would right this wrong. This bill would require employers to make reasonable accommodations for pregnant workers who need them. Without this legislation, some may continue to work in unsafe conditions. Currently, pregnant workers might be let go or forced into unpaid leave, just for asking for reasonable accommodations. Some may quit their job to avoid risking the health of their pregnancy. This is unacceptable. Pregnant workers deserve better. They deserve these commonsense protections. That is why I am proud to cosponsor and vote for this bill today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 1107, 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.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the bill?

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I am in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. Foxx of North Carolina moves to recommit the bill (H.R. 2694) to the Committee on Education and Labor with instructions to report the bill back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Pregnant Workers Fairness Act”.

SEC. 2. NONDISCRIMINATION WITH REGARD TO REASONABLE ACCOMMODATIONS RELATED TO PREGNANCY.

It shall be an unlawful employment practice for a covered entity to—

(1) not make reasonable accommodations to the known limitations related to the pregnancy, childbirth, or related medical conditions of a qualified employee, unless such covered entity can demonstrate that the accommodation would impose an undue hardship on the operation of the business of such covered entity;

(2) require a qualified employee affected by pregnancy, childbirth, or related medical conditions to accept an accommodation other than any reasonable accommodation arrived at through the interactive process referred to in section 5(7);

(3) deny employment opportunities to a qualified employee if such denial is based on the need of the covered entity to make reasonable accommodations to the known limitations related to the pregnancy, childbirth, or related medical conditions of a qualified employee;

(4) require a qualified employee to take leave, whether paid or unpaid, if another reasonable accommodation can be provided to the known limitations related to the pregnancy, childbirth, or related medical conditions of a qualified employee; or

(5) take adverse action in terms, conditions, or privileges of employment against a qualified employee on account of the employee requesting or using a reasonable accommodation to the known limitations related to the pregnancy, childbirth, or related medical conditions of the employee.

SEC. 3. REMEDIES AND ENFORCEMENT.

(a) EMPLOYEES COVERED BY TITLE VII OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The powers, remedies, and procedures provided in sections 705, 706, 707, 709, 710, and 711 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e–4 et seq.) to the Commission, the Attorney General, or any person alleging a violation of title VII of such Act (42 U.S.C. 2000e et seq.) shall be the powers, remedies, and procedures this Act provides to the Commission, the Attorney General, or any person, respectively, alleging an unlawful employment practice in violation of this Act against an employee described in section 5(3)(A) except as provided in paragraphs (2) and (3) of this subsection.

(2) COSTS AND FEES.—The powers, remedies, and procedures provided in subsections (b) and (c) of section 722 of the Revised Statutes (42 U.S.C. 1988) shall be the powers, remedies, and procedures this Act provides to the Commission, the Attorney General, or any person alleging such practice.

(3) DAMAGES.—The powers, remedies, and procedures provided in section 1977A of the Revised Statutes (42 U.S.C. 1981a), including the limitations contained in subsection (b)(3) of such section 1977A, shall be the powers,

remedies, and procedures this Act provides to the Commission, the Attorney General, or any person alleging such practice (not an employment practice specifically excluded from coverage under section 1977A(a)(1) of the Revised Statutes).

(b) EMPLOYEES COVERED BY CONGRESSIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY ACT OF 1995.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The powers, remedies, and procedures provided in the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1301 et seq.) to the Board (as defined in section 101 of such Act (2 U.S.C. 1301)) or any person alleging a violation of section 201(a)(1) of such Act (2 U.S.C. 1311(a)(1)) shall be the powers, remedies, and procedures this Act provides to the Board or any person, respectively, alleging an unlawful employment practice in violation of this Act against an employee described in section 5(3)(B), except as provided in paragraphs (2) and (3) of this subsection.

(2) COSTS AND FEES.—The powers, remedies, and procedures provided in subsections (b) and (c) of section 722 of the Revised Statutes (42 U.S.C. 1988) shall be the powers, remedies, and procedures this Act provides to the Board or any person alleging such practice.

(3) DAMAGES.—The powers, remedies, and procedures provided in section 1977A of the Revised Statutes (42 U.S.C. 1981a), including the limitations contained in subsection (b)(3) of such section 1977A, shall be the powers, remedies, and procedures this Act provides to the Board or any person alleging such practice (not an employment practice specifically excluded from coverage under section 1977A(a)(1) of the Revised Statutes).

(4) OTHER APPLICABLE PROVISIONS.—With respect to a claim alleging a practice described in paragraph (1), title III of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1381 et seq.) shall apply in the same manner as such title applies with respect to a claim alleging a violation of section 201(a)(1) of such Act (2 U.S.C. 1311(a)(1)).

(c) EMPLOYEES COVERED BY CHAPTER 5 OF TITLE 3, UNITED STATES CODE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The powers, remedies, and procedures provided in chapter 5 of title 3, United States Code, to the President, the Commission, the Merit Systems Protection Board, or any person alleging a violation of section 411(a)(1) of such title shall be the powers, remedies, and procedures this Act provides to the President, the Commission, the Board, or any person, respectively, alleging an unlawful employment practice in violation of this Act against an employee described in section 5(3)(C), except as provided in paragraphs (2) and (3) of this subsection.

(2) COSTS AND FEES.—The powers, remedies, and procedures provided in subsections (b) and (c) of section 722 of the Revised Statutes (42 U.S.C. 1988) shall be the powers, remedies, and procedures this Act provides to the President, the Commission, the Board, or any person alleging such practice.

(3) DAMAGES.—The powers, remedies, and procedures provided in section 1977A of the Revised Statutes (42 U.S.C. 1981a), including the limitations contained in subsection (b)(3) of such section 1977A, shall be the powers, remedies, and procedures this Act provides to the President, the Commission, the Board, or any person alleging such practice (not an employment practice specifically excluded from coverage under section 1977A(a)(1) of the Revised Statutes).

(d) EMPLOYEES COVERED BY GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEE RIGHTS ACT OF 1991.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The powers, remedies, and procedures provided in sections 302 and 304 of the Government Employee Rights Act of 1991 (42 U.S.C. 2000e–16b; 2000e–16c) to the Commission or any person alleging a violation of section 302(a)(1) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 2000e–16b(a)(1)) shall be the powers, remedies, and procedures this Act provides to the Commis-

sion or any person, respectively, alleging an unlawful employment practice in violation of this Act against an employee described in section 5(3)(D), except as provided in paragraphs (2) and (3) of this subsection.

(2) COSTS AND FEES.—The powers, remedies, and procedures provided in subsections (b) and (c) of section 722 of the Revised Statutes (42 U.S.C. 1988) shall be the powers, remedies, and procedures this Act provides to the Commission or any person alleging such practice.

(3) DAMAGES.—The powers, remedies, and procedures provided in section 1977A of the Revised Statutes (42 U.S.C. 1981a), including the limitations contained in subsection (b)(3) of such section 1977A, shall be the powers, remedies, and procedures this Act provides to the Commission or any person alleging such practice (not an employment practice specifically excluded from coverage under section 1977A(a)(1) of the Revised Statutes).

(e) EMPLOYEES COVERED BY SECTION 717 OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The powers, remedies, and procedures provided in section 717 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e–16) to the Commission, the Attorney General, the Librarian of Congress, or any person alleging a violation of that section shall be the powers, remedies, and procedures this Act provides to the Commission, the Attorney General, the Librarian of Congress, or any person, respectively, alleging an unlawful employment practice in violation of this Act against an employee described in section 5(3)(E), except as provided in paragraphs (2) and (3) of this subsection.

(2) COSTS AND FEES.—The powers, remedies, and procedures provided in subsections (b) and (c) of section 722 of the Revised Statutes (42 U.S.C. 1988) shall be the powers, remedies, and procedures this Act provides to the Commission, the Attorney General, the Librarian of Congress, or any person alleging such practice.

(3) DAMAGES.—The powers, remedies, and procedures provided in section 1977A of the Revised Statutes (42 U.S.C. 1981a), including the limitations contained in subsection (b)(3) of such section 1977A, shall be the powers, remedies, and procedures this Act provides to the Commission, the Attorney General, the Librarian of Congress, or any person alleging such practice (not an employment practice specifically excluded from coverage under section 1977A(a)(1) of the Revised Statutes).

(f) PROHIBITION AGAINST RETALIATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—No person shall discriminate against any employee because such employee has opposed any act or practice made unlawful by this Act or because such employee made a charge, testified, assisted, or participated in any manner in an investigation, proceeding, or hearing under this Act.

(2) PROHIBITION AGAINST COERCION.—It shall be unlawful to coerce, intimidate, threaten, or interfere with any individual in the exercise or enjoyment of, or on account of such individual having exercised or enjoyed, or on account of such individual having aided or encouraged any other individual in the exercise or enjoyment of, any right granted or protected by this Act.

(3) REMEDY.—The remedies and procedures otherwise provided for under this section shall be available to aggrieved individuals with respect to violations of this subsection.

(g) LIMITATION.—Notwithstanding subsections (a)(3), (b)(3), (c)(3), (d)(3), and (e)(3), if an unlawful employment practice involves the provision of a reasonable accommodation pursuant to this Act or regulations implementing this Act, damages may not be awarded under section 1977A of the Revised Statutes (42 U.S.C. 1981a) if the covered entity demonstrates good faith efforts, in consultation with the employee with known

limitations related to pregnancy, childbirth, or related medical conditions who has informed the covered entity that accommodation is needed, to identify and make a reasonable accommodation that would provide such employee with an equally effective opportunity and would not cause an undue hardship on the operation of the covered entity.

SEC. 4. RULEMAKING.

Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission shall issue regulations in an accessible format in accordance with subchapter II of chapter 5 of title 5, United States Code, to carry out this Act. Such regulations shall provide examples of reasonable accommodations addressing known limitations related to pregnancy, childbirth, or related medical conditions.

SEC. 5. DEFINITIONS.

As used in this Act—

(1) the term “Commission” means the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission;

(2) the term “covered entity”—

(A) has the meaning given the term “respondent” in section 701(n) of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e(n)); and

(B) includes—

(i) an employer, which means a person engaged in industry affecting commerce who has 15 or more employees as defined in section 701(b) of title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e(b)), subject to the applicability to religious employment as set forth in section 702(a) of title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e-1(a));

(ii) an employing office, as defined in section 101 of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1301) and section 411(c) of title 3, United States Code;

(iii) an entity employing a State employee described in section 304(a) of the Government Employee Rights Act of 1991 (42 U.S.C. 2000e-16c(a)); and

(iv) an entity to which section 717(a) of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e-16(a)) applies;

(3) the term “employee” means—

(A) an employee (including an applicant), as defined in section 701(f) of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e(f));

(B) a covered employee (including an applicant), as defined in section 101 of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1301);

(C) a covered employee (including an applicant), as defined in section 411(c) of title 3, United States Code;

(D) a State employee (including an applicant) described in section 304(a) of the Government Employee Rights Act of 1991 (42 U.S.C. 2000e-16c(a)); or

(E) an employee (including an applicant) to which section 717(a) of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e-16(a)) applies;

(4) the term “person” has the meaning given such term in section 701(a) of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e(a));

(5) the term “known limitation” means physical or mental condition related to, affected by, or arising out of pregnancy, childbirth, or related medical conditions that the employee or employee’s representative has communicated to the employer whether or not such condition meets the definition of disability specified in section 3 of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12102);

(6) the term “qualified employee” means an employee or applicant who, with or without reasonable accommodation, can perform the essential functions of the employment position, except that an employee or applicant shall be considered qualified if—

(A) any inability to perform an essential function is for a temporary period;

(B) the essential function could be performed in the near future; and

(C) the inability to perform the essential function can be reasonably accommodated; and

(7) the terms “reasonable accommodation” and “undue hardship” have the meanings given such terms in section 101 of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12111) and shall be construed as such terms are construed under such Act and as set forth in the regulations required by this Act, including with regard to the interactive process that will typically be used to determine an appropriate reasonable accommodation.

SEC. 6. WAIVER OF STATE IMMUNITY.

A State shall not be immune under the 11th Amendment to the Constitution from an action in a Federal or State court of competent jurisdiction for a violation of this Act. In any action against a State for a violation of this Act, remedies (including remedies both at law and in equity) are available for such a violation to the same extent as such remedies are available for such a violation in an action against any public or private entity other than a State.

SEC. 7. RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER LAWS.

Nothing in this Act shall be construed to invalidate or limit the powers, remedies, and procedures under any Federal law or law of any State or political subdivision of any State or jurisdiction that provides greater or equal protection for individuals affected by pregnancy, childbirth, or related medical conditions.

SEC. 8. SEVERABILITY.

If any provision of this Act or the application of that provision to particular persons or circumstances is held invalid or found to be unconstitutional, the remainder of this Act and the application of that provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina (during the reading). Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from North Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes in support of her motion.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, this motion is the final opportunity to amend this legislation and would do so without any delay in passage.

Madam Speaker, Republicans support protections in Federal law for pregnant workers, and we believe employers should provide reasonable accommodations for pregnant workers.

I support the provisions in H.R. 2694, which were previously outlined during the general debate. I also recognize that improvements to the bill were the result of bipartisan negotiations, and I commend Chairman SCOTT for his outreach in this regard.

Unfortunately, despite our agreement on these changes, there remains an important outstanding issue that must be resolved. The bill before us today does not include a narrow but longstanding provision from the Civil Rights Act that protects religious organizations from being forced to make

employment decisions that conflict with their faith. The motion to recommend adds this important protection.

This very limited provision is already in current law, and it allows religious organizations to make religiously based employment decisions.

Without this longstanding Civil Rights Act provision, H.R. 2694 will create confusion and legal risk for religious organizations in their religiously based employment decisions.

At least 16 States and the District of Columbia in their pregnancy discrimination or pregnancy accommodation laws also include a provision similar to the Civil Rights Act religious organization protection.

In fact, a Democrat-invited witness at a committee hearing highlighted Kentucky’s recently enacted pregnancy accommodation law as a template for Congress to follow. Kentucky’s law includes a religious organization protection very similar to the one found in the Civil Rights Act.

At the Rules Committee hearing on H.R. 2694 earlier this week, the bill’s sponsor, Chairman NADLER, said it is not necessary to incorporate into H.R. 2694 the Civil Rights Act provision that protects religious organizations. He stated that because H.R. 2694 does not repeal this provision, it will still be effective if the bill becomes law.

At the same hearing, Chairman SCOTT said the religious organization protection should not be included in H.R. 2694 because it is overinclusive and would provide too much protection.

I strongly disagree with both of these perspectives, and I am not sure Chairman NADLER’s explanation is in line with Chairman SCOTT’s position.

Without the current law protection, H.R. 2694 will create legal jeopardy for religious organizations, as I have previously stated. But for the sake of argument, let’s assume the provision is superfluous.

Madam Speaker, what would the harm be in including the Civil Rights Act protection in H.R. 2694? At worst, the provision would be duplicative with the Civil Rights Act, causing no harm to workers or employers. At best, it will prevent a religious organization from being required to violate its faith.

By adding this simple reference to H.R. 2694 from the Civil Rights Act, we can ensure the protections in the bill are harmonized with the protections for religious organizations found in the Pregnancy Discrimination Act, PDA, and the Americans with Disabilities Act, ADA.

I would also briefly like to address recent claims made by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce—a trade association which represents few, if any, religious employers—that, under this bill, required workplace accommodations would not come into conflict with a religious organization’s beliefs.

The chamber acknowledges that leave, including paid leave, can be part of a reasonable accommodation under

the ADA, from which H.R. 2694 incorporates the definition of reasonable accommodation. Therefore, if a religious organization has a paid leave policy, H.R. 2694 could require the organization to allow paid leave for purposes that conflict with its religious tenets.

The chamber also contends that H.R. 2694 is not a bill that addresses hiring, unlike the PDA and the ADA, which apply to hiring. This is false. H.R. 2694 applies to both employees and job applicants, so it is indeed a hiring statute.

Therefore, the religious organization protections in the Civil Rights Act and the ADA are just as relevant to H.R. 2694 as they are to those statutes.

Madam Speaker, to conclude, the motion to recommit includes H.R. 2694 in its entirety, with one important addition related to religious organization protections. My amendment simply incorporates the title VII religious organization protection to ensure these organizations are not forced to violate their faith in making employment and accommodation decisions.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this simple but important addition to the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, first, let me just restate what I said about the Congressional Research Service that found that States typically do not enact separate or specialized religious exemptions for pregnancy accommodation laws.

Madam Speaker, this MTR would jeopardize women's health and risk their pregnancies in order to provide a religious exemption for employers, to exempt them from the requirement to provide just basic and reasonable accommodations for the workforce. Exactly who would want them to deny these basic accommodations?

First, it is unnecessary. The Pregnant Workers Fairness Act already exempts small private employers, including religious employers, with fewer than 15 employees. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, 80 percent of religious organizations have fewer than 10 employees.

Second, the underlying bill does not in any way amend or change the underlying exemptions in title VII of the Civil Rights Act or Americans with Disabilities Act or any other bill. It doesn't affect the Religious Freedom Restoration Act. But it would, if it is specified in this bill, give the employer the idea that they could deny reasonable accommodations if they for some religious reason don't agree with the pregnancy: women who are pregnant and divorced, women pregnant out of wedlock, pregnant in a same-sex relationship.

What, you don't have to give them a water break?

This amendment is unnecessary. The other exemptions are there for legitimate religious reasons, and this overbroad amendment would just cause mischief.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Ms. WILD).

Ms. WILD. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

I rise in opposition to this political poison pill of an MTR.

Corporations are a legal creation. They don't have religious beliefs. Their officers might, but they do not.

Let's be clear about who inspired the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act.

It is women who have asked for accommodations in lifting requirements because their doctors told them they were at high risk of miscarriage or preterm birth.

It is women like the worker in Pennsylvania who was denied a schedule change and fired due to cramping in her uterus that landed her in the ER.

This MTR invites discrimination. It emboldens those who would use religion as a basis to discriminate against people who are pregnant and not married, workers in same-sex couples, women who used IVF to get pregnant, even people with partners of a different race.

Something the proponents of this amendment aren't saying out loud is that other religious exemptions would already apply to the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act.

This MTR frustrates the purpose of a good bill, a bill that is supported by the Chamber of Commerce and by 89 percent of voters.

Every year, an estimated quarter of a million women are denied requests for an accommodation because current law forces pregnant workers to find other nonpregnant employees who received similar accommodations to make a case.

When pregnant women are denied accommodations, they face health risks, miscarriage, premature births.

Symptoms and conditions of pregnancy cannot be fully appreciated unless you have been pregnant yourself. So when you consider this vote on the MTR, remember that 80 percent of directors of ACWI Index companies are men. Men who have never experienced the struggles of pregnancy will be deciding whether to invoke an exemption to deny an accommodation to a pregnant worker. That is not right.

This bill is not some new burden on employers. They must already engage in a good faith interactive process over reasonable accommodations under the ADA.

This bill, as written, takes employer concerns into account. Employers with fewer than 15 employees or those who would suffer undue hardship need not provide accommodations.

Madam Speaker, I urge a resounding "no" vote on this MTR because it dilutes the very protections for pregnant workers that the bill seeks to estab-

lish. Those protections are long overdue.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam 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.

Ms. FOXX of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3 of House Resolution 965, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question are postponed.

CONDEMNING ALL FORMS OF ANTI-ASIAN SENTIMENT AS RELATED TO COVID-19

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on adoption of the resolution (H. Res. 908) condemning all forms of anti-Asian sentiment as related to COVID-19, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 243, nays 164, answered "present" 1, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 193]
YEAS—243

Adams	Correa	Gomez
Aguilar	Costa	Gonzalez (OH)
Allred	Courtney	Gonzalez (TX)
Axne	Cox (CA)	Gottheimer
Barragan	Craig	Green, Al (TX)
Bass	Crist	Grijalva
Beatty	Crow	Haaland
Bera	Cuellar	Harder (CA)
Beyer	Cunningham	Hastings
Bishop (GA)	Dauids (KS)	Hayes
Blumenauer	Davis (CA)	Heck
Blunt Rochester	Davis, Danny K.	Herrera Beutler
Bonamici	Dean	Higgins (NY)
Boyle, Brendan	DeGette	Himes
F.	DeLauro	Horn, Kendra S.
Brindisi	DelBene	Horsford
Brooks (IN)	Delgado	Houlahan
Brown (MD)	Demings	Hoyer
Brownley (CA)	DeSaulnier	Huffman
Bustos	Deutch	Hurd (TX)
Butterfield	Dingell	Jackson Lee
Carbajal	Doggett	Jayapal
Cárdenas	Doyle, Michael	Jeffries
Carson (IN)	F.	Johnson (GA)
Cartwright	Engel	Johnson (TX)
Case	Escobar	Kaptur
Casten (IL)	Eshoo	Katko
Castor (FL)	Espallat	Keating
Castro (TX)	Finkenaue	Kelly (IL)
Chu, Judy	Fitzpatrick	Kennedy
Ciциlline	Fletcher	Khanna
Cisneros	Foster	Kildee
Clark (MA)	Frankel	Kilmer
Clarke (NY)	Fudge	Kim
Clay	Gabbard	Kind
Cleaver	Gallego	Kirkpatrick
Clyburn	Garamendi	Krishnamoorthi
Cohen	Garcia (IL)	Kuster (NH)
Connolly	Garcia (TX)	Lamb
Cooper	Golden	Langevin

Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsock
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCaul
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Mfume
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Norcross
Ocasio-Cortez

NAYS—164

Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rose (NY)
Rouda
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan
Sanchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shalala
Sherrin
Sherman
Sires

Gibbs
Gohmert
Gooden
Gosar
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harris
Hartzler
Hern, Kevin
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill (AR)
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Jacobs
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
Lamborn
Latta
Lesko
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McClintock
McKinley
Meuser
Miller

Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Murphy (NC)
Newhouse
Norman
Nunes
Palmer
Pence
Perry
Posey
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (SC)
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)
Smucker
Stauber
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Taylor
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Turner
Van Drew
Walberg
Walorski
Waltz
Watkins
Weber (TX)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams

Slotkin
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stanton
Stevens
Stivers
Suzuki
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres Small
(NM)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Upton
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walden
Wasserman
Schultz

□ 1249

Messrs. BRADY, KELLY of Pennsylvania, and LONG changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. GONZALEZ of Texas and DOGGETT changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the resolution was agreed to.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 965, 116TH CONGRESS

Barragan (Beyer)
Blumenauer (Beyer)
Butterfield (Kildee)
Chu, Judy (Takano)
Clay (Davids (KS))
Cohen (Beyer)
Davis, Danny K. (Underwood)
DeSaulnier (Matsui)
Frankel (Clark (MA))
Grijalva (Raskin)
Hastings (Wasserman Schultz)
Jayapal (Raskin)
Khanna (Gomez)
Kirkpatrick (Gallego)

Langevin (Lynch)
Lawrence (Kildee)
Lawson (FL) (Demings)
Lieu, Ted (Beyer)
Lipinski (Cooper)
Lofgren (Jeffries)
Lowenthal (Beyer)
Lowe (Tonko)
Meng (Clark (MA))
Moore (Beyer) (Correa)
Payne (Wasserman Schultz)
Pingree (Clark (MA))
Pocan (Raskin)
Porter (Wexton)

Rooney (FL) (Beyer)
Roybal-Allard (Aguilar)
Rush (Underwood)
Serrano (Jeffries)
Sewell (AL) (DeBene)
Sires (Pallone)
Trahan (McGovern)
Waters (Brownley (CA))
Watson Coleman (Pallone)
Welch (McGovern)
Wilson (FL) (Hayes)

Banks
Barr
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (NC)
Bost
Brady
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Cleaver
Cline
Cloud
Cole
Collins (GA)
Comer
Conaway
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curtis
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Emmer
Estes
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxy (NC)
Fulcher
Gallagher
Garcia (CA)
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Gonzalez (OH)
Gosar
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Griffith
Guest

Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harris
Hartzler
Hern, Kevin
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill (AR)
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Hurd (TX)
Jacobs
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Katko
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
Lesko
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McAdams
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McKinley
Meuser
Miller
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Murphy (NC)
Newhouse
Norman
Nunes

Olson
Palmer
Pence
Perry
Posey
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (SC)
Rodgers (WA)
Roe, David P.
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rooney (FL)
Rose, John W.
Rouzer
Roy
Rutherford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Stauber
Stefanik
Steube
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Van Drew
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Waltz
Watkins
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoho
Young
Zeldin

NAYS—226

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Axne
Barragan
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)
Castro (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney

Cox (CA)
Craig
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Cunningham
Davids (KS)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeGette
DeLauro
DeBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Engel
Escobar
Eshoo
Española
Finkenauer
Fletcher
Foster
Frankel
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Gooden
Gottheimer
Green, Al (TX)

Grijalva
Haaland
Harder (CA)
Hastings
Hayes
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Horn, Kendra S.
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski

PREGNANT WORKERS FAIRNESS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to recommit on the bill (H.R. 2694) to eliminate discrimination and promote women’s health and economic security by ensuring reasonable workplace accommodations for workers whose ability to perform the functions of a job are limited by pregnancy, childbirth, or a related medical condition, offered by the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX), on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the motion.

The Clerk redesignated the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 177, nays 226, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 194]

YEAS—177

Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodoi
Armstrong
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson

Loeb sack Payne
Lofgren Perlmutter
Lowenthal Peters
Lowe Peterson
Lujan Phillips
Luria Pingree
Lynch Pocan
Malinowski Porter
Maloney Pressley
Carolyn B. Swalwell (CA)
Maloney, Sean Quigley
Matsui Raskin
McBath Rice (NY)
McCollum Richmond
McEachin Rose (NY)
McGovern Rouda
McNerney Roybal-Allard
Meeks Ruiz
Meng Ruppertsberger
Mfume Rush
Moore Ryan
Morelle Sanchez
Moulton Sarbanes
Mucarsel-Powell Scanlon
Murphy (FL) Schakowsky
Nadler Schiff
Napolitano Schneider
Neal Schrader
Neguse Schrier
Norcross Scott (VA)
Ocasio-Cortez Scott, David
Omar Serrano
Pallone Sewell (AL)
Panetta Shalala
Pappas Sherman
Pascrell Sherrill

Rush (Underwood)
Serrano (Jeffries)
Sewell (AL) (DelBene)
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stanton
Stevens
Suozi
Price (NC)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres Small (NM)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HECK). The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3 of House Resolution 965, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 329, nays 73, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 195]

YEAS—329

Adams DeGette
Aguilar DeLauro
Allred DelBene
Amodei Delgado
Axne Demings
Bacon DeSaulnier
Balderson Deutch
Barr Diaz-Balart
Barragán Dingell
Bass Doggett
Beatty Doyle, Michael
Bera F.
Beyer Emmer
Bilirakis Escobar
Bishop (GA) Eshoo
Blumenauer Espallat
Blunt Rochester Ferguson
Bonamici Pinkenauer
Bost Fitzpatrick
Boyle, Brendan Fleischmann
F. Fletcher
Brindisi Fortenberry
Brooks (IN) Foster
Brown (MD) Frankel
Brownley (CA) Fudge
Buchanan Gabbard
Bucshon Gallagher
Burchett Gallego
Burgess Garamendi
Bustos Garcia (CA)
Butterfield Garcia (IL)
Calvert Garcia (TX)
Carbajal Gianforte
Cárdenas Golden
Carson (IN) Gomez
Carter (TX) Gonzalez (OH)
Cartwright Gonzalez (TX)
Case Gottheimer
Casten (IL) Hastings
Castor (FL) Hayes
Castro (TX) Heck
Chabot Green, Al (TX)
Chu, Judy Griffith
Grijalva Grijalva
Cicilline Guthrie
Cisneros Haaland
Clark (MA) Hagedorn
Clarke (NY) Harder (CA)
Clay Hartzler
Cleaver Hastings
Cline Hayes
Clyburn Heck
Cohen Herrera Beutler
Cole Higgins (NY)
Comer Hill (AR)
Connolly Himes
Cooper Holding
Correa Hollingsworth
Costa Horn, Kendra S.
Courtney Horsford
Cox (CA) Houlahan
Craig Hoyer
Crenshaw Hudson
Crist Huffman
Crow Huizenga
Cuellar Hurd (TX)
Cunningham Jackson Lee
Curtis Jacobs
Davids (KS) Jayapal
Davis (CA) Jeffries
Davis, Danny K. Johnson (GA)
Davis, Rodney Johnson (OH)
Dean Johnson (TX)

Watson Coleman (Pallone)
Welch (McGovern)
Waters (McGovern)
Wilson (FL) (Hayes)
Neguse
Newhouse
Norcross
Nunes
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Posey
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Reed
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rodgers (WA)
Roe, David P.
Rogers (KY)
Rooney (FL)
Rose (NY)
Rose, John W.
Rouda
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppertsberger
Rush
Rutherford
Ryan
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scalise
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shalala
Sherman
Sherrill
Shimkus
Simpson
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (MO)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speler
Stanton
Staubert
Stefanik
Stevens
Stewart
Stivers
Suozi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres Small (NM)
Trahan
Trone
Turner
Underwood
Upton
Van Drew
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walden
Walorski
Waltz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watkins
Watson Coleman
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Wexton
Wild
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Young
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—27

Abraham
Arrington
Bishop (UT)
Byrne
Cook
Davidson (OH)
DeFazio
Duncan
Dunn
Evans
Gaetz
Graves (GA)
Grothman
Spano
Steil
Tiffany
Timmons
Walker
Palazzo
Riggleman
Roby
Sensenbrenner
Steano
Steil
Tiffany
Timmons
Walker
Wright

□ 1337

Messrs. NADLER, VEASEY, RYAN, and MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

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

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 194.

Mr. ARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained by a media hit across the Capitol complex. I would have been a strong “yes” on rollcall No. 194.

Mr. GOODEN. Mr. Speaker, on the Motion to Recommit from today’s vote series, I incorrectly voted “no” when my intention was to vote “yes.”

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 965, 116TH CONGRESS

Barragán (Beyer) Hastings
Blumenauer (Beyer) (Wasserman) (Schultz)
Butterfield (Kildee) Jayapal (Raskin) (Khanna (Gomez))
Chu, Judy (Takano) Kirkpatrick (Gallego)
Clay (Davids (KS)) Langevin (Lynch)
Cohen (Beyer) Lawrence (Kildee)
Davis, Danny K. (Underwood) Lawson (FL)
DeSaulnier (Matsui) Lieu, Ted (Beyer)
Frankel (Clark (MA)) Lipinski (Cooper)
Grijalva (Raskin) Lowenthal (Beyer)

Lowey (Tonko)
Meng (Clark (MA))
Moore (Beyer)
Napolitano (Correa)
Payne (Wasserman) (Schultz)
Pingree (Clark (MA))
Pocan (Raskin)
Porter (Wexton)
Rooney (FL) (Beyer)
Roybal-Allard (Aguilar)
Hastings
Meng (Clark (MA))
Moore (Beyer)
Napolitano (Correa)
Payne (Wasserman) (Schultz)
Pingree (Clark (MA))
Pocan (Raskin)
Porter (Wexton)
Rooney (FL) (Beyer)
Roybal-Allard (Aguilar)

NAYS—73

Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Baird
Banks
Bergman
Biggs
Bishop (NC)
Bishop (UT)
Brady
Brooks (AL)
Buck
Budd
Carter (GA)
Cheney
Cloud
Conaway
Crawford
DesJarlais
Estes
Flores
Foxy (NC)
Fulcher
Gibbs
Gohmert
Gooden
Gosar
Graves (MO)
Guest
Harris
Hern, Kevin
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (PA)
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
Lamborn
Long
Loudermilk
Luetkemeyer
Massie
McClintock
Meuser
Murphy (NC)
Norman
Olson
Palmer
Pence
Perry
Reschenthaler
Rogers (AL)
Rouzer
Roy
Scott, Austin
Smith (NE)
Smucker
Steube
Taylor
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Walberg
Weber (TX)
Westerman
Yoho

NOT VOTING—28

Abraham
Byrne
Collins (GA)
Cook
Davidson (OH)
DeFazio
Duncan
Dunn
Engel
Evans
Gaetz
Granger
Graves (GA)
Grothman
Kaptur
Marchant
McHenry
O’Halloran
Palazzo
Riggleman
Roby
Sensenbrenner
Spano
Steil
Tiffany
Timmons
Walker
Wright

□ 1424

Mrs. HARTZLER and Mr. CLINE changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained due to personal reasons. Had I been present on September 17, 2020, I would have voted: “yea” on H. Res. 908—Condemning all forms of anti-Asian sentiment as related to

COVID-19 (Rep. Meng—Judiciary); “nay” on motion to recommit on H.R. 2694—Pregnant Workers Fairness Act (Rep. Nadler—Education and Labor); and “yea” on H.R. 2694—Pregnant Workers Fairness Act (Rep. Nadler—Education and Labor).

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE
RESOLUTION 965, 116TH CONGRESS

Barragán (Beyer)	Langevin (Lynch)	Rooney (FL) (Beyer)
Blumenauer (Beyer)	Lawrence (Kildee)	Roybal-Allard (Aguilar)
Butterfield (Kildee)	Lawson (FL)	Rush
Chu, Judy (Takano)	(Demings)	(Underwood)
Lieu, Ted (Beyer)		Serrano
Clay (Davids (KS))	Lipinski (Cooper)	(Jeffries)
	Loftgren (Jeffries)	Sewell (AL)
Cohen (Beyer)	Lowenthal (Beyer)	(DelBene)
Davis, Danny K. (Underwood)	Lowe (Tonko)	Sires (Pallone)
DeSaulnier (Matsui)	Meng (Clark (MA))	Trahan (McGovern)
Frankel (Clark (MA))	Moore (Beyer)	Waters
	Napolitano (Correa)	(Brownley (CA))
Grijalva (Raskin)		Watson Coleman (Pallone)
Hastings (Wasserman Schultz)	Payne (Wasserman Schultz)	Welch (McGovern)
Jayapal (Raskin)	Pingree (Clark (MA))	Wilson (FL) (Hayes)
Khanna (Gomez)		
Kirkpatrick (Gallego)	Pocan (Raskin) Porter (Wexton)	

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. Madam Speaker, I rise for the purpose of inquiring of the majority leader the schedule for next week.

Madam Speaker, I am happy to yield to my friend, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the House majority leader.

HONORING RETIRING PARLIAMENTARIAN THOMAS J. WICKHAM, JR.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Before we begin the colloquy, let me make some remarks about someone who has made a real difference in this House.

Madam Speaker, every society that wants to be a successful society has to have rules. Thomas Jefferson, one of the great political thinkers of the centuries, observed that there had to be both comity and fairness if we were going to come together and have a democracy that was operational.

Dick Gephardt used to say that the legislative process was a substitute for armed confrontation, that the resolution of differences in a democracy needed to be done in a civil way, pursuant to rules.

Madam Speaker, we are losing, in a short period of time, a gentleman who has made a difference for this House, this Congress—House and Senate—has made a difference to the civility of this House, a gentleman who, by the way, is not responsible in any way for the lack of civility that, from time to time, breaks out in this House.

□ 1430

I refer, Madam Speaker, to our Parliamentarian, Tom Wickham. I have had the privilege of knowing him all of

his days in the House of Representatives. He has been here for a significant period of time and has served as our Parliamentarian for essentially four Congresses, 8 years.

He stands—or sits, at this point in time—a short, at least 6 feet, distance, with his mask on, which is a unique experience for him, from the Speaker's rostrum. He is there to ensure that we play by the rules. He is there to ensure us that we do not take advantage of one another, but that we resolve, in pursuit of the rules, the differences that we may have and do so in a way that, for centuries, essentially, have governed how we process in the legislative arena.

It is a nonpartisan role. Obviously, he served when there were Republican Speakers, and obviously, he is serving now with a Democratic Speaker. It is nonpartisan, but it is sometimes thankless, particularly when you have to make a ruling, particularly that the majority party does not like.

I must say that there is probably not a Member among us who hasn't at some point in time said either, “Gee, I am sorry Wickham made that ruling,” or, “I don't agree with Wickham.” Therefore, it is a tough job because we are all pretty powerful people. We all think we are pretty smart people, and we know this, that, and the other. So, you have to have the courage of your convictions as well as the intellectual reasoning to go behind your decision. Tom Wickham has had that every day he has served in this House.

It is hard to be a referee because the calls don't always go the way people want. One of the hallmarks of the Parliamentarian's Office, and Tom Wickham in particular, is they call them as they see them. No matter the effect of those rulings, they make the ruling that they believe is correct. You can disagree, but what you cannot disagree with is that the Parliamentarian's Office prides itself on calling them as they see them.

Now, it was difficult, I am sure, for every Parliamentarian, and the Parliamentarian's Office, to conduct this role. But they have done so in a manner, all the time I have been here, which I am in my 40th year, that has been a credit to the House of Representatives, a credit to our democracy, a credit to Thomas Jefferson's perception of trying to create rules and ways of doing things that credited democracy, that did not undermine it.

Tom was also the Deputy Parliamentarian and the Assistant Parliamentarian, so he has had a lot of experience. He has spent a quarter of a century working for this House.

I will miss him. We will miss him. This Congress will miss him.

He will be succeeded by somebody who has experience and depth and will, I know, in the tradition of all the Parliamentarians with whom I have worked over those 40 years, be fair and unflinching in calling it as he sees it.

We will miss Tom's good humor and kind nature. I know my staff will miss

working closely with him every day to ensure the smooth and proper running of the floor.

On behalf of Democrats, and I know Mr. SCALISE will speak on behalf of his party as well, I want to thank you, Tom, for your service, for your dedication to this institution, for the temperate way in which you dealt with all of us, even when we were not temperate. You were steady, thoughtful, fair.

Also, as I said, I want to congratulate Deputy Parliamentarian JASON SMITH, who will succeed Tom as Parliamentarian of the House. He will, as every Parliamentarian with whom I have served, be fair, be honest, and call them as he sees them. My staff and I look forward to working with him in his new role.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, reclaiming my time.

Obviously, we will have an opportunity to continue, as we should, this tribute to Tom Wickham.

So, Tom, congratulations on what you have done to preserve the integrity of this institution.

We come here as Republicans, Democrats, as Americans first, but people who all have their own views. Even if you are Republican, we don't all think exactly the same way, as Democrats don't always think the same way. But we come here to achieve certain things, to make this a more perfect Union in the ways in which our districts—our 750,000, roughly, people elect us to come and be part of this democracy, the world's greatest democracy.

You come and work with other people. Sometimes, you battle with other people in the arena of legislative ideas. It is not physical confrontation, as the majority leader pointed out. But sometimes, you have to persuade. Sometimes, you have to fight for your beliefs.

But ultimately, if you are going to achieve the things you came here to do, you have to change legislation. It takes an act of Congress, as they say. When you do that, you have to follow the rules.

The Jefferson Manual that goes back to 1801 are the rules that govern this great House. If there is a bill on the floor and you wish to make a change to that bill, you want to offer an amendment to the bill, bring a motion to recommit to the bill, you have to work within the rules. Those rules are interpreted not by the majority, not by the minority, but by the Parliamentarian.

The job you have done for 25 years in the Parliamentarian's Office, but especially since 2011 as the House Parliamentarian, you don't always tell people what they want to hear, but you tell people what is the right way to do something according to the rules that we have established so that there is a fair process.

A lot of people don't see this back and forth. If the Parliamentarian rules against you, it is not a personal thing. In many cases, a Member will go to the

Parliamentarian, Republican or Democrat—I have done this myself—and said, “This is what I would like to achieve.”

Sometimes, they tell you that you can't do it on that bill because there are germaneness issues. But sometimes, there is that gray area where if you are trying to do it this way, it won't work, but if you try to do it another way, it actually would work. That is really the art of the ability of a Parliamentarian, to work with Members of Congress to help them achieve the things they are trying to do. We still have to go and get the votes, but at least allowing a Member that opportunity to go fight it out and make their case.

In many cases, that case wouldn't be able to be made if the Parliamentarian wasn't fair in offering that guidance to Members of Congress, whatever they are trying to achieve, whatever their background, whatever their district, to be fair and to at least give them that opportunity to come here on the House floor and fight that battle, hopefully right that wrong, and advance the things that they were elected to go do to make this a more perfect Union.

So thank you, Tom, for that fairness.

I know as Jason takes on this role in a few weeks, he will have a great legacy to build upon and to look toward somebody who did the job right and served this country in a very proud and respected way.

I know Heather is probably watching on C-SPAN. I am not sure how many other people are, but Heather, hopefully, is, your wife. She will have more time to work with you. I am not sure who the parliamentarian of your house is. I am the House Republican whip, but in my house, Jennifer is the one who plays that role.

But in your house, hopefully, Heather sees you more, because you are here when we are here, and sometimes those are late hours, and sometimes those are long weekends.

We appreciate the sacrifices you have made. Hopefully, in this next role in your life, you will be able to enjoy more time with your wife, Heather, and your family.

We truly do thank you for playing this part of your role in history and adding to what is great about this great democracy.

Do you mind standing up so everybody in the Chamber here can see you and pay the proper tribute?

Madam Speaker, I yield to my friend.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

If I might wryly observe, Madam Speaker, that I have not seen the Parliamentarian pass you a note to instruct the gentleman to address the Chair.

Tom, I am going to address you.

Mr. SCALISE. As I was addressing it to the Speaker, of course.

Mr. HOYER. Tom Wickham, for those who are watching, is a wonderful example of the extraordinary patriotism,

loyalty, and talent that has contributed to this House's operation by all of our staff. He is one of the best, but we have the best.

Tom, I know you treated all the staff, certainly on my staff—and I know all the staff—with great respect because you knew how important they were. We all know how important you have been to the operations of this House.

I don't know what you will be doing. But assuming that you, at this young age of yours—I told you that you were way too young for us to let you go, but you are going—you will be doing other things, and you will bring great value to whatever enterprise you pursue. We have been blessed for a quarter of a century with your service, and we thank you for that service. Godspeed.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, reclaiming my time.

Madam Speaker, we all appreciate Tom's service to our country and especially to this Chamber.

Now, if I may inquire of the majority leader the schedule for next week, and I would yield.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, on Monday, the House will meet at 12 p.m. for legislative business. No votes are expected in the House on Monday.

On Tuesday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for morning-hour debate and 11 a.m. for legislative business.

I would remind Members that Monday is expected to be a travel day following the holiday. So, Monday we will have business on the floor, but we will have no votes on the floor.

On Wednesday and Thursday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for morning-hour debate and 11 a.m. for legislative business.

On Friday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business.

We will consider several bills, Madam Speaker, under suspension of the rules, a large number of suspension bills, in fact. The complete list of suspension bills will be announced by the close of business tomorrow.

The House will consider, as well, next week a continuing resolution for fiscal year 2021.

Madam Speaker, the House has passed 10 of its appropriations bills of the 12 appropriations bills we have.

Sadly, the Senate has not passed a single bill out of committee, has not voted on a single appropriations bill in its committee. As a result, clearly, we will not be able to conclude the appropriations process, and we will have to have a CR to make sure that government stays serving the American people.

Hopefully, we can reach a bipartisan agreement, and there will not be a controversial continuing resolution. I know Democrats and Republicans and the administration are working toward that end.

I expect and hope a bill to be filed tomorrow. That is our hope. But we do expect to consider that bill next week.

The CR, as I said, is necessary to avert a shutdown that would only fur-

ther damage our economy and undermine our efforts on COVID-19.

In addition, the House will consider H.R. 4447, the Clean Economy Jobs and Innovation Act. This bill, Madam Speaker, is a package of legislation reported out of the Energy and Commerce Committee and the Science, Space, and Technology Committee to invest in energy innovation and clean energy development.

In addition, the House may consider H.R. 6270, the Uyghur Forced Labor Disclosure Act, and H.R. 6210, the Uyghur Forced Labor Prevention Act.

Members are advised that additional legislative items are possible.

I yield back to my friend, the Republican whip.

□ 1445

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman and appreciate the timeline, especially the comments about the negotiations that have been going on in a very constructive way regarding a continuing resolution. They have definitely been in good faith with Republicans and Democrats as well as with the White House. It is encouraging to hear that, potentially, tomorrow that could be filed and we fully expect to be ready to take that up next week if that does, in fact, happen.

I know the differences that we have been talking about in the last few days are minor in consideration of all of the factors that are included in a continuing resolution. So I think, as people watch some of the bigger fights that are real between the two sides, to see that on something as important as properly and responsibly funding the government that we are making very good progress on at least a short-term mechanism that would stave off any kind of shutdown between now and September 30, I appreciate the work that has been done by the majority with the minority and with the White House and Senate to get to that point. Hopefully, we do get that legislation filed and are able to take it up next week.

Unless the gentleman had anything else on that, there was another legislative issue I wanted to bring up.

As we both know, there are conversations going on regarding a potential next relief package. We don't know if there will be an agreement reached. These negotiations have been going on for weeks and weeks since the CARES Act, the multiple pieces of legislation that we filed both before and after that we have come to an agreement on, things like the Paycheck Protection Program that both sides worked very hard on, very successfully on.

Reports have come out to show over 50 million Americans' jobs were saved by the work we did as a Congress working together to save millions of small businesses and over 50 million jobs as we are struggling through this pandemic.

One of the things I would like to ask the gentleman to take a look at is that

we may get an agreement, but we may not on a bigger relief package, and we see multiple bills that are out there. The Senate has been trying to advance something. The House has had a position. Some House Democrats yesterday filed a separate bill with some other House Republicans to try to have a third way, and the White House has been talking about a different option. In the meantime, we clearly don't have an agreement yet on that.

I would ask if the gentleman would look at H.R. 8265. This is a bill by Representative CHABOT of Ohio. He is the lead Republican on the House Small Business Committee. This is a bill that would specifically target those small businesses that were part of the Paycheck Protection Program. This is not a new idea. This is taking the existing framework of a bill that we, both sides, came together to pass, a very successful bill.

As the gentleman knows, the Paycheck Protection Program still has over \$130 billion remaining in its account, money that wasn't spent. We were able to help every business that asked. Every business that was eligible was able to go to their local bank, didn't have to go to an SBA lender.

Again, I want to thank our small community banks that played such an important role. We would not have been able to help all those small businesses stay afloat if our local community banks didn't participate in helping the customers that they usually see on a daily basis who are struggling.

But as that money is sitting in that account, the program has expired, so the money can no longer be spent. We have appropriated this money. It is not new money and it is not a new program. But what Representative CHABOT's bill does is it would allow those small businesses that have shown a loss—we know there are some businesses doing better today than they were before COVID; there are some that are doing dramatically worse after COVID.

This would specifically be limited to those businesses that have experienced at least a 25 percent loss or more, that they would be able to go for a second round of Paycheck Protection loans, using existing money, not new money, the money that is locked in an account that can no longer be spent.

So maybe we do get an agreement between now and then on a larger package, but if we don't, at a minimum, I would just ask the gentleman—I would think this would be something that could pass on the suspension calendar to at least help small businesses using a program we already agree upon, that we already know has been successful. It saved small businesses in every single district of this country. It is not a Republican or Democrat plan. It has been a plan that truly has been a lifeline for any of our small businesses. And, again, over 50 million jobs have been saved.

I would just ask the gentleman if he would take a look at that, if we don't

get an agreement, to potentially bring something like that to the floor—that could be a suspension-type bill to pass—and, at least while we are negotiating things that may or may not happen, help those businesses that we know need help.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Of course, the Paycheck Protection Program was a very, very important program. I was pleased that the committees came up with that program and we had bipartisan support for that program.

I will tell the gentleman that that is an important effort for us to take, but I would also say it is very important for us to act on behalf of millions of people who still do not have a job or are on unemployment and need the supplemental unemployment that they were receiving to survive and keep their families going.

We have millions of people who are suffering from food shortages, the inability to keep their family fed. We need to pass, we believe, the supplemental nutrition program.

We need to make sure that States, in my view, have the ability to function. They are hemorrhaging revenues because of COVID-19, because of the decrease in the economy. States, cities, municipalities, counties are suffering, and many other aspects, including testing, which is one of the critical components of us confronting COVID-19.

So while I agree with the gentleman that the program that he talks about—of course, we created that program and we passed it in a bipartisan fashion, and it was very bipartisan in the Senate. I know Mr. CARDIN and Mr. RUBIO were both involved in that. It was very important to pass that.

But I will tell the gentleman that I was pleased that the President indicated that we need to invest very significant sums, which he then said would come back to the U.S. or help the U.S. economy. I think that was a positive step forward.

I would also observe, as the gentleman observed, that Speaker PELOSI and Secretary Mnuchin reached four major deals, compromises—four. One was, we thought, very big at the time, \$8.3 billion, which now looks somewhat small. But we reached four of those. We brought them to the House floor, the Senate floor, and they passed overwhelmingly in bipartisan votes.

Secretary Mnuchin and the Speaker have been discussing trying to get to, for 4 months now—now, Mr. MEADOWS is also in the room. Mr. MEADOWS and I have a very positive relationship, but my observation has been, through the years, Mr. MEADOWS is more about stopping deals than making deals.

But I agree with the gentleman, we need to act. I am hopeful that the administration and the Senate and the House will reach agreement ASAP, not only on the PPP, which I agree with the gentleman on, not only on the

PPP, but all the other programs that I mentioned and many more that are in the HEROES bill.

The Speaker has indicated we are certainly prepared to negotiate what the expenditure is, and she has indicated a willingness to come down very, very substantially to try to reach an agreement, which is what compromise is all about. That hasn't happened yet, but I am hopeful that it will happen in the near term, because I agree with the gentleman, we need to act. I am urging the administration and all of us to come to an agreement.

Unfortunately, in the Senate, their efforts have not been successful in passing a bill. So we have no alternative bill beyond the HEROES bill that passed, as I said, 4 months ago, so we have nothing to conference because there is no Senate bill.

In fact, Mr. MCCONNELL went from a trillion down to a half a trillion, which almost every economist, either at a trillion or half a trillion, says is not sufficient for health reasons and economic reasons and family reasons to confront the enormity of the challenge that still confronts us as a result of COVID-19.

So I thank the gentleman for mentioning Mr. CHABOT's legislation. He is right, of course, there is \$130 billion in the pot. I think we ought to purpose that to either a continuation of PPP or a continuation of PPP and other things. But I think we ought to do it, and what we are trying to do is a comprehensive package that deals with all the challenges confronting American families, particularly the unemployment insurance.

As of July 31, as the gentleman knows, the supplemental payment lapsed. To some degree, the President has tried to put additional sums in there. Some States are pursuing it and some States have effected it.

But I hope that the bottom line is, in the next week, in the near term, and I think the President's statement was helpful, and I hope, frankly, the Senators take that to heart, that we need to invest much more than they suggested if we are going to meet the scope of the problem that exists.

I thank the gentleman bringing to the House's attention that particular bill, and certainly it will be under consideration as well, I think, by those who are negotiating, mainly Secretary Mnuchin and Speaker PELOSI. Mr. MCCONNELL has chosen not to participate in those discussions, as you know. Mr. SCHUMER does, and I think Mr. MCCARTHY does—I am not sure all the time, but I am sure he does as well.

We want to get an agreement. We want to do what we have done four times: reached an agreement, passed it overwhelmingly in both Houses for the people, because the people are hurting and we need to act and meet that challenge of their hurt and their need to support themselves, their families, and, as you point out, their businesses.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

As we look at the various topics that the gentleman from Maryland brought up on the negotiations, if you looked at the Senate bill—and, clearly, there are multiple bills out there—ultimately, it is going to take a bipartisan bill working with the administration. Mr. MEADOWS has been here many times working, trying to meet, sometimes not being able to get meetings with some leaders.

But at the same time, if you look at the Senate bill, they did include some enhanced unemployment. They included more money for small businesses, for families, for testing. They had \$16 billion for testing, \$31 billion for vaccine, which I know—I want to bring that up. They had \$20 billion for farmers, \$15 billion for childcare.

They did have liability protection, which continues to be a very big issue many small businesses bring up. They want to make sure that, if they open safely, they are not going to be shut down by frivolous lawsuits. That is something that there has been a lot of negotiation about as well.

But, ultimately, when you look at those differences, we will hopefully get that resolved. In the meantime, if that can't get broken, at a minimum, if we can look at some of the money that is unspent because, in addition to the PPP, I think the gentleman knows, we also put about \$150 billion in the CARES Act toward our States to help all of our States, a formula that allowed States and, in some cases, local governments get money to help themselves through these tough times.

There is not one State that has spent all that money. And I know some people want to talk about how much more money to give, but if they haven't spent the money they have already gotten, maybe we can look there as another way to help push more relief, including with schools.

If a school wants to reopen safely—and I would encourage all schools, the protocols have been out there. The Centers for Disease Control have put out very good, responsible safety protocols for safely reopening schools, and it varies, depending on the kind of region you are in. If you have a spike, there is a way to handle that. If you are in an area that has not seen a prevalence of COVID, then there is a different way to handle it. But in every case, there is a way to safely reopen schools. The American Academy of Pediatrics has laid that out as well. It means following the safety guidelines, but it can be done and needs to be done.

Unfortunately, in every case it is not being done, but it is not for lack of money. Any school system that needs more assistance, whether it is masks or screens for the teachers or whatever else they might need, sanitizer, the funds that we sent to the States, again, none of which have spent all of that money, can be used to help to safely reopen schools as well.

So those are all conversations we will hopefully have.

I do want to then talk about where we are with a vaccine, because we have been seeing a lot more reports on the progress, the tremendous progress that has been made within the medical community. And we know from the very beginning of this disease that our frontline healthcare workers have been some of the heroes, probably the biggest heroes of all of this, those hospital workers, the nurses, the doctors, but also those people working in the labs.

□ 1500

Almost instantly after China lied to us about the origination of the disease, lied to us about even whether or not the disease could be spread from person to person they corrupted the WHO. But ultimately as we started to find out what was coming out of Wuhan, I don't know, even the Foreign Affairs Committee of this House majority had a hearing titled: "The Wuhan Coronavirus." So clearly, we know where this started. It has been discussed.

But at the same time, we have been working feverishly to find a cure, to find a vaccine. We have seen therapies emerge at a rapid pace. President Trump implemented Operation Warp Speed, which was a way to get red tape out of the way. Nobody is cutting corners on safety, but ultimately what we are all doing is focusing all the energy and the weight of this Federal Government behind finding a cure and a vaccine, and what we are seeing now is remarkable success in progress.

Here are some of the companies that right now are in phase 3 of testing on an actual vaccine for COVID-19. These are all very respected companies, not only in America, but worldwide, globally respected.

I am concerned by some of the comments we are starting to see by some people trying to undermine the public's confidence in a vaccine if it were to be approved by the FDA. And let's keep in mind, the FDA would have to approve any vaccine. You have to get approved by the FDA to go to phase 2. You have to get approved to go to phase 3, and then ultimately after testing on tens of thousands of people at a pace we have never seen before—with money, by the way, that we helped pass, and again, the gentleman and I both were part of those coalitions, Republican and Democrat, working to put money in place for that testing, for the work that is being done by these great companies to start now making the vaccine vials, a hundred million vials possibly that could be made before the drug is approved if, in fact, it then gets that approval, so that you don't have to wait to start mass producing after the approval.

If the FDA does approve any or all of these drugs as a vaccine that would actually prevent COVID-19, I hope we would both encourage people, if they wanted to, to then go and get that vaccine. And this is, hopefully, not going to be a debate within the country. Hopefully, it is going to be a recogni-

tion that America has the best scientific minds in the world. We have the most respected drug companies in the world, and they are working feverishly, not cutting a single corner on safety.

These would have to be safe and effective drugs for the FDA to approve them, but if any one or all of them get approved, then I would hope we would encourage people to go and protect their families, if that is what they want to do. And I know a lot of people that would want to do it. I have heard from some people, as I am sure the gentleman has, that they may want to wait a little while. But I also know that people want to be safe and secure in their homes. They want to have a confidence level that they are not going to be at risk of dying from COVID. And ultimately a vaccine and a therapy are the final answer that gets us over the hump, that gets us to where we can fully start reopening.

We are seeing many States at advanced levels of opening their economy, but we also know that we are not where we need to be, and a vaccine is probably going to be that biggest determining point that helps people reopen in a much more effective way. I hope we can at least agree that if that approval comes by the FDA that it is something we can all embrace and encourage people to pursue, if that is what they feel is best for their family.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, the whip mentioned undermining confidence. I will tell the whip with all due respect; nobody has undermined confidence in the healthcare system more than the President of the United States. No one has diverted more attention from the experts; no one has denigrated the experts, which undermines confidence in their advice and counsel, than the President of the United States. And no one in the health community said that the coronavirus was a hoax.

We have just seen that Mr. Woodward heard in late January that the President thought this was a very serious matter. And then, frankly, he conveyed to the American people, don't worry about it, it is going to go away. In a few days, a few weeks, it is going to go away.

No one has undermined the confidence of the American people in the CDC or the FDA or the NIH more than the President of the United States. He said they are wrong.

And I say that because confidence needs to be built by leadership. And if the vaccine can come out next month, hooray, if it can be done consistent with what the medical experts and the pharmaceutical experts tell us can give the American people confidence.

But I will tell my friend Mr. Caputo substantially undermined confidence because he wanted to tell the experts what to say apparently consistent with what the administration's policy was as opposed to what the scientific evidence was.

And so when you mention confidence, some people were trying to undermine confidence; we have had six, seven, eight months of undermining confidence.

And it is a shame. Because the gentleman is absolutely right. People are going to need confidence. And they are going to have to take the vaccine because that is the only way this economy is going to get back to where it needs to be. People having confidence in the safety for themselves, their husband, their wife, their children to be about the business of America and their own personal business.

So I would hope that the President would leave it to the experts, not to his judgment, to the experts as to when a vaccine is ready to deliver to the public. And then I think all of us ought to have that confidence to—I certainly am going to get the vaccine when the medical experts tell me this is safe to take, and I am going to urge my family to do the same. And I am sure you have just indicated you would do the same. I think we will, hopefully, do that.

But the instilling of confidence, I would tell my friend, starts at the top and with all of us, as well, because people respect us in some respects sometimes, and they think we have knowledge that they may not have, and therefore, they want to have confidence that, yes, this is good; no, it is not, don't do it.

So I would simply say to my friend, I hope that we get a vaccine. I hope we get it as soon as possible. And I hope that the election has nothing to do with the vaccine. I hope the decision has everything to do with science and medicine. And I think all Americans hope that, as well.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I would tell the gentleman it is not hope that you have to have. This is all about science.

Name one of these companies that would put their name on a drug that would be injected into American people based on politics or based on a timeline that would have an impact on an election? Not one of these companies would do it. I would challenge anyone to name a company that would do that, because they wouldn't do that. So it is not a hope.

If the FDA approves one of these drugs or all of these drugs, it is because they work, they save lives. And we can't have an undermined confidence that they would save lives—because a vaccine is not something that a President or a candidate for President sits in a lab and figures out. It is a very serious process that the FDA, who is the most respected agency in the world for drug approval, has to sign off on every step of the way.

There are three phases. These are the companies that made it all the way through. There are other companies that are in earlier stages and may actually get to an FDA-approved vaccine, as well, and they are all very well respected, too, but these are the only

companies. There is no mystery company. These are the companies that are in competition, not with themselves, but they are trying to save lives. And from everything we are hearing, the results are tremendously successful. We should be applauding that.

Operation Warp Speed has gotten us to this point, and while the President might not get credit—and I think it is an important point, as the gentleman talks about instilling confidence, where the President is on science. I have been in many of those meetings with Dr. Fauci, with Dr. Birx, with the whole team of the whole coronavirus task force.

Mr. HOYER. How about Dr. Redfield?

Mr. SCALISE. He has been in some of those meetings, too. And as the gentleman knows, not all doctors agree.

Mr. HOYER. Did you see what happened in the last 48 hours?

Mr. SCALISE. There are some doctors who will say this is the way to do it, and there are some doctors who say that is the way to do it. You get 10 attorneys in a room; you might get 10 opinions. The saying "go get a second opinion," that is because maybe not all doctors agree.

But when you are President of the United States you don't have the luxury of waiting for every doctor to be in agreement. If there is an inflection point on a decision, and some doctors are over here, and some doctors are over there, guess what, it is the President who has to make that final call, not because he has ignored science, but because he has looked to the science, and ultimately, he has to make that decision.

Dr. Fauci himself was in a committee hearing by the Select Subcommittee that the majority whip, Mr. CLYBURN, chairs. I am the lead Republican on that committee. We had Dr. Fauci in our committee. I asked him specifically, I went down the line on major decisions that had to be made by this President and whether or not science was used or not and whether or not it worked. I started, by the way, with the decision of whether or not to stop flights from China when we found out after China lied that they, in fact, did have this disease spreading widely in China, and President Trump made that decision to stop flights from China.

I know the Democrat nominee for President was against that decision, but President Trump worked with the experts. Dr. Fauci was part of that.

I asked him, I said, Was that the right decision by President Trump?

He said, Yes, it was.

I said, Did that decision save American lives?

He said, Yes, it I did.

And we went down the line on decision after decision, and they were all science-based. At no point was the President trying to undermine science.

In fact, some people were trying to suggest that Dr. Fauci was being sidelined, and yet, he was at the hearing, under oath, speaking on behalf of his

role in the administration, and he said he has never been sidelined. He was actually asked that question, Have you been sidelined? He said, "no" under oath.

Now, is he always in agreement with the other doctors in the room? No, he is not. Does that mean he is wrong? No. But maybe he is. But, again, doctors can disagree because that is what science is. It is not two plus two equals four every time because you are dealing with some very complicated issues of a disease we knew nothing about less than a year ago.

Fortunately, with Operation Warp Speed, President Trump put together the best scientists, not just in America, but I would argue in the world, to figure out how to solve this, how to come up with things like hydroxychloroquine, which some people might say doesn't work. I have talked to many doctors who use it successfully to save lives even today. That should be the doctor's decision. Some people want government to control all those decisions. I would rather the doctor being the one to work with his patient.

You look at the other drugs that are out there today, but again, now we talk about a vaccine, there is not one company on this list—these are the only companies right now in phase 3. And if any of them are approved by the FDA, I hope nobody would question the integrity of that drug.

Do you think any of these companies would put their name on a drug that they don't stand behind as a safe and effective vaccine for this disease? And that is really the point.

It is all about science here. It is all about science and some people are trying to undermine that. And we need to get away from that because that will cost lives. If somebody is reluctant to take one of these drugs because they heard somebody that said, well, don't trust it if it comes from this President or that candidate, that is a dangerous game because lives would be lost if people didn't take that vaccine because they didn't have that confidence. We all need to have that confidence. We all work with science.

We have all had doctors who told us one thing, and maybe you wanted to go get that second opinion, but at the end of the day, you have got to make that choice, and you make it based on all the science that is available, and not all the time do all the scientists agree. In fact, many times on the complicated issues you get different opinions from different scientists. This President has worked with some of the best in the world.

And according to Dr. Fauci himself, by and large, the President has followed even Dr. Fauci's advice and has made the right decisions up and down the line based on science. And most importantly, President Trump's decision following the science has saved American lives, starting with that very first decision, which Joe Biden himself was

against. How many American lives would have been lost if we didn't ban the flights from China; if we didn't ban the flights from Europe, when it was breaking out in Europe; if we didn't do 15 days to stop the spread, which President Trump did on the advice of his scientist? After that they said we need to go another 30 days. President Trump did that, too. Every one of those decisions was based on science. Every one of those decisions saved American lives.

□ 1515

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

This President doesn't take responsibility for anything other than good things. If anything bad happens, this President does not take responsibility. He points to somebody else.

What I interrupted the gentleman on was he says, "the scientists." Redfield is a scientist. He is a medical doctor. He is the head of the CDC. He made a comment, his best judgment as to when vaccines were going to be available, widely available.

The President contradicted him on both points he made just a few days ago, as he has done with Fauci, as he has done with Hahn, as he has done with others.

My confidence in those three companies is that they will come to the referee and will say: "Is this ready to go?" The referee, in this case the FDA, that the gentleman says is so respected has that responsibility.

What I don't have confidence in, what I think so many of the American people don't have confidence in, is they will get a call from the White House that says: "This is the judgment you are going to make."

We have seen, over and over and over again, decisions modified because of White House direction. In fact, Caputo was there for exactly that reason at HHS, not CDC, but overseeing CDC.

I tell my friend, Madam Speaker, yes, we need to have confidence, but we need to be truthful with them. We need to tell them the truth. We need to take direction from the experts, not substitute our judgment.

The gentleman talks about hydroxychloroquine. Obviously, Fauci didn't think that was a great recommendation to make. That was for doctors to make, but the President made it. In fact, most of the doctors thought that was not a good recommendation.

Certainly, Clorox was even less than that, I say as an aside. Maybe it was tongue in cheek, but unfortunately, when the President speaks, people don't necessarily think it is tongue in cheek, and it becomes dangerous.

I will say to my friend, hopefully, that this vaccine issue will be resolved by the experts and give confidence to the American people that they can, in fact, rely on the experts and their doctor to take the vaccine because, hopefully, it will be in a position where, in

fact, it will give the confidence and the result that is promised.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I would just remind the gentleman, with all due respect to Dr. Redfield, he is not the head of the FDA.

The FDA is the agency that approves drugs, and in fact, the FDA is the agency working every day with these companies. There is a very strict protocol for going through phases of testing.

Now, one thing that is important to point out on the testing, because, again, some people wonder because Operation Warp Speed has gotten us to a point quicker, maybe in the history of the world, at finding a vaccine for a disease we knew nothing about 8 months ago, but the reason they are doing it is not because they are cutting corners. No one in science that I have heard has suggested that they are cutting corners because they are not. They have strict protocols.

What they are doing, number one, the President put real money in place behind making sure that each of these drug companies has direct communication with the FDA every step of the way so they know if tests need to be run on more people or different demographic groups, as is done with other drugs, they can do it quickly. They have a wide range of people willing to be tested.

To the tribute of all Americans, over 300,000 Americans have signed up for these tests. This isn't being tested on just a few people. Sometimes, a drug takes years and years to get to market for a lot of reasons. One is red tape.

President Trump has done a great job of getting the red tape out of the way to let the scientists actually do their job in real time. Something could sit on somebody's desk for months, in many cases, delaying lifesaving drugs. We have gotten that red tape out of the way.

Frankly, we ought to look at working together as Republicans and Democrats at making that the norm, not the exception, to actually be able to get red tape out of the way to help save lives.

But as they are doing it, they are testing it on more people than is normally the case. Sometimes, you might only have a few thousand people who are willing or in a position to be tested. Today, you have hundreds of thousands of people who are being tested.

If they make it through each step, it is not based on who is in the White House. It is based on what the doctors at the FDA, working with the smart people in these drug companies, have come up with based on the test results. If they test people and there are problems, it doesn't even make it to phase 2.

These are all in phase 3. They are all showing tremendous promise, but if one of them makes it through or if all of them make it through, it is not because somebody rushed it. It is because the doctors and the scientists said it works. Not one of these companies

would put their name on that vaccine, not one of them.

Again, I would challenge anybody, Madam Speaker, if they think any of these companies would cut a corner, please let us know right now because that is not the case. That narrative shouldn't be out there because that narrative would be a false narrative and would cost American lives. If that narrative were to get out, then there might be people who wouldn't take the vaccine who otherwise would and should, where it could save their life, because this will save American lives.

And it is through American ingenuity. We ought to be proud of this.

We should put the politics aside and say thank God America is the leader in healthcare to the point where we have great American companies partnering, in this case, with a German company here in America, testing at a level we have never seen before on more people because we took the priority, through Operation Warp Speed, to put all the focus of these great agencies on finding a cure for COVID-19.

We are on the brink of doing it. It may not happen if the science doesn't match. But if the science does say these work, we all ought to applaud that and encourage people to explore, in a conversation with their doctor, whether or not they should take it.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I am not going to prolong this. The only thing I would say is, under the gentleman's theory, Madam Speaker, we wouldn't need the FDA because, clearly, these companies would not do anything just because of profit. And I don't allege that they would do that.

But we have an FDA because we need a referee to look at it without thinking of the consequences of a yes or no answer but a scientific answer. That is the only observation I would make.

I get it. I get that the companies are reputable companies.

I support them. They do great work. But we have an FDA because we need somebody who is an independent arbiter, not just because no company would do this. Because if no company would do it, we wouldn't need the FDA.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I never suggested that. In fact, I said at the outset that these companies are in direct communication with the FDA on a regular basis. That is what Operation Warp Speed is.

In the old way of doing things, these companies would have submitted their data and would have waited months while some faceless bureaucrat let it sit on a desk and nothing happened.

Instead, what the President did was said there will be direct contacts where they can communicate with the FDA. They are not the enemy.

These companies aren't the enemy. The FDA is not the enemy. But it shouldn't be viewed as you are on one side and you are on the other side.

They are both working together because they are both part of the smartest scientific community in the world.

They work together because the FDA wants to get it right and these companies want to get it right.

We saw one of them just a few days ago. They had a pause, which is the protocol. That is the safety protocol because there was a question in the testing, and they addressed it. I am sure there were many. I don't know directly, but I am sure there were many conversations with the FDA.

But then they started up again, which means there wasn't a problem. But it meant they followed the protocols, which say, if you see something that you need to go review, you hold off, and then you go check that out. That is what one of these did, and now they are back on track.

The others continue to go through, all of them, working with the FDA. That is really what this is about. It is about a partnership because the FDA has to sign off.

I am sure the gentleman would agree. You want to make sure you have multiple people looking at it. You don't just want the company that is making the drug looking at it. You want the regulator looking at it as well because, ultimately, they have to sign off on it.

They are not doing it blindly. No one suggests that. But they are doing it with a much sharper focus. It is the top priority, I think we would all agree. This needs to be the priority to get our country back on track, and it has to be done right. But it is not going to get signed off if it is not right. So, it is a partnership, and it is working incredibly well.

Again, this new partnership ought to be the model in the future. It shouldn't be the exception just because of COVID. It is working incredibly well.

We worked together to pass the 21st Century Cures Act, which ultimately will find a cure for cancer, for Alzheimer's, for ALS, for other diseases. It is because we put a sharper focus over at the National Institutes of Health, and we put additional resources over at the National Institutes of Health.

That priority, what we are learning from this, ought to be replicated to help find a cure for some of those other diseases so that maybe we can find even more cures for people who are living today, not just for somebody 30 years from now, but for somebody struggling today with one of those terrible diseases.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I have nothing left to say.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I know we will continue this conversation. Hopefully, the bill gets filed tomorrow, and we can resolve more of these issues next week. I look forward to seeing the gentleman and working with him on all of these.

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

HONORING COMMISSIONER BILLIE DEAN

(Mrs. DEMINGS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. DEMINGS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the life of Commissioner Billie Dean from the city of Apopka.

Mr. Dean was a guiding light for Apopka.

From bravery in Korea, to the classrooms and commission, to the forefront of racial integration in the South, Commissioner Dean was a champion for his community.

He was a local hero for his work to revitalize South Apopka and to fight for justice. As a teacher and a commissioner, he made the future of Apopka his ultimate cause.

There is no higher praise for a public servant than the love of his community. Apopka loved him, and he loved Apopka.

Madam Speaker, we are grateful for a life well lived.

AMERICANS ARE WAITING

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

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Madam Speaker, why were we brought back to Washington, D.C., this week?

Was it to provide much-needed relief and assistance to American families and small businesses because of the pandemic? No.

Instead, we continue to spend time on another set of mostly partisan messaging bills with little or no input from Republicans. My Democratic colleagues rely on grandstanding and talk more about the bills they have passed than the bills, Madam Speaker, they have actually gotten signed into law.

It is time for Democrats to get serious and stop trying to score political points and come back to the negotiating table. Let's serve the American people by actually getting much-needed bipartisan legislation signed into law to fight this virus and get our economy back.

We have already proven how much good we can accomplish for American families and the American people when we work together.

RECOGNIZING HOPE LEE ON HIS 100TH BIRTHDAY

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

Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. Hope Lee, a revered constituent of New York's 14th Congressional District who is celebrating his 100th birthday this year and has served so valiantly for our country.

During World War II, Mr. Lee received a Bronze Star Medal, two Purple

Hearts, and a Combat Infantry Badge for his service to the country during World War II.

Mr. Lee, in fact, was supposed to go to Washington, D.C., this year to get his Congressional Gold Medal of Honor this May, but it was postponed due to the pandemic.

I think it is incredibly important to honor his work and his service here on the House floor.

He is extraordinarily proud of his service in the U.S. military and hangs his American flag outside his house for every U.S. holiday.

In fact, he and his wife, Rose Lee, have been happily married for 76 years, and Mr. Lee still does the cooking for himself and his wife.

Madam Speaker, I ask our colleagues to join me in recognizing Mr. Hope Lee.

Thank you for your service, and happy birthday, Mr. Lee.

□ 1530

SUICIDE PREVENTION AWARENESS MONTH

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

Mr. WALTZ. Madam Speaker, as a combat veteran, I think a lot about my past experiences in battle and personally have dealt with my own struggles, from PTS to survivor's guilt.

But this year, we are in a collective battle, and the front lines look very different. We are fighting against an invisible enemy, against COVID-19, and we are forced to distance ourselves and to change our entire way of life. This isolation is causing anxiety, depression, and sometimes takes us to even darker places, even with suicidal thoughts.

September is Suicide Prevention Awareness Month, and I am teaming with a veterans group, Mission Roll Call, to raise awareness about suicide prevention, especially the 22 veterans per day we are currently losing.

In combat, we are constantly checking on our brothers and sisters to our left and our right, and we have to do the same back here at home. So I say to all veterans out there: Reach out. Ask your buddy how they are doing. Share a memory. Let them know that you are thinking about them and you have their back.

Together, we are stronger. Together, we can win this fight.

NATIONAL RECOVERY MONTH

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

Ms. DEAN. Madam Speaker, recovery is challenging and isolating even during normal days, and this pandemic has only made it more difficult for those who suffer from addiction and substance use disorder. That is why National Recovery Month, this month,

takes on even greater meaning as many are navigating isolation and distance from family and support networks.

National Recovery Month is personal for me and my family. My son, Harry, is in long-term recovery from opioid addiction. Now he is healthy, he is well, and he works now to help others who struggle with substance abuse disorder.

In his work, he reminds me that, during the pandemic, so many have it even tougher on the road to recovery. He reminds me that not all are as fortunate as we have been, and we recognize National Recovery Month for its importantly shining a light on this issue.

I call on us to dedicate more resources to support those suffering with addiction and substance use disorder to live happy, rewarding, healthy lives.

And for those suffering with substance use disorders: You are not alone. There is hope.

STAND UP FOR POLICE

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

Mr. GUEST. Madam Speaker, no matter your political affiliations in 2001, there were no greater heroes than our first responders who risked their own lives to save their fellow citizens on 9/11. Republicans and Democrats thanked our first responders, while children across our Nation looked up to them as examples of what it meant to be heroes, to risk their own well-being in service to their fellow citizens.

Now, across the Nation, we see a stark contrast to that scene from almost 20 years ago. Radicals now seek to defund the police. They threaten the men and women who risk their lives in service to our community, and, at times, they target our officers with violence, which, in the most tragic of cases, means these officers who are also fathers, mothers, sons, and daughters never return home to their family.

I am calling on Members of Congress who have remained silent in recent months to now publicly oppose the violence against our law enforcement community so that we can put an end to the basic attacks against our first responders.

NATIONAL SUICIDE AWARENESS MONTH

(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 September as National Suicide Prevention Month.

Every year, close to 800,000 people die by suicide, leaving their family and friends to navigate the tragedy of loss. This is one death every 40 seconds.

Studies by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention show that sui-

cide rates are rising, and suicide is the 10th leading cause of death in the U.S. for all ages.

This important month is a time to share resources and stories in an effort to shed light on this stigmatized topic. It is beneficial to learn and pay attention to the warning signs of suicide and periodically check in with friends and family members, especially during these challenging times.

Additionally, talking about suicide in an open and caring way can help those who are having suicidal thoughts. As the isolating effects of the COVID-19 pandemic continue to grip our world, it is imperative we take our physical and mental health seriously.

I encourage everyone to educate themselves about suicide and the patient-centered resources available so we can help protect those in our communities, friends, and loved ones.

ISSUES OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. DEAN). 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. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS), my good friend, great patriot, and veteran.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Madam Speaker, as folks in the Chamber know, I have been taking some time to thank friends, family, and staff, for supporting me these 24 years as a Member of the House.

Today, before I go down the organizational chart and mention caseworkers, legislative assistants, legislative correspondents, staff assistants, schedulers, there are some outliers in my organization that I need to mention.

Mary Ellen, Mary Ellen Maxwell, and Maria Maxwell are all the same person. The Madonia family has strong roots in Springfield, Illinois, and in the Illinois Republican Party.

Mary Ellen was on the campaign staff with me in 1996. Upon our victory, she joined the congressional staff. She eventually moved away and then got married.

On returning to Illinois with Brad, she joined Team Shimkus as my campaign treasurer. Her family also grew, adding Zane and Lilly.

We continue to joke about how Governor Edgar pointed to her at an event one time and said: "Oh, you are the one who is going to go jail." Well, not only has she not gone to jail, she is a stickler for the law, keeping us both out of trouble.

Dora Rohan has spent 29 years working with me, protecting me, and being my friend. She started out as my executive assistant when I became treasurer of Madison County. As the only countywide elected Republican, I needed a confidential employee whom I could trust. Dora fit the bill and also

brought with her amazing secretarial skills, including shorthand.

Dora followed me to my congressional office and became a caseworker for the remainder of her professional career. Oh, the stories she could tell, and someday, I hope she will.

I also appreciated the times when we did travel together. These trips provided me a different perspective and insight to the goings on in my office, much to the chagrin of some of my other employees.

I have had two great legislative assistants who informally became part of my senior staff. Chris Sarley and Jordan Haverly rose to prominence on their ability to handle policy, negotiations, and the politics that arise from public policy.

They both were what we called shared staff. Because of my role as either chairman or ranking member of the Environment and Economy Subcommittee, they were my primary point person with the full committee. They also played key roles in negotiations with staff members of other offices, from Republican offices and Democrat offices.

Chris Sarley and I had a lot of legislative successes, and I could spend all my time on that. Another Illinois boy, but a Chicagolander, I was skeptical at first until I found out that he was a Sox fan, not a fan of that other team.

Chris' claim to fame is our success shepherding the Toxic Substance Control Act, commonly known as TSCA, through the legislative process and having it signed by President Obama. That piece of legislation took 5½ years.

This was the first rewrite of a major environmental law since it was passed in 1976. Praised by the chemical manufacturers and the environmental community, it is a perfect example of threading the needle to reform and update an old law.

Thank you, Chris.

Jordan is from Pennsylvania and is also in his second tour of duty with my office. He handles my subcommittee now. With Democrats in charge, we attempt to prevent overreach which is not scientifically supported and would hurt jobs in the economy. Many times doing nothing is better than doing something poorly.

Jordan has a gift for working with social media. He also has a great handle on who I am and how I would like to respond to most issues. He never lets me down.

Jordan, like my legislative director, seems to want to go down with the ship. That is loyalty, which I appreciate. He will be a great pick-up for any office.

Madam Speaker, as I have said numerous times, one is only as good as the people they have around them. These are some of the best, and I thank them.

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, I thank Mr. SHIMKUS for the wonderful tribute being paid. We will have to stand up here at some point and pay a wonderful tribute to Mr. SHIMKUS.

Obviously, there is a great deal of trouble going on, a lot of troubled people in this country. It is interesting, recently, my wife had flown up to be here in Washington for the President's speech on the White House grounds and, flying back, she noticed there were people with the BLM, Black Lives Matter, paraphernalia, things on there saying "BLM," "Black Lives Matter."

It was interesting to hear, apparently, some of the comments, and the comments had to do with the free plane tickets they got to fly up to protest here. One person said, yeah, they got a free minivan the whole time they were here.

Somebody is paying for those items to come up and threaten and assault. Thankfully, there weren't near as many batteries with the actual physical part of the assault, just threatened assaults.

My wife and I, when we left the White House grounds up from the closed Pennsylvania part, trying to get down to our car in front of the Willard, we ended up being chased by a mob. The mob was on its way, and they were very loud and aggressive as they ran toward us, so I thought we will cut through the Willard, because I knew we would never make it all the way around the next block.

There was a door there, a glass door, and I kept knocking on the door, and there were people at the other end of the hall. They could see us. Nobody would come open the door.

Finally, the mob was getting closer as they were running toward us, and I said: Look, if they get here before this door gets open, you go ahead around the corner. I am sure they will be all enthralled with beating me. I don't think they will come after you. Just get around the block. There are police at the other end of the next block. Just get there while they are after me. Don't try to stay and defend me.

But out of nowhere, this guy just comes up behind me—he worked for the Willard—scanned his card, opened the door right before the crowd got there.

But it is just amazing, you know, who wants to inflict violence like that, and, more particularly, who is it that is funding people to come up and create havoc like that?

In an article by Katharine Gorka a couple of days ago in *The Federalist*, entitled, "How the 1960s Riots Fore-shadow Today's Communist Weaponization of Black Pain"—clearly, there has been pain this country. George Floyd's death was so unnecessary. It was outrageous.

□ 1545

But who is paying?

Who is stirring up all this violence to create more pain, more suffering, and more damage?

It is a question worth finding an answer for.

I have thought numerous times about David Horowitz. I introduced him to someone some years back and said that

he used to be a Socialist; and David, now 80, said, LOUIE, I wasn't a Socialist, I was a Communist. I was a complete Communist, man.

David has written before about his turn from being a Communist in the sixties. One of the things that he had said hit him very hard was they were preparing for protests, and someone else was trying to encourage efforts to make the police overreact so that they would hurt one of them. David didn't want anybody to get hurt or killed. He was told, We want the police to kill somebody because then we can ramp it up, and they won't be able to stop us. He never signed on to get somebody killed.

But if you study the Marxist revolution going back to 1917, the October Revolution—of course, there was one earlier that year—but the Bolsheviks weren't the strongest party, the group of people at that time. There were so many things that could have gone wrong, but one thing they wanted to do—it is right out of the Marxist playbook—was to create such chaos that your little group may have a chance to weasel into power and take over.

We are seeing a lot of that play out in this country. Fortunately, we have people in authority in the Federal Government—at least most places in the Federal Government in this administration, not all. We could improve some of the President's appointments who didn't turn out quite as strong as we had hoped. But we have to get to the bottom of who is paying, who is trying to get this thing all stirred up.

This article from yesterday's, *Washington Times*, Jeff Mordock: "Attorney General William P. Barr told federal prosecutors last week to charge violent demonstrators with a range of offenses, including sedition, a charge usually reserved for someone plotting to overthrow the government."

But that bears looking back at the Federal sedition charge, 18 U.S. Code 2384 is seditious conspiracy.

Some people I hear talk about it as this is treason. If you look at treason, both in the Constitution Article III, section 3, it is more about levying war against the United States Government. 18 U.S.C. 2381 is treason, and it is giving aid and comfort to the enemies of the United States. So it is a tough go.

But if you look at the seditious conspiracy: "If two or more persons in any State or Territory, or in any place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, conspire to overthrow, put down, or to destroy by force the Government of the United States, or to levy war against them, or to oppose by force the authority thereof, or by force to prevent, hinder, or delay the execution of any law of the United States, or by force to seize, take, or possess any property of the United States contrary to the authority thereof, they shall each be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than 20 years, or both."

So that could very well come into play.

Madam Speaker, I bring it up hoping that those who think it is just fun to create havoc, maybe throw Molotov cocktails or even pay for them or help supply them, help fund people who are going to come throw them or create havoc, then you are looking at 20 years just under that statute alone.

I know under the doctrine of *Posse Comitatus*, from my days in the Army and since then, that some people are confused about the doctrine. They say that the President can never commit troops against American people. But we saw the Clinton administration utilize vehicles and equipment—it had to have people helping from Fort Bliss, as I understand it, from back in those days—that ended up leading to the death of 70 or 80 people there outside of Waco. The President can, but he has to do it himself. That was one of the confusing things back then. President Clinton, as I recall, was asked about it and he said something like, Oh, that is Reno's deal.

Well, you couldn't utilize what was utilized against David Koresh with his confused personality, problematic as it was. Even that, you couldn't use military resources without the President's approval. So we never found out how in the world the orders were given, if the President himself didn't give it. That was a violation of the law.

But here in 10 U.S. Code 253, it says, "The President, by using the militia or the armed forces, or both, or by any other means, shall take such measures as he considers necessary to suppress, in a State, any insurrection, domestic violence, unlawful combination, or conspiracy . . ."

But you note the words "domestic violence." It goes on.

"If it so hinders the execution of the laws of that State, and of the United States within the State, that any part or class of its people is deprived of a right, privilege, immunity, or protection named in the Constitution and secured by law . . ."

So it is wide open to being used in some of these riots where people's life, liberty, and certainly their property is not being protected, it is being overwhelmed. I think the President is right to give Governors and mayors the chance to protect their people, but at some point if it is not done, this ought to make clear to those Governors and mayors who aren't protecting their people, the President has authority to send in people to put down what appears to be sedition. This violence really is Marxist violence.

It says in their title, Black Lives Matter. But if you look at what they are in favor of, it is not about Black lives mattering; it is things like destroying the family. Of course, BLM calls it the Western-style family, and that alone is just completely fiction.

The families we have traditionally known in the United States since our very inception weren't Western style. These were Middle Eastern. These came from Moses and from Christians

or Jews who believed what Moses said was inspired or provided by God. He said that a man shall leave his father and mother, a woman will leave her home, and the two will become one.

Years later Jesus is asked about marriage and divorce. He quotes Moses verbatim and then adds the line: What God has joined together let nobody separate. So we didn't come up with that type of marriage. It is not Western style. We have to give credit where credit is due. It is Middle-Eastern style. It is from Moses. It is from Jesus. So you can't really take credit for that.

But, then, again, when you are a Marxist group dedicated to the overthrow of the government and replacing it with a Socialist, Communist, Progressive, whatever you want to call it, that is the way they go. That is the direction. You destroy the history so you can't learn from prior mistakes and you can't learn from prior successes, you just rewrite the history. Orwell had a lot to say about that.

There is a study—as this article from *The Federalist* points out by Joy Pullmann—up to 95 percent of 2020 U.S. riots are linked to Black Lives Matter. That is quite a good article and quite informative.

But then this article by Edwin Mora says that a pro-Communist China group is funding a Black Lives Matter-linked organization. It points out that a pro-Communist China group, the Chinese Progressive Association in San Francisco, is actively funding a venture by Black Lives Matter cofounder and unabashedly anti-capitalist, Alicia Garza.

Another article by Peter Hasson from 2 days ago points out that Black Lives Matter cofounder Alicia Garza in 2015 said that capitalism must be abolished for Black lives to matter.

So, basically, they are pushing for the destruction of our Constitution-based government, and they are creating all kinds of chaos.

So it shouldn't surprise anybody who saw the article yesterday by Douglas Ernst that that Jesus statue that is 90 years old was destroyed at St. Patrick's Cathedral in El Paso, the quote here is: I am in shock.

But that is what Socialist, Communist, Progressives push. If you look at what Communists, Socialists have done, it is clear: you have to get rid of any belief in anything except the government.

As I have mentioned before, when I was an exchange student in the Soviet Union, there were eight Americans that summer from the U.S. We went to the former city—it was the only recognized Christian seminary in the Soviet Union at the time—of Zagorsk. There was a building—as you would turn into the walled area of Zagorsk, there was a building there with a painting of Lenin's face and above it Lenin. Below it was "Lenin s nami," Lenin is with us. So you may be turning in here to learn about Jesus, but just remember

it is Lenin who is with us, nobody else. That is the message.

It actually made me nauseous to go into an old church in Moscow that had a stained glass window with big gorgeous colors; instead of Jesus with all the children suffering to come under Him, it was Lenin sitting as Jesus is often depicted surrounded by the children. It was a bit sickening to go into the massive cathedral there in what was then St. Petersburg originally, then it became Leningrad. But that gorgeous, massive cathedral had been converted to a museum of atheism and evolution—just incredible.

But that is where this all has to go if you are going to have a successful destruction of the freedoms we have and go to government control and government ownership and no private property. That is where it all ends up, if we don't get it stopped. It will mean the end of the country that afforded the greatest opportunities individually, the greatest assets individually, and the highest standard of living.

It is tragic that we have poverty in the United States, tragic that we still have any homelessness at all that hasn't apparently improved a whole lot since the War on Poverty started trillions of dollars ago, but even so, we still had the highest standard of living and opportunities, I would submit, in history. It is what freedom and private property has brought—innovation, the greatest innovation in the history of the world. But that is all in jeopardy right now, and Americans better wake up. It is all at risk.

These Marxist revolutionaries need to be stopped. It is sedition. It is a violation of Federal and most State law, and it is time to put it to an end. If the Governors and mayors who have been allowing this to go on—depriving Americans of their life, liberty, pursuit of happiness on their own property—then it will be time for the President to use these Federal statutes to step in and bring peace to the country once again, so we can go through our lives without worrying about being chased by a mob that is upset with you just because you went and heard a speech.

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

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 4(b) of House Resolution 967, the House stands adjourned until noon tomorrow.

Thereupon (at 4 p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, September 18, 2020, at noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

5302. A letter from the Deputy Assistant General Counsel, Office of Special Education

and Rehabilitative Services, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's Final priorities, requirements, and selection criteria — Technical Assistance and Dissemination To Improve Services and Results for Children With Disabilities—The Individuals With Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) Paperwork Reduction Planning and Implementation Program [Docket ID ED-2020-OSERS-0014] received September 14, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

5303. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Food Labeling; Gluten-Free Labeling of Fermented or Hydrolyzed Foods; Correction [Docket No.: FDA-2014-N-1021] (RIN: 0910-AH00) received September 14, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5304. A letter from the Associate Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Citrus Tristeza Virus Expressing Spinach Defense Proteins 2, 7, and 8; Temporary Exemption From the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2019-0182; FRL-10011-47] received September 14, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5305. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Georgia: Emission Reduction Credits [EPA-R04-OAR-2020-0072; FRL-10013-73-Region 4] received September 14, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5306. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's notice of final action denying petitions for reconsideration — Accidental Release Prevention Requirements: Risk Management Programs Under the Clean Air Act [EPA-HQ-OEM-2015-0725; FRL-10013-31-OLEM] received September 14, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5307. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Tiafenacil; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2019-0413; FRL-10013-02] received September 14, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5308. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Deoxyribonucleic Acid (DNA) Sequences; Exemption From the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2017-0351; FRL-10013-43] received September 14, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5309. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Pennsylvania; Reasonably Available Control Technology (RACT) for Volatile Organic Compounds (VOC) Under the 2008 Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) [EPA-R03-OAR-2019-0562; FRL-10014-11-Region 3] received September 14, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5310. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; New Mexico; Repeal of State Regulations for Particulate Matter for Lime Manufacturing Plants [EPA-R06-OAR-2018-0856; FRL-10014-08-Region 6] received September 14, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5311. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval of Air Quality Implementation Plans; California; Coachella Valley; 2008 8-Hour Ozone Nonattainment Area Requirements [EPA-R09-OAR-2019-0241; FRL-10014-24-Region 9] received September 14, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5312. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes; Indiana; Redesignation of the Morgan County Sulfur Dioxide Nonattainment Area [EPA-R05-OAR-2019-0590; FRL-10014-25-Region 5] received September 14, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5313. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; FL; GA; KY; MS; NC; SC; Definition of Chemical Process Plants Under State Prevention of Significant Deterioration Regulations [EPA-R04-OAR-2020-0177; FRL-10014-29-Region 4] received September 14, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5314. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Finding of Failure To Attain the 2006 24-Hour Fine Particulate Matter Standards; California; Los Angeles-South Coast Air Basin [EPA-R09-OAR-2020-0309; FRL-10014-44-Region 9] received September 14, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5315. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; SC and TN; Minimum Reporting Requirements in SIPs [EPA-R04-OAR-2016-0655; FRL-10014-35-Region 4] received September 14, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5316. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Missouri; Restriction of Emission of Lead From Specific Lead Smelter-Refinery Installations [EPA-R07-OAR-2020-0256; FRL-10014-22-Region 7] received September 14, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5317. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Missouri; Control of Emissions from Industrial Surface Coating Operations [EPA-R07-OAR-2020-0339; FRL-10014-32-Region 7] received September 14, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5318. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — 1-Octanamine, N, N-dimethyl-, N-oxide; Exemption From the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2017-0312; FRL-10003-75] received September 14, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5319. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Idaho; Infrastructure Requirements for the 2015 Ozone Standard [EPA-R10-OAR-2018-0766; FRL-10012-38-Region 10] received September 14, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5320. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — National Priorities List [EPA-HQ-OLEM-2017-0603, EPA-HQ-OLEM-2019-0484, 0485, 0486, 0487 and 0488; FRL-10012-71-OLEM] received September 14, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5321. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporations' final rule — Procedures for PBGC Guidance Documents (RIN: 1212-AB49) received September 14, 2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

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:

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas: Committee on Science, Space, and Technology. H.R. 3607. A bill to amend the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to direct Federal research in fossil energy and to promote the development and demonstration of environmentally responsible coal and natural gas technologies, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 116-510). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. PALLONE: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 3935. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide for the continuing requirement of Medicaid coverage of nonemergency transportation to medically necessary services; with an amendment (Rept. 116-511). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. PALLONE: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 5663. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to give authority to the Secretary of Health and Human Services, acting through the Commissioner of Food and Drugs, to destroy counterfeit devices; with an amendment (Rept. 116-512). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. PALLONE: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 4866. A bill to amend the 21st Century Cures Act to provide for designation of institutions of higher education that provide research, data, and leadership on continuous manufacturing as National Centers of Excellence in Continuous Pharmaceutical Manufacturing, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 116-513). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. PALLONE: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 4995. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve obstetric care and maternal health outcomes, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 116-514). 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. MCHENRY (for himself and Mr. STIVERS):

H.R. 8280. A bill to require the Securities and Exchange Commission to extend exemptions for securities offered as part of employee pay to other individuals providing goods for sale, labor, or services for remuneration, to preempt certain provisions of State law with respect to wage rates and benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on 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.

By Mr. CLYBURN (for himself, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. RIGGLEMAN):

H.R. 8281. A bill to amend the Act entitled "Act to provide for the establishment of the Brown v. Board of Education National Historic Site in the State of Kansas, and for other purposes" to provide for inclusion of additional related sites in the National Park System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BUCK (for himself, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. RIGGLEMAN, Mr. KING of Iowa, and Mr. GOSAR):

H.R. 8282. A bill to prohibit Federal funds from being made available to teach the 1619 Project curriculum in elementary schools and secondary schools, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LATTA (for himself and Mrs. DINGELL):

H.R. 8283. A bill to provide temporary licensing reciprocity for telehealth and interstate health care treatment; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. PALMER (for himself, Mr. PERRY, Mr. BUCK, Mrs. RODGERS of Washington, Mr. BOST, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. STEUBE, Mr. WESTERMAN, and Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma):

H.R. 8284. A bill to require recipients of Pandemic Unemployment Assistance to provide employment documentation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. GABBARD (for herself and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois):

H.R. 8285. A bill to amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to prohibit payments under such Act to States which permit ballot harvesting, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BANKS (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina):

H.R. 8286. A bill to impose sanctions with respect to foreign persons that knowingly spread malign disinformation as part of or on behalf of a foreign government or political party for purposes of political warfare and to require a determination regarding the United Front Work Department of the Chinese Communist Party; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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. BIGGS (for himself and Mr. GOSAR):

H.R. 8287. A bill to amend title 54, United States Code, to increase public access to recreational areas on Federal land; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BISHOP of Utah:

H.R. 8288. A bill to correct shortfalls in the Great American Outdoors Act by providing fairness and parity to Eastern States, strengthening commitments to urban recreation, establishing logic in funding priorities, and ensuring appropriate consequences for shifts in funding sources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. YOUNG):

H.R. 8289. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to grant family of members of the uniformed services temporary annual leave during the deployment of such members, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CASTEN of Illinois (for himself, Ms. FRANKEL, Mrs. LAWRENCE, and Ms. MENG):

H.R. 8290. A bill to implement title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 with respect to elementary and secondary schools, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CLEAVER (for himself and Mr. MCKINLEY):

H.R. 8291. A bill to direct the Secretary of Energy to establish a grant program for tree planting to reduce residential energy consumption; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CRAWFORD (for himself and Mr. NEWHOUSE):

H.R. 8292. A bill to amend the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 with respect to the application of the Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasure rule to certain farms, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. CROW (for himself, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. TRAHAN, and Mr. TIPTON):

H.R. 8293. A bill to ensure that Federal work-study funding is available for students enrolled in residency programs for teachers, principals, or school leaders, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. DAVIS of California (for herself, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. NORCROSS, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Ms. SCHRIER, Ms. WILD, Mr. SABLAN, Ms. FUDGE, Mrs. HAYES, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. TRONE, Mr. DESAULNIER, and Ms. UNDERWOOD):

H.R. 8294. A bill to amend the National Apprenticeship Act and expand the national apprenticeship system to include apprenticeships, youth apprenticeships, and pre-apprenticeship registered under such Act, to promote the furtherance of labor standards necessary to safeguard the welfare of apprentices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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 Ms. DELAURO (for herself, Mr. COLE, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi):

H.R. 8295. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Education to make grants to support edu-

cational programs in American civics and history, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 8296. A bill to establish and support advanced nuclear energy research and development programs at the Department of Energy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio (for himself, Mr. LUCAS, and Mr. MARSHALL):

H.R. 8297. A bill to direct the Secretary of Energy to establish and support advanced recycling research and development programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Ms. HAALAND (for herself, Mr. COLE, and Ms. MCCOLLUM):

H.R. 8298. A bill to amend the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act to move the enforcement office to the Bureau of Indian Affairs, to increase the civil monetary penalties for failure to follow the processes established by that Act, to protect confidential information, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota:

H.R. 8299. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to transfer certain National Forest System land to the State of South Dakota, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. LANGEVIN (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, and Mr. CICILLINE):

H.R. 8300. A bill to provide for a temporary increase to the Federal share for certain highway projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mrs. LESKO (for herself, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. TIFFANY, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. RESCHENTHALER, Mr. HICE of Georgia, Mr. STEUBE, Mr. BUDD, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. YOHO, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. GUEST, and Mr. KELLER):

H.R. 8301. A bill to withhold a percentage of Federal funding from State and local prosecutors who fail to faithfully prosecute crimes related to protests and riots; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEVIN of Michigan (for himself and Ms. BONAMICI):

H.R. 8302. A bill to promote the furtherance of standards necessary to safeguard the welfare of apprentices; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LUCAS (for himself and Mr. MCNERNEY):

H.R. 8303. A bill to establish and support the Quantum User Expansion for Science and Technology Program at the Department of Energy and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. MALINOWSKI (for himself and Mr. GALLAGHER):

H.R. 8304. A bill to prohibit the disbursement of funds to entities owned or controlled by individuals with executive or managerial authority over the operations of political committees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mrs. MURPHY of Florida (for herself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico, Mr. MCADAMS, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. ROSE of New York, and Mr. BRINDISI):

H.R. 8305. A bill to provide that Members of Congress shall not be paid if Congress has not approved a concurrent resolution on the budget and passed the regular appropriations bills on a timely basis, to eliminate automatic pay adjustments for Members of Congress, to prohibit the use of funds provided

for the official travel expenses of Members of Congress and other officers and employees of the legislative branch for first-class airline accommodations, to establish a lifetime ban on lobbying by former Members of Congress, to prohibit the consideration in the House of Representatives of any legislation containing an earmark, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committees on Oversight and Reform, the Judiciary, and Rules, 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. MURPHY of North Carolina:

H.R. 8306. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish a pilot program to furnish hyperbaric oxygen therapy to a veteran who has a traumatic brain injury or post-traumatic stress disorder; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PAYNE (for himself and Mr. MALINOWSKI):

H.R. 8307. A bill to require the Federal Emergency Management Agency to continue to provide certain supplies to schools that provide in-person learning; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. PHILLIPS (for himself, Mr. CHABOT, and Mr. MORELLE):

H.R. 8308. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to require group health plans and health insurance issuers offering group or individual health insurance coverage to provide coverage for services furnished via telehealth if such services would be covered if furnished in-person, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ROGERS of Alabama (for himself, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. KATKO, Mr. WALKER, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Mrs. LESKO, Mr. GREEN of Tennessee, Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. GUEST, Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina, Mr. VAN DREW, and Mr. GARCIA of California):

H.R. 8309. A bill to authorize certain authorities of the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, Ways and Means, Transportation and Infrastructure, Oversight and Reform, Energy and Commerce, Foreign Affairs, and House Administration, 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. ROGERS of Alabama (for himself, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. RESCHENTHALER, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, and Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 8310. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to provide for enhanced visa security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Homeland Security, and Foreign Affairs, 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. ROSE of New York:

H.R. 8311. A bill to require a report regarding the potential impacts of any changes to the risk-rating methodology for the National Flood Insurance Program of the Federal Emergency Management Agency before implementation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY (for herself, Ms. BARRAGAN, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. LOWENTHAL, and Mr. HASTINGS):

H.R. 8312. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to prohibit the emission of any greenhouse gas in any quantity from any new electric utility steam generating unit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Natural Resources, and Foreign Affairs, 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 Ms. WILD (for herself, Mr. COSTA, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. HAALAND, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. RUSH, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. POCAN, Ms. OMAR, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. GOMEZ, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, and Ms. BONAMICI):

H.R. 8313. A bill to suspend the provision of security assistance to the Philippines until the Government of the Philippines has made certain reforms to the military and police forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, 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. GOSAR (for himself, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. YOHO, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. FULCHER, Mrs. LESKO, Mr. BANKS, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. ROY, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. PERRY, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. HICE of Georgia, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. WALTZ, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. STEUBE, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. CLINE, Mr. MAST, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, Mr. BUCK, Mr. RIGGLEMAN, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. BUDD, Mr. WEBER of Texas, and Mr. MARSHALL):

H. Res. 1119. A resolution expressing support for the recognition of Constitution Week; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. BASS (for herself and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey):

H. Res. 1120. A resolution urging the Government of Tanzania and all parties to respect human rights and constitutional rights and ensure free and fair elections in October 2020, and recognizing the importance of multi-party democracy in Tanzania; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LEVIN of Michigan (for himself, Mr. CHABOT, and Mr. ENGEL):

H. Res. 1121. A resolution urging the Government of Burma to hold free, fair, inclusive, transparent, participatory, and credible elections on November 8, 2020; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. NORTON:

H. Res. 1122. A resolution expressing support for dance as a form of valuable exercise and of artistic expression, and for the designation of September 19, 2020, as "National Dance Day"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. WITTMAN (for himself, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mrs. LURIA, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mrs. DINGELL, and Ms. VELAZQUEZ):

H. Res. 1123. A resolution expressing support for the designation of September 29,

2020, as National Urban Wildlife Refuge Day; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. YARMUTH (for himself and Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee):

H. Res. 1124. A resolution expressing support for designation of the week of September 21 through 26, 2020, as National Adult Education and Family Literacy Week; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

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. MCHENRY:

H.R. 8280.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 To regulate commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian

By Mr. CLYBURN:

H.R. 8281.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. BUCK:

H.R. 8282.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 8283.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. PALMER:

H.R. 8284.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section VII, Clause XVIII

By Ms. GABBARD:

H.R. 8285.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The United States Constitution, Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. BANKS:

H.R. 8286.

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, specifically clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress).

By Mr. BIGGS:

H.R. 8287.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. BISHOP of Utah:

H.R. 8288.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, clause 2

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 8289.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I; Section 8; Clause 1 of the Constitution states The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States . . .

By Mr. CASTEN of Illinois:

H.R. 8290.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 Clause 1

By Mr. CLEAVER:

H.R. 8291.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

H.R. 8292.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I of the US Constitution

By Mr. CROW:

H.R. 8293.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18 of section 8 of Article 1 of the Constitution.

By Mrs. DAVIS of California:

H.R. 8294.

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 Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 8295.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 3 provides Congress with the power to "regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes."

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 8296.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio:

H.R. 8297.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution stating that Congress has the authority 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."

By Ms. HAALAND:

H.R. 8298.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Constitution Article I, Sec. 8

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota:

H.R. 8299.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2: "The Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States."

By Mr. LANGEVIN:

H.R. 8300.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mrs. LESKO:

H.R. 8301.

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, specifically clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress).

By Mr. LEVIN of Michigan:

H.R. 8302.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 1 of the Constitution.

By Mr. LUCAS:

H.R. 8303.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Constitution, Article I, 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.”

By Mr. MALINOWSKI:

H.R. 8304.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mrs. MURPHY of Florida:

H.R. 8305.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 6

By Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina:

H.R. 8306.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. PAYNE:

H.R. 8307.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 Clause 3—Congress has the ability to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. PHILLIPS:

H.R. 8308.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 18 allows Congress to make all laws “which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution” any “other” powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States.

By Mr. ROGERS of Alabama:

H.R. 8309.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18.

By Mr. ROGERS of Alabama:

H.R. 8310.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1—“The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;”

Article I, Section 8, Clause 4—“To establish a uniform rule of naturalization, and uniform laws on the subject of bankruptcies throughout the United States;”

Article I, 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.”

By Mr. ROSE of New York:

H.R. 8311.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution “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 any Department or Officer thereof.”

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY:

R.R. 8312.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Ms. WILD:

H.R. 8313.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. CON. STAT. Art. 1, Sec. 8, Cl. 1, 3, 18

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 20: Mr. JACOBS.
 H.R. 216: Mr. CURTIS and Mr. BACON.
 H.R. 587: Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina.
 H.R. 645: Mr. JEFFRIES and Ms. SHERRILL.
 H.R. 733: Mrs. TORRES of California.
 H.R. 784: Mr. JACOBS.
 H.R. 856: Mr. TIPTON.
 H.R. 884: Mr. CÁRDENAS.
 H.R. 913: Mr. MCKINLEY and Mr. RUSH.
 H.R. 1042: Ms. FUDGE, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.
 H.R. 1109: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.
 H.R. 1224: Mr. THOMPSON of California and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
 H.R. 1228: Mr. VAN DREW.
 H.R. 1325: Mr. COOK, Mr. RIGGLEMAN, Mr. GIBBS, and Mr. GUEST.
 H.R. 1597: Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. LUCAS, and Mr. PHILLIPS.
 H.R. 1694: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.
 H.R. 1711: Mr. PERLMUTTER.
 H.R. 1766: Mr. DELGADO, Mr. MCADAMS, and Mr. MAST.
 H.R. 1911: Mrs. LEE of Nevada.
 H.R. 2279: Mr. TONKO, Mr. GUEST, Mr. MCKINLEY, and Mr. GARAMENDI.
 H.R. 2393: Mr. COHEN.
 H.R. 2435: Mr. WOMACK, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mrs. DEMINGS, and Mr. COHEN.
 H.R. 2442: Mrs. DEMINGS, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mrs. TORRES of California, Mr. SIRE, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. KEATING, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL, and Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
 H.R. 2477: Mr. SOTO.
 H.R. 2585: Mr. DESAULNIER.
 H.R. 2594: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
 H.R. 2653: Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. COSTA.
 H.R. 2731: Mr. SOTO.
 H.R. 3107: Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. CASE, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Mr. GARAMENDI.
 H.R. 3114: Mr. RUIZ.
 H.R. 3563: Ms. JACKSON LEE and Ms. BASS.
 H.R. 3572: Mr. SMITH of Washington.
 H.R. 3884: Ms. BONAMICI.
 H.R. 3975: Mr. BRINDISI, Mr. COHEN, Mr. GUEST, Mr. MOOLENAAR, and Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY.
 H.R. 4009: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
 H.R. 4194: Mr. MALINOWSKI and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.
 H.R. 4228: Mr. MCNERNEY.
 H.R. 4231: Mr. EMMER.
 H.R. 4446: Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mrs. AXNE, Mrs. DEMINGS, and Ms. SPANBERGER.
 H.R. 4476: Mr. KHANNA and Mr. BEYER.
 H.R. 4554: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
 H.R. 4722: Mr. HORSFORD.
 H.R. 4738: Mr. MEUSER.
 H.R. 4762: Mr. EMMER.
 H.R. 4764: Mr. SMITH of Washington.
 H.R. 4838: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
 H.R. 4940: Mr. CLEAVER.

H.R. 4960: Mr. EMMER.

H.R. 5002: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. WENSTRUP, and Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 5141: Mr. SIRE, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Miss RICE of New York, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. KEATING, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL, Ms. HOULAHAN, and Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.

H.R. 5309: Ms. GARCIA of Texas.

H.R. 5534: Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. TRONE, Mr. GALLEGRO, Mr. THOMPSON of California, and Mr. WENSTRUP.

H.R. 5605: Mr. WALDEN, Ms. SHALALA, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. TITUS, Ms. DEAN, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. GAETZ, and Mrs. MILLER.

H.R. 5734: Mrs. HAYES.

H.R. 5877: Ms. PRESSLEY.

H.R. 5878: Ms. PRESSLEY.

H.R. 5879: Ms. PRESSLEY.

H.R. 5880: Ms. PRESSLEY.

H.R. 5919: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

H.R. 5952: Mrs. HARTZLER.

H.R. 5995: Mr. KELLY of Mississippi.

H.R. 6210: Mrs. RODGERS of Washington, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. WALTZ, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. LOUDERMILK.

H.R. 6644: Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 6703: Mr. CRAWFORD, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, and Mr. SIRE.

H.R. 6718: Mr. LYNCH.

H.R. 6733: Mr. CASE and Mr. FOSTER.

H.R. 6788: Ms. CRAIG and Mr. NUNES.

H.R. 6813: Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, and Mr. PENCE.

H.R. 6866: Ms. GABBARD.

H.R. 7039: Mr. MAST.

H.R. 7040: Mr. MAST.

H.R. 7073: Ms. BARRAGÁN.

H.R. 7136: Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 7231: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina and Mr. SPANO.

H.R. 7254: Mr. BLUMENAUER and Ms. BONAMICI.

H.R. 7272: Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 7286: Ms. CLARKE of New York.

H.R. 7292: Mr. COOK.

H.R. 7308: Mr. LAMB and Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

H.R. 7309: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 7443: Mr. STAUBER.

H.R. 7481: Mrs. BUSTOS, Ms. WEXTON, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. GOODEN, Ms. STEFANIK, and Mr. BOST.

H.R. 7496: Ms. SPEIER.

H.R. 7525: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 7562: Ms. SLOTKIN.

H.R. 7618: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 7636: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 7642: Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. COOPER, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. PRESSLEY, and Mrs. MILLER.

H.R. 7725: Mr. RICE of South Carolina.

H.R. 7777: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. BERGMAN, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, and Mr. JACOBS.

H.R. 7781: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 7794: Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas.

H.R. 7806: Mr. HURD of Texas, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mrs. BUSTOS, Miss RICE of New York, and Mr. LONG.

H.R. 7809: Mr. BUCSHON and Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.

H.R. 7868: Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 7876: Mrs. NAPOLITANO and Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.

H.R. 7896: Mr. MOOLENAAR.

H.R. 7926: Mr. COSTA.

H.R. 7947: Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. UPTON, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. CRIST, Mr. MULLIN, and Mr. SAN NICOLAS.

- H.R. 7970: Mr. LAMALFA, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. BARRAGAN, and Ms. ESHOO.
- H.R. 8017: Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Ms. WILD, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. BONAMICI, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
- H.R. 8030: Ms. STEFANIK and Mr. JACOBS.
- H.R. 8031: Ms. STEFANIK and Mr. JACOBS.
- H.R. 8053: Mr. PHILLIPS.
- H.R. 8082: Mr. KELLER.
- H.R. 8091: Mr. PHILLIPS.
- H.R. 8117: Mr. GOSAR, Mr. HICE of Georgia, and Mr. NORMAN.
- H.R. 8150: Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Ms. STEVENS, Mr. COOPER, Mr. RYAN, Mr. LEVIN of California, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.
- H.R. 8169: Mr. COHEN.
- H.R. 8179: Mr. GROTHMAN and Ms. GABBARD.
- H.R. 8181: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mrs. HAYES, and Mr. SAN NICOLAS.
- H.R. 8192: Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. BLUNT ROCH-ESTER, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. DELAURO, and Mr. DOGGETT.
- H.R. 8194: Mr. EVANS.
- H.R. 8201: Mr. CLINE, Mr. BIGGS, and Mr. WILLIAMS.
- H.R. 8202: Mr. HUDSON.
- H.R. 8236: Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. MAST, and Mr. STEUBE.
- H.R. 8242: Mr. HIGGINS of New York.
- H.R. 8249: Ms. MENG, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. HASTINGS, and Ms. CLARKE of New York.
- H.R. 8254: Mr. SUOZZI.
- H.R. 8264: Mr. BIGGS and Mr. CRAWFORD.
- H.R. 8266: Ms. PLASKETT, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. MALINOWSKI, and Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
- H.R. 8273: Mr. FLEISCHMANN.
- H. Con. Res. 20: Mr. PHILLIPS.
- H. Con. Res. 27: Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma, Mr. MARCHANT, and Mr. CONNOLLY.
- H. Res. 114: Mr. HARDER of California.
- H. Res. 697: Mr. CURTIS, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. COHEN, Mr. MAST, and Mr. MCADAMS.
- H. Res. 746: Mrs. MILLER.
- H. Res. 823: Mr. GALLEGO.
- H. Res. 835: Ms. SPEIER.
- H. Res. 854: Ms. PRESSLEY.
- H. Res. 1022: Mr. CASE.
- H. Res. 1024: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.
- H. Res. 1057: Mrs. HAYES.
- H. Res. 1078: Ms. ESHOO.
- H. Res. 1083: Ms. STEFANIK.
- H. Res. 1099: Mr. TED LIEU of California and Mr. PHILLIPS.
- H. Res. 1100: Mr. COHEN and Mr. FITZPATRICK.
- H. Res. 1110: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. MARSHALL, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. RYAN, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. COOPER, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. BUCK, Mr. BRADY, Mr. YOHO, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. ARRINGTON, Mr. BOST, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. COSTA, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. GUEST, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. PAPPAS, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. GREEN of Tennessee, Mr. BURCHETT, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, and Mr. BALDERSON.
- H. Res. 1112: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
- H. Res. 1115: Mr. KINZINGER and Mr. BURGESS.