Curtis
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donalds
Duncan
Dunn
Emmer
Estes
Fallon
Feenstra
Ferguson
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franklin, C. Scott
Fulcher
Gallagher
Garbarino
Garcia (CA)
Gibbs
Gimenez
Gohmert
Gonzales, Tony
Gonzalez (OH)
Good (VA)
Gooden (TX)
Gosar
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Greene (GA)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harris
Harshbarger
Hartzler
Hern
Herrell
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Hinson
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Issa
Jackson
Jacobs (NY)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Katko
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kim (CA)
Kinzinger
Kustoff
LaHood
Lamborn
Latta
LaTurner
Lesko
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Mace
Malliotakis
Mann
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClain
McHenry
McKinley
Meijer
Meuser
Miller (IL)
Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks
Moolenaar
Mooney
Moore (AL)
Mullin
Murphy (NC)
Nehls
Newhouse
Norman
Nunes
Obernolte
Owens
Palazzo
Palmer
Pence
Perry
Pfluger
Posey
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (SC)
Rodgers (WA)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Rosendale
Rouzer
Roy
Rutherford
Salazar
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Spartz
Stauber
Steel
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons
Turner
Upton
Van Drew
Van Duyne
Wagner
Walberg
Walorski
Waltz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Zeldin

NAYS—214

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Auchincloss
Axne
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bourdeaux
Bowman
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brown
Brownley
Bush
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson
Cartwright
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Davids (KS)
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Evans
Fletcher
Foster
Frankel, Lois
Fudge
Gallego
Garamendi
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez, Vicente
Gottheimer
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Haaland
Harder (CA)
Hastings
Hayes
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Horsford
Houlahan
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jacobs (CA)
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Jones
Kahele
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim (NJ)
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Leger Fernandez
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lieu
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Manning
McBath
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Moulton
Mrvan
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Newman
Norcross
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Sewell
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stanton
Stevens
Strickland
Suozzi
Swalwell
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Williams (GA)
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—15

Davis, Danny K.
Gaetz
Green (TN)
Hoyer
LaMalfa
Loudermilk
Mast
Matsui
McClintock
Mfume
Moore (UT)
Scott, David
Valadao
Vargas
Young

□ 1332

Messrs. GARCÍA of Illinois, KEATING, Mses. BASS, CLARK of Massachusetts, Mrs. TORRES of California, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Allred (Davids (KS))
Barragán (Beyer)
Bowman (Clark (MA))
Buchanan (Donalds)
Cárdenas (Gomez)
Carter (TX) (Nehls)
DeSaulnier (Thompson (CA))
Deutch (Rice (NY))
Frankel, Lois (Clark (MA))
Gonzalez, Vincente (Gomez)
Gosar (Wagner)
Grijalva (García (IL))
Hastings (Wasserman Schultz)
Joyce (PA) (Smucker)
Kirkpatrick (Stanton)
Langevin (Lynch)
Lawson (FL) (Evans)
Lieu (Beyer)
Lofgren (Jeffries)
Lowenthal (Beyer)
McCaul (Kim (CA))
Meng (Clark (MA))
Moore (WI) (Beyer)
Moulton (Trahan)
Napolitano (Correa)
Neguse (Perlmutter)
Payne (Wasserman Schultz)
Pingree (Kuster)
Porter (Wexton)
Roybal-Allard (Bass)
Ruiz (Aguilar)
Rush (Underwood)
Watson Coleman (Pallone)
Wilson (FL) (Hayes)

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Miss Kaitlyn Roberts, one of his secretaries.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 803, COLORADO WILDERNESS ACT OF 2021, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5, EQUALITY ACT

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 147 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 147

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 803) to designate certain lands in the State of Colorado as components of the National Wilderness Preservation System, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. An amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 117-2, modified by the amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources; (2) the further amendments described in section 2 of this resolution; (3) the amendments en bloc described in section 3 of this resolution; and (4) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. After debate pursuant to the first section of this resolution, each further amendment printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules not earlier considered as part of amendments en bloc pursuant to section 3 of this resolution shall be considered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, may be withdrawn by the proponent at any time before the question is put thereon, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

SEC. 3. It shall be in order at any time after debate pursuant to the first section of this resolution for the chair of the Committee on Natural Resources or his designee to offer amendments en bloc consisting of further amendments printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution not earlier disposed of. Amendments en bloc offered pursuant to this section shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources or their respective designees, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

SEC. 4. All points of order against the further amendments printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules or amendments en bloc described in section 3 of this resolution are waived.

SEC. 5. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 5) to prohibit discrimination on the basis of sex, gender identity, and sexual orientation, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) 90 minutes of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary; and (2) one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman and my colleague from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania (Mr. RESCHENTHALER), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule, House Resolution 147, providing for consideration of H.R. 5, the Equality Act, under a closed rule. The rule provides 90 minutes of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking member of the Committee on the Judiciary and one motion to recommit.

The rule also provides for consideration of H.R. 803, the Protecting America's Wilderness and Public Lands Act, under a structured rule. The rule provides 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking member of the Committee on Natural Resources and self-executes a manager's amendment from Chairman GRIJALVA. It also makes in order 29 amendments, provides en bloc authority to Chairman GRIJALVA, and provides one motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, we are here today to debate the rule for two critical pieces of legislation, H.R. 5, the Equality Act, and H.R. 803, the Protecting America's Wilderness and Public Lands Act.

This is a historic day for Congress and for equal rights. Over 45 years ago, Congresswoman Bella Abzug introduced the first version of the Equality Act, a bill that will provide full legal protections to LGBTQ people all across our country by extending the protections of the Civil Rights Act to them and making clear that we must respect, defend, and celebrate the dignity innate of everyone in our communities, including—and perhaps especially—those who are perceived as different or non-binary.

The version of the Equality Act that we consider today is the result of years of careful legislative drafting and amends existing civil rights laws to provide protection from discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity in key areas of public life: employment, housing, credit, education, public spaces and services, federally funded programs, and jury service.

Additionally, the Equality Act updates the public spaces and services covered in current law to include retail stores and services, such as banks, legal services, and transportation. These important updates would strengthen existing protections for everyone.

The journey to this final version of the Equality Act was led by a dear colleague who is a historymaker in his own right, co-chair of the LGBTQ Equality Caucus and my colleague on the Judiciary Committee, Congressman DAVID CICILLINE of Rhode Island. Congressman CICILLINE worked with lawyers and advocates from the left and the right, religious groups, and a host of civil rights groups to make sure the language of the Equality Act achieved full legal equality while protecting existing civil rights for other marginalized groups.

The resulting bill is supported by 130 of the largest employees in the country, our largest labor unions, and the hundreds of organizations including, to name just a few, the Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, the NAACP, the National Women's Law Center, the Episcopal Church, the Union for Reform Judaism, and the United Church of Christ.

And, most importantly, it is supported by a clear and overwhelming majority of the American people. Seventy-one percent of Americans support this legislation, including majorities of Democrats, Independents, and Republicans.

The clear majority of both the House and the American people recognize that for too long LGBTQ people have faced discrimination with no Federal legal recourse. It is beyond dispute that LGBTQ people—especially transgender people and, even more so, transgender women of color—face discrimination across this country.

To echo other speakers, this issue is deeply personal for me. It has been personal since my baby sister came out to me almost 40 years ago. For many people all across this country and across this House, that is when this fight hits home.

It gets personal when someone whom you love says: This is who I am.

It gets personal when you know and value that person and you want to do whatever you can to make sure that your loved one can live their life to the fullest, free from hate and discrimination.

I am sad to say that my home, Pennsylvania, is one of the 30 States that defies the will of its people by not having legal protections for LGBTQ people. The idea that my sister—someone who put her life on the line for our country when she served in our Armed Forces—could drive across State lines and lose protections is heartbreaking.

The Equality Act ends the patchwork of State laws and creates uniform, nationwide protections. LGBTQ people won't have to worry that being transferred to another State by their employer or needing to move home to take care of ailing parents will cause them to lose civil rights protections. From sea to shining sea, LGBTQ people will have the security and stability that comes from knowing that, if they face discrimination, they have legal recourse.

It is also important to note what the Equality Act does not do. The Equality Act does not impinge on religious freedom. Religious liberty is a cornerstone value of our Constitution and our country. Religious organizations are currently able to prefer their own members and their version of morality in hiring for religious positions, such as ministers and schoolteachers. The Equality Act does nothing to change that. The Equality Act does not force anyone to perform or obtain abortions in violation of their religious beliefs, and it does not strip girls of their title 9 protections.

The Equality Act does clarify what has long been held: That religious freedom laws do not create an exemption to civil rights laws.

□ 1345

Just like a person can't use a claim of religious freedom to refuse to sell a house to an interracial couple, under the Equality Act LGBTQ families will be protected from discrimination regardless of its motivation.

Consider the stakes facing LGBTQ people too often all across this country. A same-sex couple walks into a restaurant. Having hired a babysitter to look after their young children, they are hoping to have a relaxing night out. But, instead, when they are seated and looking at the menu, the manager comes over and tells them that they have to leave. They aren't welcome.

This kind of insecurity and humiliation occurs on a daily basis across this country, and in 30 States the couple would have no legal recourse. Often, humiliation is just the tip of the iceberg. Same-sex couples are far more likely to be denied housing; qualified and high-performing transgender people are more likely to be fired from their jobs; and LGBTQ young people face rejection and discrimination in school, which can deny them an education.

These injuries compound and lead to poverty, homelessness, and violence. The impact is felt the hardest by transgender women of color, who confront racial discrimination, sex discrimination, and gender identity discrimination. The intersection of these forms of discrimination is all too often deadly.

The protections provided by the Equality Act give LGBTQ people an equal chance at the American Dream. While discrimination and rejection has ended the lives of too many transgender people, many are succeeding despite discrimination.

We are talking here about the civil rights of our friends, our family, and public servants. In Pennsylvania, Dr. Rachel Levine, a transgender woman, served in the Governor's cabinet as Secretary for Health, and has recently been nominated by President Biden to serve as Assistant Health Secretary.

Mara Keisling, a Pennsylvania native, is the founder and Executive Director of the National Center for

Transgender Equality and a pioneer for civil rights protections.

Sarah McBride was recently sworn in as the first transgender Senator in the State of Delaware.

And of course, Pete Buttigieg was recently sworn in as the U.S. Secretary of Transportation, becoming the first openly gay cabinet member to be confirmed by the Senate.

Opponents of the Equality Act keep trying to pit cisgender girls against transgender girls, when really this legislation is about strengthening opportunity for all girls and women. Whether it is women's sports, single-sex colleges, or homeless services for women, the Equality Act simply prohibits discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation and gender identity in these areas. It doesn't undermine these institutions or prohibit them; it simply ensures that they are inclusive of all women and girls, including trans women and girls.

Support for this legislation is overwhelming and deserves an overwhelmingly positive response from this body. I encourage all of my colleagues to support the rule and underlying legislation, and further encourage the Senate to swiftly act to pass this bill so that we can finally provide firm, statutory protections to the LGBTQ community.

Next, Mr. Speaker, is H.R. 803, the Protecting America's Wilderness and Public Lands Act. This is a package of public bills from the Natural Resources Committee that will designate more than 1.5 million acres as wilderness areas, and more than 1,200 river miles into the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System.

The bill would also withdraw more than 1.2 million acres of public land from new drilling and mining, ensuring that iconic landscapes like the Grand Canyon and Colorado's Thompson Divide are permanently protected for future generations to enjoy.

Few things in the United States are as universally cherished by Americans as are our public lands. Our country is home to more than 111 million acres of designated wilderness, and these lands help us combat climate change, provide for an array of ecological diversity, and offer recreational activities to Americans young and old.

As we continue to endure the devastating effects of climate change, providing for millions of additional acres of wilderness will allow for these areas to continue to serve as critical ''carbon sinks'' to capture and mitigate carbon dioxide in our atmosphere.

A similar version of this legislation passed the House last Congress, but this version includes a critical new piece from Natural Resources Committee Chairman GRIJALVA, the Grand Canyon Protection Act. This bill would permanently ban new mining claims on approximately one million acres of public land surrounding Grand Canyon National Park, while helping to protect the clean water resources critical to the livelihoods of local Tribal communities.

The Grand Canyon Protection Act was developed by Chairman GRIJALVA in close consultation with all of the relevant stakeholders in his district and serves to protect one of the most cherished places in the United States.

You may hear my colleague from Pennsylvania argue that this bill is nothing but a land grab, an attempt to subvert private industry. Of course, this couldn't be farther from the truth.

Mining, like every other industry, is subject to the whim of the free market. Historically, when the demand for these minerals has dropped, mining companies are all too prepared to skip town without cleaning up any of their mess.

This bill isn't about whether or not nuclear energy and its inputs will be part of our clean energy future, but if we want to ensure that it is, then I would recommend that we first start by supporting effective regulations on new and existing nuclear plants and their capabilities. The best way to ensure demand for a product is to similarly ensure that its user won't decide it isn't worth pursuing or is unaffordable.

The merits of nuclear energy aside, you can't deny that its use in this country is on the downswing or, at the very least, stagnant. This isn't due to over-regulation; it is due to under-regulation. It is due to massive cost overruns and incompetent government oversight.

The U.S. has had only one new nuclear reactor become operational in the last 20 years. This isn't because a mining company or two hasn't been afforded the opportunity to desecrate our national resources, but because the U.S. has not yet proven we can responsibly operate a nuclear plant that, from start to finish, is safe and has the trust of the American people.

Public lands do not belong to those only in the Congressional district in which they are located; they belong to all of us. Wilderness areas in the great State of Colorado belong to you and me as much as Independence Hall belongs to a native of Colorado. We all have a role to play in protecting these lands and seeking carveouts for mining companies is not the right way forward.

I want to especially thank my colleague, Congresswoman DIANA DEGETTE, for her tireless and bipartisan work in getting this legislation to such a great place.

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

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

I thank the distinguished gentlewoman from my home State of Pennsylvania for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the rule before us provides for the consideration of two pieces of legislation. Let's just look at both pieces one at a time.

The first bill, H.R. 5, the Equality Act, provides for civil rights protections for lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer individuals.

Let me start by saying that Republicans believe all people should be treated equally under the law. Let me repeat that. Republicans believe all people should be treated equally under the law. But the Equality Act misses that mark.

Rather, H.R. 5 represents a radical departure from existing civil rights protections that will have significant implications on everyday life, and eliminate laws ensuring women and girls have the same opportunities as men and boys.

Just take student athletics. H.R. 5 would redefine sex to include gender identity, meaning a transgender woman, a person who was born genetically male but identifies as a woman, could not be barred from participating in girls' or women's athletics.

Further, I have concerns that, due to the lack of committee action, this bill has not been fully thought out and it may be difficult, frankly, if not impossible, to actually implement in line with congressional intent.

Perhaps the most pressing example of this is the term ''gender identity,'' which is so vague that even the special interest groups backing this bill cannot agree on a single definition of that.

Lastly, I am troubled that the Religious Freedom Restoration Act is not applicable under this measure. Without this vital protection, churches, synagogues, mosques, and religiously affiliated schools will be forced to act contrary to their deeply held beliefs or stop offering certain services to the public.

Religious freedom was once an issue that all Americans, regardless of political party, strongly supported. It is incredibly disappointing to see my colleagues across the aisle abandon this principle in an effort to appease their far-left radical progressive base.

Mr. Speaker, the second part of this rule provides for consideration of H.R. 803, the Protecting America's Wilderness and Public Lands Act. This legislation consists of 8 natural resources bills, and will create nearly 1.5 million acres of wilderness, establish the most restrictive Federal land use classification, as well as lock up rivers and other lands across four western States.

Like all my Republican colleagues, I strongly support responsible preservation of our Nation's natural resources. Remember, it was Republican Teddy Roosevelt who started this movement.

However, my colleagues across the aisle have ignored this and have gone way too far. This bill takes a partisan approach to public land protection, and not a single Republican has cosponsored the underlying measures.

Further, some of the lands affected by this legislation lie in congressional districts where Members of Congress do not support such actions. These Members have not had the opportunity to share their opposition or their concerns, as bills in H.R. 803 were not marked up by this Congress.

H.R. 803 also ignores input from local communities, who voiced concern that these measures will hurt local economies and rural jobs. As we recover from the COVID–19 pandemic, the last thing that we should be doing is eliminating good-paying, family-sustaining jobs.

Further, this bill will actually increase catastrophic wildfires, as the new wilderness and scenic river designations prohibit scientific forest management.

I am especially concerned that this measure withdraws 1.2 million acres from mineral production, including uranium, a necessary component for the U.S. nuclear reactor fleet.

Currently, our Nation is relying on China for the vast majority of rare earth elements and critical materials, which are necessary for everything from building a fighter jet to a cell phone.

Just last week, we saw China threaten to cut off its mineral supply to American defense contractors. We have watched as China has done this to sister democracies such as Japan.

This bill will give the Chinese Communist Party, and other unstable and hostile regimes, control over our energy and mineral needs, putting our economic and national security at risk.

We must not cut off access to the minerals and materials necessary for everyday life and for the protection of our Nation.

I would urge my colleagues across the aisle to seek a bipartisan approach to these two bills, to this rule, not just today, but also in the weeks and months ahead.

Mr. Speaker, I urge opposition to the rule, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania, a distinguished member of the Rules Committee, for yielding me the time; and I want to thank her for her eloquent opening.

Mr. Speaker, we are just weeks away from the 53rd anniversary of Martin Luther King, Jr.'s famous speech at the National Cathedral. That is when he uttered the powerful line, ''The moral arc of the universe is long, but it bends towards justice.''

In many ways, those words are as misconstrued as they are well-known, because some have taken them to mean that if you just wait long enough, justice is inevitable. Dr. King knew better, though. He knew that for the moral arc to bend, people needed to be courageous enough to actually bend it.

Just 6 years after this line was spoken, Members of this Chamber showed that courage when they introduced the original Equality Act. They did so in the shadow of the Stonewall riots, at a time when even discussing LGBTQ issues publicly was seen by many as taboo.

These Members recognized the fundamental unfairness in a patchwork of State laws being used to deny some Americans fundamental rights like jobs and homes, just because of who they were or who they loved.

□ 1400

They had the backbone to act, giving a voice in these hallowed Halls to the many advocates nationwide fighting for equality from the outside.

Getting to this point has been a long, long, long road, and I am a proud cosponsor of the Equality Act that is before us today, and I have pushed for this day for a long time. I know this hasn't been easy. So many people and so many organizations, though, never wavered. And along the way, they changed hearts and minds on this issue.

What may have been a radical idea then is not now. In fact, most people today not only support such protections for LGBTQ Americans, they incorrectly believe that they are already in place. That is how common sense this bill is, Mr. Speaker.

This House made history when it passed the Equality Act for the first time last Congress, and we did so in a bipartisan way. Unfortunately, it didn't even get a vote in the Republican-controlled Senate, and the prior Republican President didn't support it. But now we have new leadership in the Senate and a President who has made passing this bill a top priority.

This moment represents our best chance yet to finally make the Equality Act the law of the land. This moment, Mr. Speaker, is an opportunity to bend the moral arc toward justice, toward fairness, and toward equality, and I encourage all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to seize it.

Let's support this rule and the underlying bill, and let's take a historic step forward toward building a more fair and just society for all Americans.

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. LESKO), my good friend.

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule.

The underlying legislation we are considering in this rule is wrought with concerning provisions. One underlying bill, H.R. 803, is just another land grab that will kill jobs, make our Nation hostage to hostile foreign powers, restrict public access and recreation opportunities on our public lands, and threaten our energy independence.

Specifically, in my home State of Arizona, this bill has dangerous implications for our mining industry. These provisions also threaten our national security by making the United States reliant on foreign nations for critical minerals.

The other bill in this rule, the so-called Equality Act, is anything but equal. In fact, it is a threat to women's privacy and safety. This bill effectively outlaws facilities reserved for biological females. This includes restrooms, showers, and locker rooms. And outrageously, this also includes women's domestic violence shelters.

As a survivor myself of domestic violence, I know the importance of these women's shelters. They are critical for women who are trying to escape domestic violence and sometimes sexual assault. Under this Equality Act, a man, a biological man, identifying as a woman cannot legally be turned away from any of these facilities.

Women will lose all rights to bodily privacy, safety, and security. Vulnerable women across America deserve better, Mr. Speaker.

In addition, this bill will end girls sports as we know it by mandating schools accept males into girls sports.

I stand in opposition to both of the underlying bills, and I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this rule.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I would just note for the record that over 20 States already have versions of this law, the Equality Act, with respect to participation in sports, as do the Olympics, and we have not seen the kind of behavior that has just been suggested.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentlewoman's courtesy and her careful, thoughtful explanation of what we are doing.

I strongly support the Equality Act, extending civil rights protections to all citizens. I have been honored to be a part of this process throughout my political career, dating back as a child legislator in the 1970s in county government, in city government in Oregon, and for the last 25 years here in Congress.

The arguments that we are hearing have been heard before. The same sort of hysterical concerns have proven not to be the case. Wild claims have been proven wrong; and especially I think of marriage equality as the most compelling. Each reform, each step of the way, has been for progress, and equality was positive, and ultimately supported by the public, as is the Equality Act. The wild claims have been proven groundless.

At the end of the day, one of the reasons is that Americans are biased in favor of fairness and equality. Another important reason, as alluded to by my friend from Pennsylvania, is personal experience. There was fear and misapprehension, but as people became experienced with a family member who married, a transgender child, when you deal with the reality of real people, what we find is that they are people like everybody else, and we do not want their lives to be turned upside down.

I come from a State where by and large these protections are in place, but they aren't in place for everybody everywhere, and we have an opportunity to make additional progress. One of the reasons that we have seen

this progress take place is the advocacy of those in the LGBT community who have been tireless, thoughtful, articulate, strategic, moving the agenda forward and bringing along often reluctant politicians.

Last but not least, I would reference what happened with our young people. Young people understand this. Young people are not hysterical. Young people express their concern and willingness to embrace others, regardless of sexual orientation, and that is why ultimately this cause will win. It is why so much progress has been made and why it will ultimately be successful.

I deeply appreciate this being brought before us, an opportunity for us to approve the Equality Act, affirm the bedrock principle of full equality, move it on to the Senate, and hopefully now with an administration committed to equality, we can enact it into law for the benefit of citizens all across the country.

I just have one 30-second evaluation of the notion of scientific forest management.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CUELLAR). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I will just say, I come from an area where so-called ''scientific management'' of forests has resulted in more forest fires, problems with water quality, problems with habitat. We are learning that we need to make different changes, and one of the tools that we have is extending wilderness protection. It strengthens the environment, protects wildlife, water resources, and makes them more resilient, not less.

It is not a matter of raking the forests, as Donald Trump said, but having an opportunity to allow the healing power of nature to provide those protections.

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOOD).

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, in their continued relentless assault on religious freedoms, Democrats are trying today, with this terrible bill, to make wholesale and damaging changes to our Nation's civil rights laws with little to no debate or even discussion on how this legislation will affect the daily lives of Americans and the institutions we hold dear.

While the Equality Act purports to be an inclusive piece of legislation, it is actually exclusive of those with a different viewpoint. It would ultimately put civil rights laws at odds with longstanding religious beliefs pertaining to sex, sexuality, and other moral issues.

The result would be that faith-based nonprofits, such as a Christian shelter for women or an adoption agency or other religiously affiliated providers of social services, could not minister in good conscience without suffering consequences under Federal law.

We have past history as a precedent, an ominous precedent, as we saw the Obama-Biden administration seek to close down the Little Sisters of the Poor and Catholic nuns who care for the dying simply because they would not pay for their employees' contraception or drugs inducing abortion.

A vote for the Equality Act would solidify the Biden-Harris administration's efforts to enforce the same radical religious and moral litmus tests that leave no room for faith-based ministries and organizations to operate without subscribing to the dogma of the left.

The Equality Act essentially weaponizes civil rights laws against Americans' fundamental liberties, and we must reject this assault on our most precious of freedoms. I oppose this rule, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I would just restate that this act does not take away any of the religious freedoms that are already enshrined in multiple laws. It does not change those laws.

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

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Georgia (Mrs. GREENE).

Mrs. GREENE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, in the spirit of the debate here for the rule, there seems to be quite a disagreement between each side over what exactly this bill says, so for a parliamentary question, I would like to request that the entire bill be read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman's request will not be entertained.

Mrs. GREENE of Georgia. Well, then, let's read some of the rules. You keep saying it doesn't violate religious freedoms when, in fact, it does. It says so directly here in the bill in these sections, and it is a shame that we aren't reading the exact text because it is the text that matters. It doesn't matter what you have to say or what I have to say. It is the actual wording.

In section 1107, it actually talks about: ''The Religious Freedom Restoration Act of 1993 shall not provide a claim concerning, or a defense to a claim under, a covered title, or provide a basis for challenging the application or enforcement of a covered title.''

This bill, in the text, also specifically talks about: ''With respect to gender identity, an individual shall not be denied access to a shared facility, including a restroom, a locker room, and a dressing room, that is in accordance with the individual's gender identity.''

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

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentlewoman from Georgia just to close.

Mrs. GREENE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, in the wording in the text of the bill of the Equality Act, it also says: ''With respect to sex, pregnancy, childbirth or a related medical condition shall not receive less favorable treatment than other physical conditions.''

As a parliamentary question, what does that mean? Does that mean that anyone can demand an abortion? And it is discrimination to be refused this medical service?

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

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, with respect to the gentlewoman's question, with respect to the language in question, it has long been held by our courts that the Religious Freedom Restoration Act does not apply to civil rights laws.

The Equality Act looks to treat discrimination against LGBTQ individuals the same way as other forms of discrimination, including racial discrimination. So, these arguments just don't hold water.

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

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from the great State of Texas (Mr. PFLUGER).

□ 1415

Mr. PFLUGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to both bills. However, I am here to talk about the partisan Federal land grab package.

Last week, my home State of Texas endured a harrowing winter storm that wiped out electricity and water for millions of Texans. It devastated homes and businesses and caused irreparable damage to livestock, crops, and industry production across the State. Tragically, some even lost their lives.

Our State was under an extreme emergency. Living through that underscored the need for safe, affordable, reliable energy. We absolutely must have a reliable baseload for our energy grids and a level playing field for all forms of energy. The Federal Government cannot pick favorites in energy.

What happened in Texas should shake our country into the realization that, as our population grows and our energy needs expand, any move to limit production will have dire consequences on our safety and our national security.

Unfortunately, this bill is another step in the vendetta to limit the American energy production. The partisan $1.2 million Federal land grab——

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

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PFLUGER. Mr. Speaker, the land grab is another Democrat attempt to restrict our country's abundant natural resources under onerous regulations that will kill jobs in the energy industry and put Americans at risk.

This is a matter of national security, and I urge my colleagues to vote against this bill and to vote for the

safety and energy independence that this country so deserves. Please join me in voting ''no'' for both bills and both rules.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I would just note that what we saw in Texas this past week was a truly astonishing, unusual snowstorm with frigid cold conditions that are not normal—as the Speaker knows—in Texas, and that happens because of climate change.

Because we haven't done enough to protect our wilderness and to protect our environment, we end up with extreme climate events like we just saw, and this bill is a step toward redressing that imbalance.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to immediately consider H.R. 682, the Reopen Schools Act.

I will do this to ensure that the $54.3 billion that Congress appropriated just last month to help schools reopen is, in fact, prioritized to meet the expenses of actually being able to open up schools for in-person learning.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD the text of my amendment, along with any extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Iowa (Mrs. HINSON), who will explain the amendment.

Mrs. HINSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to oppose the previous question. This is the third time here today that Republicans have called on this body to consider my bill, the Reopen Schools Act. It is a commonsense solution to get students and teachers to return to the classroom and to do it safely.

This legislation would condition a portion of State COVID relief grants for education on schools actually reopening. My Democrat colleagues already voted for these funds to be used specifically for schools to reopen safely back in December, $54 billion.

The science on this is definitive. If certain safety precautions are taken, teachers and students can resume in-person learning safely. So that is why Congress sent the States this money back in December.

But after nearly a year of this pandemic lockdown, millions of students are still learning exclusively from behind a screen. Our children are struggling academically and they are falling behind.

But the toll on mental health is what is most concerning to me. Even after a year, many kids haven't seen their school friends. They haven't been out to play on a playground. They are isolated, disconnected, and they are lonely. From increased stress and anxiety, depression, even suicidal thoughts or attempts, our youngest generation is facing a mental health crisis.

Hospitals have seen a staggering increase in mental health emergencies among young children. It is heartbreaking. And the longer the goal posts continue to be moved on reopening schools, the worse this mental health crisis for our young people will become.

My home State of Iowa is leading the way to put students' education and mental health first. My two sons got on the school bus this morning in Iowa. They are in class right now receiving hands-on attention from their teachers, and they will play with their friends at recess today.

As a parent, I am grateful that I had the ability to make the right choice for my children and send them back to class to learn in person. But millions of parents around the country have not been given this choice, with many school districts still only offering virtual learning. I have heard of so many families who are struggling as schools remain shuttered and they have no clear timetable for reopening.

It is vulnerable families with at-risk children who are impacted the most by these decisions. Let's think about the kids who don't have access to a computer or WiFi to try to complete their lessons online. Or let's talk about the kids who rely on school breakfast and lunch and they are going hungry without these vital nutrition programs. Or what about the victims of child abuse and neglect who are locked in with potential abusers. Or kids who are left at home all day because their parents have no choice but to go to work.

We cannot allow children and families to continue to suffer right now. It is time for students to get back into the classroom, and we can do it safely. With the Reopen Schools Act, they will be able to do so safely. Teachers will be back in the classroom safely, and we can get this country moving forward again.

Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will join me in supporting our students by defeating the previous question. We need to get kids back to school. So I urge a ''no'' vote.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN).

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

I have some good news for the gentlewoman who just spoke. The reconciliation bill that is coming to the floor, hopefully, on Friday will have a whole bunch of resources in it to help States safely reopen schools. So I hope we will get a good bipartisan vote on that.

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WENSTRUP), the good doctor.

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the previous question. If the previous question is defeated, Republicans will amend this rule to immediately consider H.R. 682, the Reopen Schools Act, which I am proud to cosponsor.

As a father of two small children, their overall health and well-being is my top priority; not just my children, but all of America's children. And as I have looked around this Chamber, I see lots of Members on both sides of the aisle who I know to be great parents and grandparents, and I know they want the best for their children, too.

I am also a doctor, and I am co-chair of our Doctors Caucus. Throughout this pandemic, we have heard calls from Members, and now from President Joe Biden, that we need to trust the science.

As a doctor, I wholeheartedly agree—and the science is clear—students and teachers can go back to in-person learning safely. I know this because my own children have been fortunate enough to go back to school in person all of this school year safely.

The American Academy of Pediatrics has stressed the importance of students returning to school for their overall health and well-being, and the CDC research is clear that transmission in schools is extremely low.

Last week, I joined Congresswoman HINSON, Whip SCALISE, and Ranking Member FOXX on a call with parents from all across the country who want their children to be able to go back to school. It was a bipartisan event. To them, this wasn't a partisan issue. The parents on the call were from across the entire political spectrum: Republicans, Democrats, and Independents.

We heard heartbreaking stories from them about some of their children falling into depression, losing their reading comprehension, and struggling to focus.

Kids are attempting or committing suicide at an alarming rate. In one county in Nevada, the suicide rate doubled from the previous year. Hospitals across the country are seeing unprecedented increases in children suicide attempts and mental health admissions.

Yes, there is some risk to returning, but nothing in life is zero risk. The consequences of staying closed are far too grave and our children are suffering both socially and academically because of it.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support the Reopen Schools Act because we have given schools the funding needed to reopen safely. However, some schools, seemingly under pressure from powerful teachers' unions, refuse to return to in-person learning.

Congress has provided more than $54 billion in State COVID relief grants for education to help reopen schools. We didn't, however, require the schools to actually reopen if they were to access the money, and that was a mistake.

Congresswoman HINSON's bill will address that issue by conditioning those funds on States producing a reopening plan to get students back to school as quickly as possible.

There are at least 3 months left in most school years around the country. We can't just let schools put off returning to in-person learning until next fall or later. We need to do what is best for our students, our children, our grandchildren, our nieces and nephews. We need to reopen the schools now.

We can't, for example, expect sixth-grade teachers to teach fourth graders.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in voting to defeat the previous question. I thank Congresswoman HINSON for her leadership on this bill.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would just note, as a parent, a former school board member, and education advocate, of course, we all want what is best for our students and what is best for our schools.

But I would also suggest that a one-size-fits-all, everybody has to go back in person to schools does not serve anybody well.

We have seen around the country—first of all, our schools in Pennsylvania are not closed. They are open. Some are virtual, some are hybrid, some are in person. But each community is doing what it needs to do in response to the conditions that are present at this time.

So I agree with my colleague on the Rules Committee that we absolutely need to get our school districts and our State and local governments the money they need to safely reopen schools, and we are looking forward to doing that with our reconciliation bill on Friday.

Mr. Speaker, I just inquire whether the gentleman from Pennsylvania is prepared to close. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I have no further speakers and at this time, and I am prepared to close.

Mr. Speaker, Republicans believe everyone should be treated equally under the law. But H.R. 5 is a radical approach that will have serious, unintended consequences for female athletes, victims of sexual violence, houses of worship, and healthcare professionals. The list goes on and on. Critically, the bill undermines important religious freedom protections.

As for H.R. 803, let's call this what it is. It is a land grab. This is a land grab, which will kill jobs in rural communities. It will leave us vulnerable to hostile nations for our energy and mineral needs. It will restrict access and recreation opportunities for the American public.

For all these reasons, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the previous question and ''no'' on the underlying measure.

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

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, today, we are moving forward on two pieces of legislation whose timely consideration is long overdue. And I would note that H.R. 5 did pass last Congress with a bipartisan majority.

So we are looking forward, at long last, to passing the Equality Act through both Chambers and removing the burden of discrimination that can move us closer to a country where members of the LGBTQ community have an equal opportunity to achieve the American Dream.

The Equality Act isn't going to be the end of our long journey toward full LGBTQ equality, but it will bring our laws into line across the country with values that our country was founded upon.

We must continually take steps to make our country more perfect. Acknowledging in law the challenges that actually face LGBTQ people and taking concrete action to correct them brings us another step closer.

Mr. Speaker, we will pass the Protecting America's Wilderness and Public Lands Act in order to ensure that the sacred lands that all Americans share equally cannot be tarnished for the benefit of a few.

We have a long way to go in addressing the myriad problems facing this country, but the two bills before us today are a strong and necessary start to helping our Nation live up to its full potential.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a ''yes'' vote on the rule and the previous question.

The material previously referred to by Mr. RESCHENTHALER is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 147

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 6. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall resolve into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 682) to encourage local educational agencies to resume in-person instruction at elementary and secondary schools, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. When the committee rises and reports the bill back to the House with a recommendation that the bill do pass, the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 7. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 682.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 219, nays 211, not voting 1, as follows:

[Roll No. 34]

YEAS—219

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Auchincloss
Axne
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bourdeaux
Bowman
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brown
Brownley
Bush
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson
Cartwright
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Davids (KS)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Evans
Fletcher
Foster
Frankel, Lois
Fudge
Gallego
Garamendi
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez, Vicente
Gottheimer
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Haaland
Harder (CA)
Hastings
Hayes
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jacobs (CA)
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Jones
Kahele
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim (NJ)
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Leger Fernandez
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lieu
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Manning
McBath
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Mfume
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Moulton
Mrvan
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Newman
Norcross
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stanton
Stevens
Strickland
Suozzi
Swalwell
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Williams (GA)
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NAYS—211

Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bentz
Bergman
Bice (OK)
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (NC)
Boebert
Bost
Brady
Brooks
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Calvert
Cammack
Carl
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cawthorn
Chabot
Cheney
Cline
Cloud
Clyde
Cole
Comer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curtis
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donalds
Duncan
Dunn
Emmer
Estes
Fallon
Feenstra
Ferguson
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franklin, C. Scott
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garbarino
Garcia (CA)
Gibbs
Gimenez
Gohmert
Gonzales, Tony
Gonzalez (OH)
Good (VA)
Gooden (TX)
Gosar
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Greene (GA)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harris
Harshbarger
Hartzler
Hern
Herrell
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Hinson
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Issa
Jackson
Jacobs (NY)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Katko
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kim (CA)
Kinzinger
Kustoff
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
LaTurner
Lesko
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Mace
Malliotakis
Mann
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClain
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
Meijer
Meuser
Miller (IL)
Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks
Moolenaar
Mooney
Moore (AL)
Moore (UT)
Mullin
Murphy (NC)
Nehls
Newhouse
Norman
Nunes
Obernolte
Owens
Palazzo
Palmer
Pence
Perry
Pfluger
Posey
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (SC)
Rodgers (WA)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Rosendale
Rouzer
Roy
Rutherford
Salazar
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Spartz
Stauber
Steel
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Duyne
Wagner
Walberg
Walorski
Waltz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Young
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—1

Matsui

□ 1531

Mr. STEWART changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Ms. CRAIG changed her vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Allred (Davids (KS))
Barragán (Beyer)
Bowman (Clark (MA))
Buchanan (Donalds)
Cárdenas (Gomez)
Carter (TX) (Nehls)
DeSaulnier (Thompson (CA))
Deutch (Rice (NY))
Frankel, Lois (Clark (MA))
Gaetz (Franklin, C. Scott)
Gonzalez, Vincente (Gomez)
Gosar (Wagner)
Grijalva (García (IL))
Hastings (Wasserman Schultz)
Joyce (PA) (Smucker)
Kirkpatrick (Stanton)
Langevin (Lynch)
Lawson (FL) (Evans)
Lieu (Beyer)
Lofgren (Jeffries)
Lowenthal (Beyer)
McCaul (Kim (CA))
Meng (Clark (MA))
Moore (WI) (Beyer)
Moulton (Trahan)
Napolitano (Correa)
Neguse (Perlmutter)
Payne (Wasserman Schultz)
Pingree (Kuster)
Porter (Wexton)
Roybal-Allard (Bass)
Ruiz (Aguilar)
Rush (Underwood)
Vargas (Correa)
Watson Coleman (Pallone)
Wilson (FL) (Hayes)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

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

MOMENT OF SILENCE HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF THE HONORABLE RON WRIGHT

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

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, as dean of the Texas Congressional delegation, I rise to express my condolences on the passing of Congressman RON WRIGHT of Arlington. In his death, Congress has lost a statesman, Texas has lost a dedicated Representative, and I have lost a dear friend.

Congressman WRIGHT was an energetic and bright presence in our delegation. He had a passion for public service, and was willing to work with anyone, regardless of party or politics, to get things done.

He leaves behind a legacy that will inspire future generations of Texans to commit themselves to public service. Though his presence will certainly be missed, we will find comfort in knowing that his memory will always be with us.

Madam Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY), my colleague and ranking member of the House Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. BRADY. Madam Speaker, today we gather as a grieving delegation and as a proud Nation to recognize the life and legacy of our colleague and friend, Congressman RON WRIGHT.

Texas born and bred, Ron worked with and for the people of Texas in some way for the past 21 years. Throughout his courageous battle with lung cancer, his good spirits never faltered, and he remained a steadfast champion of his conservative principles.

To many of us, it seemed like Ron never had a bad day. In fact, the last two bills he introduced in Congress protected the unborn and the sanctity of life, something Ron always passionately supported. Think about that. As his life was waning, he was protecting the lives of the innocent unborn.

The Texas people have lost a real fighter, and all of us have lost a true friend. Cathy and I and our entire Texas delegation hold Ron's wife, Susan, close to our hearts, and our deepest condolences go out to his children, grandchildren, and staff.

Godspeed to you, my friend. You will be missed.

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I ask that we all rise for a moment of silence.

The SPEAKER. The Chair asks all Members in the Chamber to rise for a moment of silence.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 803, COLORADO WILDERNESS ACT OF 2021, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5, EQUALITY ACT

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on adoption of the resolution (H. Res. 147) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 803) to designate certain lands in the State of Colorado as components of the National Wilderness Preservation System, and for other purposes, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5) to prohibit discrimination on the basis of sex, gender identity, and sexual orientation, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 218, nays 208, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 35]

YEAS—218

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Auchincloss
Axne
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bourdeaux
Bowman
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brown
Brownley
Bush
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson
Cartwright
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Davids (KS)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Evans
Fletcher
Foster
Frankel, Lois
Fudge
Gallego
Garamendi
García (IL)
García (TX)
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez, Vicente
Gottheimer
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Haaland
Harder (CA)
Hastings
Hayes
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jacobs (CA)
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Jones
Kahele
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim (NJ)
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Leger Fernandez
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)