United States
*of* America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 117th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

*Vol. 167* WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, MAY 14, 2021 *No. 84*

# *Senate*

The Senate was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Monday, May 17, 2021, at 3 p.m.

# *House of Representatives*

FRIDAY, MAY 14, 2021

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

## DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
*May 14, 2021.*

I hereby appoint the Honorable HENRY CUELLAR to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

## PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Margaret Grun Kibben, offered the following prayer:

Compassionate God, there have been many voices lifted this week—voices filled with concern, tentative in hope, tinged with anger, and strong in belief.

Holy God, we call on You this day to help us in the orchestration of our disparate refrains.

Lead us to appreciate the importance of each perspective—each lawmaker who represents fervently the interests of their districts, each side of the aisle which speaks to their concerns, and each individual who yearns to be heard and understood.

As only You can, God, redeem our competing efforts to achieve our common purpose. Correct our inclination to talk at each other, and aid us in finding ways to engage with each other, that we would find a means to bring our dissonant efforts into some sense of accord.

May unity be found in our respective desires.

May love come forth even in our disagreements, and may a joyful noise emerge from our differences and harmony arise from the diversity of voices, so that the words spoken here would glorify and praise You and serve this Nation faithfully.

It is in the oneness of Your name we pray.

Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 11(a) of House Resolution 188, the Journal of the last day's proceedings is approved.

## PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. GARCIA) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. GARCIA of Texas led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

## JACINTO CITY'S 75TH ANNIVERSARY

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

Ms. GARCIA of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today I want to wish Jacinto City and community in my district a happy 75th anniversary. Jacinto City is a beloved community in our district full of hard-working Americans who contribute to our economy and work every day to build a country we love.

In the 1940s the city became the meeting point for immigrant families who worked in shipyards, nearby steel mills, and war plants. These workers were here seeking the American Dream, a dream that became a reality thanks to the entrepreneurial spirit of its immigrant community.

This is inspiring, and it reminds us now more than ever that our workers play a vital role in empowering and transforming our country.

Today, Jacinto City is a beacon of hope for the State's great economy and for our Nation. Its diverse community is led by a Latina mayor, Ana Diaz. It is an example of our country's social fabric and how our immigrants make us a stronger and more vibrant country.

I couldn't be prouder to represent this great community, and I am thankful to the families for their hard work and their contributions to our country.

Happy anniversary, Jacinto City. Feliz aniversario.

## JUSTICE FOR OFFICER ERIC WILLIAMS

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

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, in 2013, Eric Williams was working as a correctional officer at USP Canaan when he was savagely murdered by an inmate who was already serving a life sentence. A jury later found the inmate guilty of Eric's murder, but because 1 out of 12 jurors voted against the death penalty, he faced no additional penalty for this crime. Such an outcome is unacceptable in our legal system. Officer Williams' tragic killing reveals a glaring injustice for victims of violent crime.

That is why I reintroduced Eric's Law this week, which would permit prosecutors to impanel a second jury for sentencing in a death penalty case when the first jury fails to deliver a unanimous verdict.

Officer Williams died protecting our community, and we owe it to him and others like him to punish the violent criminals who commit these acts. Though we will never be able to rid our society of heinous crimes or acts of violence, this bill is a step in the right direction to ensure victims and their families have every opportunity to pursue the justice they deserve.

## INFRASTRUCTURE JOBS

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

Ms. DEAN. Mr. Speaker, 22 million Americans lost their jobs during the pandemic. Slowly we have begun to rebuild, restore, and get back on track. Since President Biden has taken office, 1.5 million jobs have been created—the most jobs created in the first 100 days of any Presidency. Yet, as the April jobs report showed us, we must continue to take additional steps to get Americans back to work.

There are more than 8 million jobs left to go. The American Jobs Plan is vital to rebuilding our community and our economy while protecting our planet. It is a once-in-a-century investment to create millions of good-paying jobs and to lay the foundation for extensive economic growth for the following decades.

In my home State of Pennsylvania, our infrastructure earned a C-minus on its infrastructure report card. There is so much we can do. We need to safely upgrade Pennsylvania's roads and bridges, mass transit, ports, rail, broadband, and water supply.

We have a chance here to make a generational investment and get our Nation back on track with the American Jobs Plan.

## FAREWELL TO REPRESENTATIVE STEVE STIVERS

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

Mr. BALDERSON. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to bid farewell to my dear friend, Representative STEVE STIVERS, as he embarks on a new adventure leading the Ohio Chamber of Commerce.

A career soldier, STEVE has served more than 30 years in the Ohio Army National Guard and holds the rank of major general. He served the United States overseas during Operation Iraqi Freedom where he led 400 soldiers and contractors. For his leadership, he was awarded the Bronze Star. In a battle closer to home, STEVE served on the front lines in America's fight against the opioid epidemic. Steve was a champion for the cause of civility not just in politics, but in our daily lives and founded the Congressional Civility and Respect Caucus.

Just as STEVE has left his mark here in the Halls of Congress and in the lives of so many Americans, I know he will continue to do big things as president and CEO of the Ohio Chamber of Commerce and as a champion for job growth across our State.

## PREGNANT WORKER ACCOMMODATION

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

Ms. MANNING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in favor of the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act.

As a working mother, this bill is very personal to me. When I was pregnant with my third child, I experienced premature labor, and my doctor ordered me to be on bed rest for 10 weeks. I was fortunate to work for an employer who allowed me to keep my job, work a reduced schedule from home, and continue earning my wages.

After my daughter was born, I was still able to take my full maternity leave to care for her, and once I returned to the office, I continued to work for that same firm for many years in part because of the accommodations that were made for me during my pregnancy.

This experience should not be unique to me. The Pregnant Workers Fairness Act will ensure that every person who needs reasonable accommodation during pregnancy will be given those accommodations so they can work to continue to support their family and contribute to their workplace.

I am proud to cast my vote in favor of the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act, and I urge my colleagues to join me.

Mr. Speaker, I will include in the RECORD a letter from the National Education Association.

## REMEMBERING PAUL CHARLES GRASSEY

(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. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember and honor Paul Charles Grassey of Savannah, Georgia, who passed away on April 11 at the age of 97.

Following the attack on Pearl Harbor, Paul joined the U.S. Air Force and was assigned as a pilot in the Eighth Air Force. He flew more than a dozen combat missions as a B–24 pilot.

Paul's most treasured purpose was discovered when he became involved with the building, growth, and development of the National Museum of the Mighty Eighth Air Force in Pooler, Georgia. He had a passion for sharing his stories about the courage and the sacrifice of the people he served with.

He loved to sing, and he led us often in patriotic songs.

In January of 2020, Paul was awarded the French Legion of Honor for his service and role in helping to free France from Nazi occupation during World War II.

I am thankful for the immense impact that Paul Grassey had on our community, and I know his legacy will remain. We will all miss him very much. My thoughts and prayers are with his family, friends, and all who knew him during this most difficult time.

## UPDATED CDC GUIDELINES

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

Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak on an issue critical to this Chamber setting an example for the rest of the country.

Yesterday, the CDC issued guidance that fully vaccinated individuals can resume indoor activities without wearing a mask or physically distancing.

I am pleased to see the Centers for Disease Control following the science and recommending that fully vaccinated individuals can go without masks indoors.

As Members of Congress, we should not only encourage constituents to get vaccinated, we should be showing them what a return to normal looks like and follow the science.

According to the Speaker, roughly 75 percent of our Members have received COVID–19 vaccinations, and, therefore, should have the choice to go without masks. Americans are looking for hope, and we are not showing it. Just as I implored on April 22, I am, again, calling on the Speaker and Attending Physician to lift the rules and fines that require fully vaccinated Members of Congress to wear masks in the House Chamber.

Even The New York Times today said that the Centers for Disease Control is

finally catching up to the science and so should the House. We must be the leaders we were elected to be, follow the science, and have the choice to go without a mask.

I am going to be that leader, and I choose no mask.

## CALIFORNIA DROUGHT

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

Mr. VALADAO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring attention to the worsening drought conditions in California.

Farmers and producers in California grow more than one-third of the vegetables and two-thirds of the fruit and nuts produced in the U.S. Depriving our farmers of the water they need to grow our Nation's food ultimately increases the cost of food for every person in the United States. Still, the House majority has yet to take action to address this drought or consider legislation that will bring clean, reliable water to our struggling communities.

In February, I introduced H.R. 737, the RENEW WIIN Act, to allow the little water we have to be made available to the communities that feed our Nation.

While I am glad to see my persistent requests for a drought emergency declaration granted this week by California's Governor, this is only a step in the right direction. We need immediate action in Congress, and I implore my colleagues in the majority to advance legislation to confront this crisis, including my bill, the RENEW WIIN Act.

□ 0915

## RESIGNATION FROM THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation from the House of Representatives:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
*Washington, DC, April 22, 2021.*

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
*Speaker of the House, Washington, DC.*

DEAR SPEAKER PELOSI: I am writing to inform you that, effective May 16, 2021, I will resign my seat in the U.S. House of Representatives representing Ohio's 15th Congressional District.

For the past ten years, it has been my honor and privilege to serve the people of Ohio's 15th District. Enclosed is a copy of my letter of resignation to the Governor of the State of Ohio, Mike DeWine.

Sincerely,

STEVE STIVERS.

---

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
*Washington, DC, April 22, 2021.*

Hon. MIKE DEWINE,
*Governor of Ohio, Columbus, OH.*

DEAR GOVERNOR DEWINE: I am writing to inform you that, effective May 16, 2021, I will resign my seat in the U.S. House of Representatives representing Ohio's 15th Congressional District.

For the past ten years, it has been my honor and privilege to serve the people of Ohio's 15th District. Enclosed is a copy of my letter of resignation to the Speaker of the House, Nancy Pelosi.

Sincerely,

STEVE STIVERS.

## PREGNANT WORKERS FAIRNESS ACT

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 380, I call up the bill (H.R. 1065) 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, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 380, 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. 1065

*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 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 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 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));*

*(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.*

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill, as amended, shall be debatable for 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the chair and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor or their respective designees.

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. Mr. 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. 1065, the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1065, the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act introduced by Representatives NADLER and KATKO.

It is unacceptable that, in 2021, pregnant workers can still be denied basic workplace accommodations that help them stay healthy during their pregnancy. These accommodations, from

providing seating and water to excusing pregnant workers from heavy lifting, are not complex or costly.

But without these protections, too many workers are forced to either leave their jobs or put their health and the health of their pregnancy at risk. We can and must do better to ensure that no worker in this country is forced to choose between financial security and a healthy pregnancy.

The Pregnant Workers Fairness Act would finally establish a right to reasonable accommodations to all pregnant workers, and it would guarantee that pregnant workers can seek those accommodations without facing discrimination or retaliation.

Last Congress, 226 House Democrats and 103 Republicans came together to pass this legislation by a margin of 329–73. I hope we can come together again this year and finally deliver this bipartisan priority to our Nation's workers.

Mr. Speaker, I urge strong support for the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act, and I reserve the balance of my time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION,
*Washington, DC, March 24, 2021.*

Hon. ROBERT C. ''BOBBY'' SCOTT,
*Chairman, Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR CHAIRMAN SCOTT: I am writing to you concerning H.R. 1065, the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act. There are certain provisions in the legislation which fall within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on House Administration.

In the interest of permitting your committee to proceed expeditiously to floor consideration, the Committee on House Administration agrees to forego action on the bill. This is done with the understanding that the Committee on House Administration's jurisdictional interests over this and similar legislation are in no way diminished or altered. In addition, the Committee reserves its right to seek conferees on any provisions within its jurisdiction which are considered in a House-Senate conference and requests your support if such a request is made.

I would appreciate your response confirming this understanding with respect to H.R. 1065 and ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in your committee report on the bill and in the Congressional Record during consideration of the bill on the House floor.

Sincerely,

ZOE LOFGREN,
*Chairperson.*

---

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR,
*Washington, DC, March 25, 2021.*

Hon. ZOE LOFGREN,
*Chairperson, Committee on House Administration, Washington, DC.*

DEAR CHAIRPERSON LOFGREN: In reference to your letter of March 24, 2021, I write to confirm our mutual understanding regarding H.R. 1065, the ''Pregnant Workers Fairness Act.''

I appreciate the Committee on House Administration's waiver of consideration of H.R. 1065 as specified in your letter. I acknowledge that the waiver was granted only to expedite floor consideration of H.R. 1065 and does not in any way waive or diminish the Committee on House Administration's jurisdictional interests over this or similar legislation.

I would be pleased to include our exchange of letters on this matter in the committee report for H.R. 1065 and in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of the bill to memorialize our joint understanding.

Again, thank you for your assistance with this matter.

Very truly yours,

ROBERT C. ''BOBBY'' SCOTT,
*Chairman.*

---

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
*Washington, DC, March 23, 2021.*

Hon. BOBBY SCOTT,
*Chairman, House Committee on Education and Labor, Washington, DC.*

DEAR CHAIRMAN SCOTT: This is to advise you that the Committee on the Judiciary has now had an opportunity to review the provisions in H.R. 1065, the ''Pregnant Workers Fairness Act,'' that fall within our Rule X jurisdiction. I appreciate your consulting with us on those provisions. The Judiciary Committee has no objection to your including them in the bill for consideration on the House floor, and to expedite that consideration is willing to forgo action on H.R. 1065, with the understanding that we do not thereby waive any future jurisdictional claim over those provisions or their subject matters.

In the event a House-Senate conference on this or similar legislation is convened, the Judiciary Committee reserves the right to request an appropriate number of conferees to address any concerns with these or similar provisions that may arise in conference.

Please place this letter into the Congressional Record during consideration of the measure on the House floor. Thank you for the cooperative spirit in which you have worked regarding this matter and others between our committees.

Sincerely,

JERROLD NADLER,
*Chairman.*

---

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR,
*Washington, DC, April 28, 2021.*

Hon. JERROLD NADLER,
*Chairman, House Committee on the Judiciary, Washington, DC.*

DEAR CHAIRMAN NADLER: In reference to your letter of March 23, 2021, I write to confirm our mutual understanding regarding H.R. 1065, the ''Pregnant Workers Fairness Act.''

I appreciate the Committee on the Judiciary's waiver of consideration of H.R. 1065 as specified in your letter. I acknowledge that the waiver was granted only to expedite floor consideration of H.R. 1065 and does not in any way waive or diminish the Committee on the Judiciary's jurisdictional interests over this or similar legislation.

I would be pleased to include our exchange of letters on this matter in the committee report for H.R. 1065 and in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of the bill to memorialize our joint understanding.

Again, thank you for your assistance with this matter.

Very truly yours,

ROBERT C. ''BOBBY'' SCOTT,
*Chairman.*

---

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND REFORM,
*Washington, DC, April 28, 2021.*

Hon. ROBERT C. ''BOBBY'' SCOTT,
*Chairman, Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR CHAIRMAN SCOTT: I am writing to you concerning H.R. 1065, the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act. There are certain provisions in the legislation that fall within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

In the interest of permitting your Committee to proceed expeditiously on this bill, I am willing to waive this Committee's right to sequential referral. I do so with the understanding that by waiving consideration of the bill, the Committee on Oversight and Reform does not waive any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the bill that fall within its Rule X jurisdiction. I request that you urge the Speaker to name members of this Committee to any conference committee that is named to consider such provisions.

Please place this letter into the Congressional Record during consideration of the measure on the House floor. Thank you for the cooperative spirit in which you have worked regarding this matter and others between our respective Committees.

Sincerely,

CAROLYN B. MALONEY,
*Chairwoman.*

---

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR,
*Washington, DC, April 29, 2021.*

Hon. CAROLYN B. MALONEY,
*Chairwoman, House Committee on Oversight and Reform, Washington, DC.*

DEAR CHAIRWOMAN MALONEY: In reference to your letter of April 28, 2021, I write to confirm our mutual understanding regarding H.R. 1065, the ''Pregnant Workers Fairness Act.''

I appreciate the Committee on Oversight and Reform' s waiver of consideration of H.R. 1065 as specified in your letter. I acknowledge that the waiver was granted only to expedite floor consideration of H.R. 1065 and does not in any way waive or diminish the Committee on Oversight and Reform's jurisdictional interests over this or similar legislation.

I would be pleased to include our exchange of letters on this matter in the committee report for H.R. 1065 and in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of the bill to memorialize our joint understanding.

Again, thank you for your assistance with this matter.

Very truly yours,

ROBERT C. ''BOBBY'' SCOTT,
*Chairman.*

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

Mr. Speaker, House Republicans have long supported protections in Federal law for all workers, including pregnant workers, and we believe employers should provide reasonable workplace 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 grandmother. Discrimination of any type should not be tolerated, and no one should ever be denied an opportunity because of unlawful discrimination.

That is why I support meaningful protections under Federal law to prevent workplace discrimination, including Federal laws that rightfully protect pregnant workers.

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

I agree with the underlying principle of H.R. 1065 and appreciate the bipartisan negotiations that took place during the 116th Congress to get this bill to where it is today. And I am pleased to see the changes we negotiated last Congress were incorporated in the legislative text this time around.

When the bill was introduced last Congress, it did not require that a pregnant worker, in order to be eligible for an accommodation, be able to perform the essential functions of the job with a reasonable accommodation. This is a sensible provision now included in the bill.

A definition of ''known limitations'' related to pregnancy, childbirth, or related medical conditions was also initially omitted. The bill now includes such a definition, including a requirement that employees communicate the known limitation to the employer. This provision will help workers and their employers understand their rights and responsibilities.

Additionally, the bill introduced last Congress appeared to allow employees a unilateral veto over offered accommodations. However, the bill now clarifies that reasonable accommodations will typically be determined through a balanced and interactive dialogue between workers and employers.

The bill introduced last Congress also did not include the limitation on applicability to employers with 15 or more employees, as is the case in title VII of the Civil Rights Act and title I of the Americans with Disabilities Act, but it now includes the 15-employee threshold.

Finally, the bill now includes a provision 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.

Unfortunately, there is one key provision missing from this bill. One of the core tenets of the Constitution is the guarantee of religious freedom. In fact, it is the first freedom mentioned in the Constitution.

For the last 240 years, the Supreme Court has upheld that principle in its decisions, and laws written by Congress have maintained strong protections for religious liberty. Yet, the bill we are discussing today deals an unnecessary blow to religious organizations, potentially forcing them to make hiring decisions that conflict with their faith.

Our job in the people's House is not to defy the Constitution, but to uphold it. No employer should have to choose between abiding by the law and adhering to their religious beliefs.

That is why Republicans offered an amendment in committee that would include a narrow but longstanding provision from the Civil Rights Act that is not currently incorporated in this bill. Committee Democrats voted down this commonsense amendment.

I also submitted the same amendment to the Rules Committee so that it could be debated today, but the Democrats prevented me from offering it. As a result, I cannot, in good conscience, vote in favor of this legislation.

I want to reiterate that I am pleased with the bipartisan negotiations that took place on H.R. 1065. When we work together, we can effect real change. But I will never support any bill that infringes on the Constitution, and I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to do the same.

Taking away rights from our citizens is not a win for the American people; it is a win for Big Government.

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

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

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

I rise in strong support of the bipartisan Pregnant Workers Fairness Act. As a mom and policymaker, I know how important it is to protect the health, well-being, and economic security of pregnant workers and their families. Unfortunately, under current Federal law, pregnant workers do not have access to reasonable workplace accommodations.

Simple accommodations, such as providing seating, water, or an extra bathroom break, would allow pregnant workers to stay safe on their job during pregnancy. But when pregnant workers do not have access to the accommodations they need, they are at risk of jeopardizing their health and the health of their baby, losing their job, being denied a promotion, or not being hired in the first place.

It is unacceptable that, in 2021, pregnant workers can still be forced to choose between a healthy pregnancy and a paycheck.

Congress passed the Pregnancy Discrimination Act more than four decades ago, but pregnant workers still suffer discrimination at an alarming rate.

Megan, a manufacturing worker in Oregon, was forced to take unpaid leave after her employer denied her modest request for light duty 3½ months before her due date. Oregon has since passed a State version of the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act, and it is working very well. But pregnant workers across the country need fairness, too.

We know that women of color are overrepresented in low-wage, physically demanding jobs and are, therefore, disproportionately harmed by a lack of access to reasonable accommodations. By clarifying the right of pregnant workers to reasonable accommodations on the job, we will finally give them the ability to work safely without fear of facing discrimination or retaliation.

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

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from the National Partnership for Women & Families in support of the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act.

NATIONAL PARTNERSHIP FOR
WOMEN & FAMILIES,
*Washington, DC, May 11, 2021.*

DEAR MEMBER OF CONGRESS: The National Partnership for Women & Families is a nonprofit, 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 in strong support of H.R. 1065, 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—a choice that no one 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 this 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, thirty-five 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 COVID–19 pandemic has exacerbated the conditions of pregnant workers. Pregnant people are at a higher risk of falling ill from COVID–19 and experiencing complications, and thus require increased protections against the virus. Since the beginning of the pandemic, pregnant workers have experienced increased levels of workplace discrimination by being denied accommodations and leave. The Pregnant Workers Fairness Act would ensure that pregnant workers have access to the accommodations they need in order to have a safe workplace experience.

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. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support this bill.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Louisiana (Ms. LETLOW).

Ms. LETLOW. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 1065.

As a working mother who has two beautiful children, I support reasonable accommodations for pregnant workers. Many of the provisions in the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act are admirable. However, it is equally important to protect First Amendment rights of our religious organizations, hospitals, and schools, including those located in the Fifth District of Louisiana.

Under this bill, organizations could be forced to make employment-related decisions that conflict with their faith and sacrifice their religious rights. For example, a faith-based employer could be deemed in violation of this bill if it does not accommodate an employee's request for paid time off to undergo an abortion.

Also, if signed into law, this bill allows an independent and uncontrollable Federal agency to make additional rules and regulations that could further erode religious liberties. It leaves decisionmaking in the hands of unelected government bureaucrats.

Therefore, Congress must include a religious freedom exemption in the base text of this bill. When it comes to religious freedom and pro-life issues, we should not allow bureaucrats and potentially the judicial system to make decisions by reading between the lines. We must send a clear message that religious freedom is nonnegotiable.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ), a member of the Committee on Education and Labor.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, Sunday, we celebrated Mother's Day. Today, we act to protect mothers-to-be.

Every pregnant worker deserves the opportunity to support their family without risking the health of their pregnancy. Yet, pregnant workers, especially those in low-wage and physically demanding jobs, are often forced to choose between their health and a paycheck.

The Pregnant Workers Fairness Act will correct these flaws in our system to ensure that pregnant women are treated fairly in the workplace.

Women carried the brunt of losses during the pandemic, losing a net 5.4 million jobs. We need to make it easier for them to get back to work, and that must include pregnant women.

I am proud that my home State of New Mexico passed legislation to protect pregnant workers, with bipartisan support, last year. It is time for Congress to do the same.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from the ACLU in support of the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act.

MAY 11, 2021.

Re Vote YES for the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act (H.R. 1065).

DEAR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS: On behalf of the American Civil Liberties Union, and our more than 1.8 million members, supporters, and activists, we write to express our support for H.R. 1065, 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 longoverdue legislation.

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 respond to 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 leave 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.

WHY CONGRESS SHOULD PASS THE PREGNANT WORKERS FAIRNESS ACT

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 employers 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 wellbeing, 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.*

□ 0930

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. FULCHER).

Mr. FULCHER. Mr. Speaker, there is no question that pregnant workers should be treated fairly and be provided with reasonable accommodations in the workforce. We are all in favor of commonsense guidelines to ensure this.

Serving as a subcommittee ranking member in the Education and Labor Committee, I had the opportunity to dive deeply into this bill and participate in the full committee markup.

While much of this law is redundant to the two laws that currently protect pregnant workers, I agree with many of the provisions in the bill, and it was substantially improved from the version introduced in 2019.

During our markup, I asked for an amendment to clarify one specific provision before lending my support. My provision singles out religious organizations by removing the exemption found in nearly every civil rights bill, including the Civil Rights Act.

Because each religion has its own unique customs, requirements, and traditions, it is not reasonable to mandate employment decisions that conflict with people's faith.

By not including this longstanding Civil Rights Act provision, H.R. 1065 is likely to create legal risk for religious organizations. Pregnancy-discrimination or pregnancy-accommodation laws in at least 16 States and the District of Columbia also include a provision similar to the Civil Rights Act religious organizations protection.

By adding a simple reference in H.R. 1065 to the Civil Rights Act, we can harmonize the bill with current law and ensure that religious organizations receive the same protections as outlined in the Civil Rights Act. This is the only reasonable thing to do.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Georgia (Mrs. MCBATH), a member of the Education and Labor Committee.

Mrs. MCBATH. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman SCOTT for bringing this vital legislation to the floor.

The Pregnant Workers Fairness Act will ensure that no pregnant woman is unfairly forced out of their job or risk their health just simply to earn a paycheck. Our mothers deserve these Federal protections.

I believe that we all want to support our working mothers. Allowing these simple accommodations can make the

difference between being forced out of a job and providing 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 can continue to support their families.

This legislation is supported by both women's health groups and the industry.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from major employers and leaders in the business community across the country that are voicing support for this legislation.

OPEN LETTER IN SUPPORT OF THE PREGNANT WORKERS FAIRNESS ACT FROM LEADING PRIVATE-SECTOR EMPLOYERS

MARCH 15, 2021.

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-eight 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, CA; Amalgamate Bank, New York, NY; AnitaB.org, Belmont, CA; BASF Corporation, Florham Park, NJ; Care.com, Inc., Waltham, MA; Chobani, Norwich, NY; Cigna Corp., Bloomfield, CT; Dow, Midland, MI; Expedia Group, Seattle, WA; Facebook, Menlo Park, CA; Gap Inc., San Francisco, CA; H&M USA, New York, NY; ICM Partners, Los Angeles, Ca.

J. Crew, New York, NY; Johnson & Johnson, New Brunswick, NJ; L'Oréal USA, New York, NY; Levi Strauss & Co., San Francisco, CA; Madewell, Long Island City, NY; Mastercard, Purchase, NY; Microsoft Corporation, Redmond, WA; Navient, LLC., Wilmington, DE; National Association of Manufactures, Washington, DC; Patagonia, Ventura, CA; Paypal, San Jose, CA; Postmates, San Francisco, CA.

Salesforce, San Francisco, CA; Society of Women Engineers, Chicago, IL; Spotify, New York, NY; Square, Inc., San Francisco, CA; Sun Life, Wellesley, MA; U.S. Women's Chamber of Commerce, Washington, DC.

The Sustainable Food Policy Alliance:

Danone North America, White Plains, NY; Mars Incorporated, McLean, VA; Nestlé USA, Arlington, VA; Unilever United States, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.

Mrs. MCBATH. Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on this legislation.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MCCLAIN).

Mrs. MCCLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in objection to the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act.

This bill was so close to being a bipartisan bill. In fact, I was ready to vote ''yes'' on it because, as the majority of people, I do not believe in discrimination. But at the very last minute, the majority had to throw in a provision to actually allow discrimination in a bill that is supposed to be about nondiscrimination—the very last minute.

Ranking Member FOXX offered an amendment to protect and not to discriminate against religious organizations.

Guess what the majority did?

They voted it down.

Remember, this is supposed to be a bill about not discriminating, yet we vote this down.

Although the bill sounds good, and as a woman—and I will say I am a woman—as a mother—and I am proud to be a mother—I was also pregnant and a worker. So I believe in fairness. I believe in nondiscrimination. I believe in protecting the rights of those individuals.

But let's stop playing games in Congress. Let's actually start protecting the people who need protection, and let's get to work.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Virginia for his kindness.

This has to pass today if we have any sense of fairness not only to women, but to our children.

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.

Pregnant workers and individuals with known limitations related to pregnancy, childbirth, or related medical conditions cannot be denied employment.

The Supreme Court decision, just recently, in 2015, that allowed pregnant workers to bring reasonable accommodation discrimination claims is not enough because pregnant workers are still being denied accommodations, because the Young decision set an unreasonably high standard for proving discrimination.

This is not discrimination. I have never seen a religious organization that wants to deny anyone any opportunity.

This is a fair assessment. I know it personally because I was denied a job because I was nursing. A job was taken away from me. When I was pregnant and was about to give birth, there was no definition of pregnancy leave for my position. At that time I was a lawyer, practicing law in a large firm, and it was, at best, two weeks and get back.

So I understand that this is essential for those workers in working conditions where they do not have the power to be protected, that they are doing heavy lifting, that they have physically demanding jobs, that they are the sole provider of their family.

This is important. Black and Latino women particularly suffer, minority women, particularly a burden.

Three in ten pregnant workers are employed in four of the occupations that make up the backbone of our communities. We must have this bill.

I ask my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from the disabled community, mental health community, United Spinal Association, and others.

MAY 11, 2021.

Re Support for Pregnant Workers Fairness Act, H.R. 1065.

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. 1065. 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. 1065 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.*
KELLY BUCKLAND,
*National Council on Independent Living.*
SAMANTHA CRANE,
*Autistic Self Advocacy Network.*
MOLLY BURGDORF,
*The Arc of the United States.*

Co-chairs, CCD Rights Task Force.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter representing organizations from Black Mamas Matter Alliance, to March of Dimes, to 1,000 Days to Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics.

MAY 11, 2021.

Re Support the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The undersigned organizations dedicated to assuring quality maternal, infant, and child health and wellbeing, improving pregnancy and birth outcomes, and closing racial disparities in maternal health enthusiastically support the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act (H.R. 1065). 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.

Congress must do all it can to end the prejudice pregnant workers, especially Black pregnant workers and 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 do not fear asking for the accommodations they need to maintain their health.

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 medically 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. For example, Black women experience maternal mortality rates three to four times higher than white women, with Indigenous women similarly experiencing disproportionately high rates. The circumstances surrounding these alarming statistics 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 demanding 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.

Furthermore, 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.

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 lowcost, 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.

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. When pregnant workers 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 also experience higher rates 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.

The Pregnant Workers Fairness Act is a measured approach to a serious problem. As organizations dedicated to maternal health and closing racial disparities in pregnancy and birth outcomes, 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,

Black Mamas Matter Alliance; March of Dimes; National WIC Association; 1,000 Days; Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics; American Academy of Pediatrics; American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists; Agricultural Justice Project; Ancient Song Doula Services; Association of Maternal & Child Health Programs; Baobab Birth Collective; Black Women's Health Imperative; Breastfeeding in Combat Boots.

California WIC Association; Centering Equity, Race & Cultural Literacy in Family Planning (CERCL-FP); Earth Action, Inc.; Farmworker and Landscaper Advocacy Project; Farmworker Association of Florida; Feminist Women's Health Center; First Focus Campaign for Children; Healthy Mothers, Healthy Babies Coalition of Georgia; Healthy Women; Human Rights Watch; Mom2Mom Global; NARAL Pro-Choice America.

National Association of Nurse Practitioners in Women's Health; National Birth Equity Collaborative; National Partnership for Women & Families; National Women's Health Network; Nebraska WIC Association; Nurse-Family Partnership; Physicians for Reproductive Health; Planned Parenthood Federation of America; Public Citizen, SisterReach; SisterSong National Women of Color Reproductive Justice Collective; U.S. Breastfeeding Committee; Workplace Fairness; Wisconsin WIC Association; ZERO TO THREE.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from the YWCA dealing with 200 local organizations in 45 States.

YWCA USA,
*Washington, DC, May 11, 2021.*

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of YWCA USA, a network of over 200 local associations

in 45 states and the District of Columbia, I write today to urge you to pass the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act (H.R. 1065). As the economy continues to struggle under the weight of the COVID–19 pandemic disproportionately affecting women and marginalized communities, there is no better time to take action to improve the economic security of women and families and strengthen our economy. I urge you to pass H.R. 1065 without delay.

For over 160 years, YWCA has been on a mission to eliminate racism, empower women, and promote peace, justice, freedom, and dignity for all. From our earliest days providing skills and housing support to women entering the workforce in the 1850s, YWCA has been at the forefront of the most pressing social movements—from voting rights to civil rights, from affordable housing to pay equity, from violence prevention to health care reform. Today, we serve over 2 million women, girls and family members of all ages and backgrounds in more than 1,200 communities each year.

Informed by our extensive history, the expertise of our nationwide network, and our collective commitment to advocating for the equity of women and families, we believe that no one should have to choose between their livelihoods and their health, family, or safety. Yet far too many women and families, including a disproportionate number of women and families of color, must make this choice every day. This has become more clear as the effects of the COVID–19 pandemic become more transparent. The impact of the COVID–19 pandemic has fallen heavily on women and women of color. Women are especially likely to be essential workers, but they are also bearing the brunt of job losses, while shouldering increased caregiving responsibilities that have pushed millions out of the workforce entirely, resulting in an economic ''Shesession''. Black women, Latinas, and other women of color are especially likely to be on the front lines of the crisis, risking their lives in jobs in health care, child care, and grocery stores, all while being paid less than their male counterparts. Pregnant employees are no exception to this situation and often forced out of work or forced to risk their health due to unclear laws around pregnancy accommodations, particularly during the pandemic.

The bipartisan Pregnant Workers Fairness Act (H.R. 1065) takes critical steps to promote healthy pregnancies and support the economic security of pregnancy workers. Today, women are a primary source of financial support for many families and bear significant caretaking responsibilities at home. At least half of all households in the U.S. with children under the age of 18 have either a single mother who heads a household or a married mother who provides at least 40 percent of a family's earnings. Additionally, more than four in five Black mothers (81.1%), 67.1% of Native American mothers, and 52.5% of Latina mothers are breadwinners. As demographics shifts and a higher number of women take their place in the workforce, a higher number of pregnant workers than ever before are working later into their pregnancies, often in physically demanding jobs without worker accommodations. As a result, too many pregnant workers are pushed out into unpaid leave or out of work altogether, threatening their families' economic security just when they need the income the most. The Pregnant Workers Fairness Act would require employers to provide reasonable accommodations to pregnant workers who need them, such as avoiding heavy lifting, taking more frequent bathroom breaks, sitting on a stool instead of standing during a shift, or carrying a water bottle. States, localities, and businesses that have begun to adopt policies similar to those identified in the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act have reported reduced lawsuits and greater employee morale. Providing reasonable accommodations for pregnant women will benefit both the employer and employees.

No one should have to choose between their paycheck and a healthy pregnancy—an issue only to be exacerbated by the pandemic—and it's time Congress took action to protect pregnant workers. If passed, this bill would take critical steps towards strengthening women's economic security, particularly at a time when the country continues to recover from the COVID–19 pandemic. At this pivotal moment, Congress must take aggressive action to address the economic disparities disproportionately affecting women and women of color. We urge you to pass the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act (H.R 1065) today.

Thank you for your time and consideration. Please contact Pam Yuen, YWCA USA Director of Government Relations, if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

ELISHA RHODES,
*Interim CEO & Chief Operating Officer.*

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, women are in the workplace. They are the backbone of this economy. We need to pass this legislation and pass it now.

I thank Mr. SCOTT and Mr. NADLER for their leadership.

Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of the Judiciary, Homeland Security, and Budget Committees, the Democratic Working Women Task Force, the Founder and Co-Chair of the Congressional Children's Caucus, and as cosponsor, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1065, 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 to 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; 191 L. Ed. 2d 279 (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.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, there are no similar conditions to pregnancy.

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.

Mr. 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 United States 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.

Mr. 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.

Mr. 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. 1065, the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOOD).

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, it amazes me that House Democrats are claiming to champion the cause of pregnant worker fairness when they are so radically anti-life.

How can Democrats claim to support fairness or champion pregnancy when they support taxpayer-funded abortion for any reason at any time on demand?

How can they claim this with a straight face when they minimize the sanctity of life and the family?

Democrats say they are pro-choice. So you would think they must at least be okay with the choice of some religious employers to object to helping their employees get an abortion and would provide an accommodation for religious reasons under this bill.

It would seem reasonable for someone who says they are pro-choice to support the notion that if someone gets an abortion, they can't force their employer to be part of this choice.

But Democrats refuse to allow language to protect religious freedom in this bill. The fact is, Democrats are only pro-choice when the choice is abortion, the taking of innocent human life.

Protections already exist for pregnant workers through the Pregnancy Discrimination Act and the Americans with Disabilities Act.

I oppose these additional heavy-handed regulations. I trust America's small business owners to treat their employees fairly. I honor the constitutional mandate that States should make their own healthcare policy.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1¼ minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ).

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act, a bipartisan proposal that will finally secure clear protection for pregnant workers.

Pregnant women should not have to risk their lives on the job. Yet, too often, instead of offering accommodations routinely given to other employees, a pregnant worker risks termination, meaning she loses her paycheck and health insurance right when she needs them the most.

We know that COVID–19 has exacerbated health inequalities for women, especially women of color.

Before the pandemic, moms in the U.S. already struggled and died from pregnancy-related causes at the highest rate in the developed world, with Black moms dying three to four times the rate of their White peers.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter on behalf of maternal health organizations who support putting a national pregnancy accommodation standard in place.

MAY 11, 2021.

Re Support the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The undersigned organizations dedicated to assuring quality maternal, infant, and child health and well-being, improving pregnancy and birth outcomes, and closing racial disparities in maternal health enthusiastically support the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act (H.R. 1065). 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.

Congress must do all it can to end the prejudice pregnant workers, especially Black pregnant workers and 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 do not fear asking for the accommodations they need to maintain their health.

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 medically 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. For example, Black women experience maternal mortality rates three to four times higher than white women, with Indigenous women similarly experiencing disproportionately high rates. The circumstances surrounding these alarming statistics 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 demanding 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.

Furthermore, 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.

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 lowcost, 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.

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. When pregnant workers 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 also experience higher rates 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.

The Pregnant Workers Fairness Act is a measured approach to a serious problem. As organizations dedicated to maternal health and closing racial disparities in pregnancy and birth outcomes, 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,

Black Mamas Matter Alliance; March of Dimes; National WIC Association; 1,000 Days; A Better Balance; Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics; American Academy of Pediatrics; American Civil Liberties Union; American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists; Agricultural Justice Project; Ancient Song Doula Services; Association of Maternal & Child Health Programs; Baobab Birth Collective.

Black Women's Health Imperative; Breastfeeding in Combat Boots; California WIC Association; Centering Equity, Race & Cultural Literacy in Family Planning (CERCL-FP); Earth Action, Inc.; Farmworker and Landscaper Advocacy Project; Farmworker Association of Florida; Feminist Women's Health Center; First Focus Campaign for Children; Healthy Mothers, Healthy Babies Coalition of Georgia; Healthy Women; Human Rights Watch; Mom2Mom Global; NARAL Pro-Choice America.

National Association of Nurse Practitioners in Women's Health; National Birth Equity Collaborative; National Partnership for Women & Families; National Women's Health Network; National Women's Law Center; Nebraska WIC Association; Nurse-Family Partnership; Physicians for Reproductive Health; Planned Parenthood Federation of America; Public Citizen; SisterReach; SisterSong National Women of Color Reproductive Justice Collective; U.S. Breastfeeding Committee; Workplace Fairness; Wisconsin WIC Association; ZERO TO THREE.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act can improve some of the most serious health consequences Black pregnant women experience in the workplace.

Federal protections for pregnant workers are stuck in the 1950s. In 2021, it is past time for workplaces to accommodate our families and protect all pregnant workers. It is women and families who keep our economy and communities running.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes.''

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

Mr. Speaker, Democrats claim it is not necessary to incorporate the religious organization protection from the Civil Rights Act in H.R. 1065 because the bill does not repeal that provision and it will still be effective if the bill becomes law. I strongly disagree.

H.R. 1065 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. 1065?

At worst, the provision would be duplicative with the Civil Rights Act, causing no harm to workers or employers.

Let's remember that the Americans with Disabilities 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. 1065 are saying the quiet part out loud in their opposition to the religious organization protection in the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

I have reached this conclusion because Democrats have also claimed that the Civil Rights Act provision is overinclusive, to begin with, and would provide too much protection in this instance.

Are Democrats saying that the existing Civil Rights Act protection for religious organizations should also be repealed?

Again, this is a provision that has been law for 56 years.

As I have stated previously, the long-standing Civil Rights Act religious organization protection should be added to H.R. 1065. At worst, it would do no harm. At best, it will prevent religious organizations from being required to violate their faith.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. KATKO), the lead cosponsor of this legislation.

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Speaker, 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 important bipartisan bill.

This legislation addresses a seemingly simple issue that I have no doubt everyone in this Chamber agrees with. No mother or mother-to-be should have to choose between being a parent and keeping their job.

This commonsense notion is, unfortunately, not the reality in many places in the United States.

Before my home State of New York passed a law prohibiting discrimination against pregnant workers, I heard far too many stories of pregnant women facing discrimination in the workforce and having to choose between a healthy pregnancy and a paycheck.

There was Yvette, a single mother of three, who worked in the same grocery store for 11 years. Having suffered miscarriages in the past, she knew her pregnancy was high risk, and she gave her employer a doctor's note with a lifting restriction.

Instead, she was fired, despite the fact that an employee with a shoulder injury had been accommodated with lighter work.

□ 0945

She lost her health insurance and had to go on Medicaid. She and her family survived on food stamps and savings.

Then there was Hilda, an employee at a Dollar Tree who worked there for 3 years when she became pregnant. As her pregnancy progressed, it became painful to stand at the cash register for 8 hours to 10 hours at a time. Denied her request for a stool, she began to experience severe complications, including bleeding and premature labor pains, and was put on bed rest. With no paid leave, she and her family struggled to make ends meet.

These women and others who have been subject to similar discrimination in the workforce suffered an unthinkable physical and financial toll. The Pregnant Workers Fairness Act ensures that going forward, no woman will face this type of discrimination.

This bipartisan bill provides pregnant workers with an affirmative right to reasonable—and I stress the word ''reasonable''—accommodations in the workplace while creating a clear and navigable standard for employers to follow. These accommodations are minor, as simple as providing an employee with extra restroom breaks or a stool to sit on.

This bill is not a hiring statute and does not amend or eliminate existing religious freedom protections. The arguments against this bill made by

some Members of my own party are based on inaccuracies or wrongfully detract from the importance of this commonsense policy.

This bill is a product of extensive bipartisan negotiation and collaboration with advocates and the business community. Reflecting the widespread support for this legislation, the bill has received numerous endorsements from the business community, including the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, as well as over 180 women's health, labor, and civil rights organizations.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter of support from a coalition of business groups, including the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, SHRM, and the National Retail Federation.

MAY 13, 2021.

TO THE MEMBERS OF THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES: We urge Congress to pass H.R. 1065, the ''Pregnant Workers Fairness Act.'' 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.

The Pregnant Workers Fairness Act, as reported 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. This legislation 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 H.R. 1065 with no changes.

Sincerely,

Associated Builders and Contractors, BASF Corporation, College and University Professional Association for Human Resources, Dow, HR Policy Association, International Franchise Association, National Restaurant Association, National Retail Federation, pH-D Feminine Health, Retail Industry Leaders Association, Society for Human Resource Management, U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. KATKO. Fundamental protections for mothers and soon-to-be mothers in the workplace are long overdue. I strongly urge my colleagues to support this commonsense, critical legislation.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. MILLER).

Mrs. MILLER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1065, the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act.

The policy choices we make here in Congress about labor should be made to support the family and our freedoms. This is because work, family, and freedom support and need each other. If one of these aspects is weakened, the whole chain is weakened as well.

The Federal Government is, once again, overreaching into our freedoms as Americans with this Pregnant Workers Fairness Act. Passing the PWFA means that a small business or religious organization could be forced to provide paid time off for an employee to have an abortion or other concerning procedures.

Instead of working to improve our systems to support families and the workplace, the Democrats are going after our First Amendment freedom of religion. Religious freedom is a bedrock principle of this country, and we must protect the ability of all Americans to act in accordance with their conscience. The Federal Government must never infringe on this sacred right.

Religious organizations should be allowed to make religiously based employment decisions, and States should be the leaders in this, not the Federal Government.

We have laws currently in place to protect discrimination in the workplace. The PWFA does not protect religious employers with the same protections contained in the Civil Rights Act of 1964. For these reasons and more, I oppose the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds to briefly respond to the fact that, first of all, this only applies to those employers with 15 workers or more. Furthermore, the Religious Freedom Restoration Act and First Amendment still apply. It is hard to imagine any religious objection to giving a pregnant worker water or an extra bathroom break, and there haven't been any complaints to the EEOC about the failure to do that.

At this time I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, pregnant women should never have to choose between maintaining a healthy pregnancy and their paycheck.

This critical bill will ensure that pregnant women get accommodations when they need them without facing discrimination and/or retaliation at work. It will especially help low-paid women—largely women of color and immigrants—working in jobs that require prolonged standing, long hours, irregular schedules, and heavy lifting or physical activity.

Many people can work just fine without accommodations through their pregnancy. However, some in physically demanding jobs need a temporary adjustment of their job duties and perhaps some rules during pregnancy so that they can continue to work and support their families.

The Pregnant Workers Fairness Act is long overdue, and we think that it is common sense.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from the Religious Action Center of Reform Judaism.

RELIGIOUS ACTION CENTER
OF REFORM JUDAISM,
*Washington, DC, May 11, 2021.*

DEAR MEMBER OF CONGRESS: I write on behalf of the Union for Reform Judaism, whose 850 congregations across North America encompass approximately 1.8 million Reform Jews, and the Central Conference of American Rabbis, whose membership includes more than 2,000 Reform rabbis, to express our support for the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act (H.R. 1065).

Over 40 years since the passage of the Pregnancy Discrimination Act in 1978, pregnant workers still face unjust barriers in the workplace. No worker should have to choose between their pregnancy and their family's financial security, yet due to the lack of explicit protections for pregnant workers needing onsite accommodations for medical or safety reasons, countless workers confront the agonizing choice between risking their health and facing forced leave, lost benefits, or possible termination.

As the inequitable impact of the pandemic has highlighted, People of Color are more likely to hold demanding, inflexible jobs where they face tradeoffs between their work and their health. Illegal pregnancy discrimination and denial of workplace accommodations, which disproportionately affect pregnant People of Color, contribute to the Black maternal health crisis and other forms of racial inequity.

The Pregnant Workers Fairness Act (PWFA) would mitigate these disparities by requiring employers to provide reasonable, temporary accommodations to pregnant workers so that they can remain in the workforce throughout their pregnancies. By requiring temporary adjustments similar to the accommodations employers already must provide through the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), pregnant workers would no longer be forced to choose between their pregnancies and their paychecks.

According to the ancient rabbis, workers should not be put in the position where they have ''to starve or afflict themselves in order to feed their children'' (Tosefta Bava Metzia 8:2). We are similarly taught that the fair treatment of all workers is a matter of tzedek, or justice. These moral imperatives guide our support for the bipartisan Pregnant Workers Fairness Act, and we strongly urge Congress to pass this bill to ameliorate the impact of discrimination against pregnant people in the workplace.

Sincerely,

BARBARA WEINSTEIN,
*Director of the Commission on Social Action of Reform Judaism.*

Ms. FOXX. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, in their statements supporting H.R. 1065, Democrat Members have encouraged the House to follow the examples of States that have enacted pregnancy accommodation laws. However, the majority of these States have laws that include important protections for religious organizations.

At least 15 States and the District of Columbia have pregnancy discrimination, or pregnancy accommodation 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.

Kentucky's pregnancy accommodation law, which was highlighted by a Democrat-invited witness at a hearing on the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act as a successful workable solution, includes a limited religious organization protection very similar to section 702

of the Civil Rights Act. Unfortunately, the bill before us today omits this needed provision.

If we are to follow the example of these States and recommendations from congressional testimony, then a provision protecting religious organizations should be added to H.R. 1065.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. STEVENS), a member of the Committee on Education and Labor.

Ms. STEVENS. Mr. Speaker, just a few weeks ago, the Census reported that the U.S. population grew at its slowest rate since the Great Depression. Birth rates are falling for the sixth year in a row.

A recent Harvard Business Review study declared that the United States has the most family-hostile policies of any industrialized country in the world. This is a wake-up moment for us, and this is why H.R. 1065, the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act, couldn't be more important, particularly for the unheard, the suffering expectant mother who has to time when she can go to the bathroom.

I hear from teachers all across Michigan who explain this to me: the woman who is bleeding and bloating and wondering when she can check in with her doctor, and then being egregiously pushed out of the workplace.

We are talking about stools, we are talking about a place for a pregnant woman to sit in the workplace. That is why it is so joyous, Mr. Speaker, that this bill today is bipartisan.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter in support of this legislation on behalf of the 1.4 million AFSCME workers.

AFSCME,
*Washington, DC, May 11, 2021.*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
*Washington, DC.*

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the 1.4 million members of the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME), I urge you to support the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act (PWFA) (H.R. 1065). This legislation would ensure that pregnant workers get adequate accommodations when they need them without facing retaliation in the workplace. It also prevents employers from refusing to make reasonable accommodations for pregnant workers unless it poses an undue hardship on an employer.

More than four decades after Congress passed the Pregnancy Discrimination Act (PDA) of 1978, women still face inequality in the workplace when they become pregnant. While the PDA prohibits discrimination against employees based on pregnancy, childbirth or related medical conditions, pregnancy discrimination is still prevalent. In 2015, the Supreme Court ruled in Young v. UPS to allow pregnant workers to bring discrimination claims under the Pregnancy Discrimination Act (PDA) of 1978. The Young decision also set an unreasonably high standard for proving discrimination.

Research shows that 88 percent of first-time mothers worked during their last trimester. Employees who are pregnant are routinely denied water bottles, bathroom breaks, stools to sit on, and larger fitting uniforms to work in. Many of these hardships can lead to an increased risk of preterm delivery and low birth rate. In addition, for far too many working women, being pregnant can still mean losing a job, being denied a promotion, or not being hired in the first place. And, while women are the majority of the U.S. workforce, these realities perpetuate challenges that no employee should have to face.

H.R. 1065 is also important because many pregnant women are front-line workers who hold physically demanding or hazardous jobs. Now more than ever, pregnant women working on the front lines and deemed essential by their employers face the risk of getting sick because of the coronavirus pandemic. Many of them also lack access to paid sick leave forcing them to choose between a paycheck and their health. At no time should anyone ever be forced to choose between financial security and a healthy pregnancy especially during the coronavirus pandemic with countless women working on the front lines. While many states have adopted laws requiring reasonable accommodations, current federal law does not plainly state that workers have a right to ask for them to reduce pregnancy complications without jeopardizing their employment. Pregnant women's lives and livelihood are on the line when they cannot work safely. This bill is essential to promote gender equity, healthy pregnancies, children and family wellness, and the economic security of pregnant and parenting women over the course of their terms.

AFSCME strongly supports H.R. 1065 and urges you to vote for its passage.

Sincerely,

BAILEY K. CHILDERS,
*Director of Federal Government Affairs.*

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

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that the U.S. Chamber of Commerce worked with the Education and Labor Committee to make improvements to the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act. However, the Chamber does have few, if any, religious organizations as members. Therefore, it is understandable they would not take the position on protections for these organizations.

As Members of Congress, we should ensure that the legislation we consider is fair to all and does not infringe on fundamental rights.

The religious organization protection that I am advocating, which comes from the Civil Rights Act, will ensure religious organizations are not compelled to make decisions that violate their faith.

H.R. 1065 should include the religious organization protection from the Civil Rights Act, which would not detract from any of the provisions included in the bill.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), the chair of the House Judiciary Committee and sponsor of the legislation.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. KATKO for cosponsoring this bill.

For as long as women have been in the workforce, they have faced discrimination because of their sex, which is only amplified when a woman is pregnant. Pregnant workers are often passed over for promotions, forced out on leave, whether paid or unpaid, and sometimes even fired. As we have seen time and again, these policies disproportionately impact women of color and low-wage hourly workers.

We all agree that 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.

Given the low cost of these accommodations, we must ask why so many employers are unwilling to provide them and keep their pregnant workers employed. The answer, unfortunately, is that for many employers, a pregnant employee embodies negative gender stereotypes regarding motherhood and pregnancy. Society still expects women to conform to stereotypical notions that to be a good parent, you must choose between pregnancy and work.

This harmful stereotype puts working women in an impossible position of having to choose between their family's health and their financial well-being. While pregnancy may create some known physical limitations, this choice between work and pregnancy is a fallacy and can be remedied with a reasonable accommodation. Despite repeated attempts by Congress over the years to address this persistent gender discrimination, many employers still view pregnancy and work as incompatible.

Current law continues to allow employers to simply force most pregnant workers out on leave rather than even considering providing an accommodation. The Americans with Disabilities Act does require employers to accommodate a pregnant worker if her work limitations rise to the disability impacting one or more major life functions. Women who have limitations that do not rise to this level are not protected under the ADA, which was not designed to address pregnancy-related gender discrimination.

Furthermore, the courts have hamstrung other attempts by Congress to address pregnancy-related gender discrimination. Courts have interpreted the Pregnancy Discrimination Act to only require employers to provide an accommodation if they also accommodate nonpregnant employees similar in their ability or inability to work and employed in similar working conditions.

In order to prove discrimination, pregnant women must have perfect and complete employment and medical histories for every other employee in their workplace. It is obviously nearly impossible for employees to have that information, as evidenced by the fact that in over two-thirds of cases, courts have sided with employers who denied a pregnant worker accommodation.

Current law lets women fall through the cracks in every sector of our economy, including the public sector. Take, for example, the story of Devyn Williams, a correctional officer trainee with the Alabama Department of Corrections. From the moment Ms. Williams told her employer she was pregnant, they started a campaign to fire her.

□ 1000

When she presented a note from her doctor requesting to be excused from a monthly physical training session during her pregnancy, the State fired her. Her employer actually wrote an email stating that her doctor's note gave them grounds to dismiss Ms. Williams.

Even with that email in her possession, Ms. Williams is still litigating her case 5 years later. No one should have to go to Federal court to get a simple accommodation to safely stay on the job while pregnant.

The bipartisan Pregnant Workers Fairness Act before us today will close this gap in the law and create an affirmative right to accommodation for all pregnant workers. Using the familiar language of the ADA as a framework, 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.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. NADLER. 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 30 States have passed pregnancy accommodation laws similar to the PWFA and over 200 business, civil rights, health, and labor organizations support the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD letters of support from two of those organizations, A Better Balance and the National Women's Law Center.

MAY 11, 2021.

Re The Pregnant Workers Fairness Act (H.R. 1065).

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of A Better Balance, I write to express our strong support for the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act (''PWFA''; H.R. 1065). 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.

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 Committee in March 2021 and October 2019, as well as in 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.

A Better Balance is a national non-profit legal organization that advances justice for workers so they can care for themselves and their loved ones without sacrificing their economic 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, ''[Gaps in our civil rights laws leave this enormous class without the right to the modest accommodations that would protect them.'' As a result, ''for many women, a choice between working under unhealthy conditions and not working is no choice at all.''

We founded A Better Balance 15 years ago because we recognized that a lack of fair and supportive work-family laws and policies—the ''care crisis''—was disproportionately harming women, especially Black and Latina mothers, in low-wage jobs. As I recently shared before Congress, ''This bias and inflexibility often kicks in when women become pregnant and then snowballs into lasting economic disadvantage. We call this the 'pregnancy penalty'—and since day one, A Better Balance has recognized it as a key barrier to gender equality in America.''

Through our free, national legal helpline, we have spoken with thousands of pregnant workers, disproportionately women of color, who have been fired or forced on to unpaid leave 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 year alone, we have heard from women across the country who continue to face termination or are forced out for needing pregnancy accommodations, in situations often exacerbated by the pandemic and economic crisis. Tesia, a retail store employee from Missouri called us in 2020 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 at that time, 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.

Although the pandemic has shined a spotlight on these issues, the stories we heard in 2020 are in many ways similar to those we've been hearing for over a decade. ln 2012, Armanda Legros was forced out of her job at an armored truck company because her employer would not accommodate her lifting restriction. Without an income, she struggled to feed her newborn and young child. As she told the Senate Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions committee in a hearing in 2014, ''Once my baby arrived just putting food on the table for him and my four-year-old was a challenge. I was forced to use water in his cereal at times because I could not afford milk.'' The need for the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act preceded our current public health crisis and will remain in place beyond the pandemic, until the law is passed.

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

Gaps in federal law, namely the Pregnancy Discrimination Act (PDA) and Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), mean many pregnant workers in need of accommodation are without legal protection in states that do not have statewide PWFA protections. As we explained in our report Long Overdue, ''[w]hile the PDA 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 two-thirds of cases decided since Young, employers were permitted to deny pregnant workers accommodations under the Pregnancy Discrimination Act. As I shared in my recent testimony, women are continuing to lose their cases because of this uniquely burdensome standard.

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 Americans with Disabilities Act is also inadequate for pregnant workers for two reasons. 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.''

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

Pregnant workers who are fired or forced on to unpaid leave 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, or face staggering health care costs associated with pregnancy and childbirth. Many workers must use up saved paid or unpaid leave they had hoped to reserve to recover from 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, despite the health risks in doing so, 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 not only a loss of pay, but also 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.

To be clear, 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 also a key solution, among many, needed to address the Black maternal and infant 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 Mureil, 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 coworkers, also Black, miscarried after supervisors dismissed their requests for reprieve from heavy lifting. As Cherisse Scott, CEO of Memphis-based SisterReach, 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 [Black 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 a devastating 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 PWFA 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 Act 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 will 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 the two challenges with the ADA outlined above.

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.*

---

MAY 11, 2021.

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. 1065). The National Women's Law Center (''the Center'') has worked for nearly 50 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 nine 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. We are eager to build on the momentum from September 2020, when the bill passed with overwhelming bipartisan support in the House, 329–73.

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. COVID–19 has only increased the need for clarity regarding employers' obligations to provide accommodations for pregnant workers. COVID–19 poses grave risks for pregnant workers, who 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 commonsense 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 benefitted 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.

Sincerely,

EMILY J. MARTIN,
*Vice President for Education & Workplace, Justice National Women's Law Center.*

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, that is why, last Congress, the House passed identical legislation with an overwhelming bipartisan vote. But as the economy reopens, the problem persists. The House must act again to pass this bill, and the Senate must take it up.

Providing reasonable accommodations to pregnant workers helps businesses, workers, and families. Passing this bill is long overdue, and I urge a ''yes'' vote.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from North Carolina has 14 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Virginia has 9¾ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1¼ minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY).

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Virginia for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, you might notice a little smile on my face. Honestly, as I was walking over here to speak on the bill, I was reflecting on my own life as a father.

I have five children. When two of my children were little, my wife was away from the house, and I was to meet her somewhere. One needed their diaper changed, and then I had to feed the other. By the time I did that, the other diaper had to be changed. My wife called me, and she said: ''You can't get out of the house, can you?''

Mr. Speaker, pregnancy and motherhood, of course, bring joy and unique challenges and call from all of us a higher sense of duty.

My wife carried my children in their earliest formation, and I carried that burden and opportunity to give them life in other ways. But if we can see pregnancy as a part of community, a journey of life for our good, the good of all, and the good of our Nation, then we accept that it requires reasonable accommodation at work when someone is pregnant, when they are giving life to their child, or if they have necessarily hard conditions. It is only the right thing to do, especially for those who are suffering.

Now, as I have been listening to this debate, a concern has been raised about civil rights and religious organizations, considerations I am surprised that haven't been worked out before now. But let's keep working on that and pass this important bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, being able to bear children is a great gift, and I am very pleased that God gave me that opportunity.

I would like to address the claim that the Civil Rights Act's protection for religious organizations is not needed in H.R. 1065 because these employers could raise the Religious Freedom Restoration Act, RFRA, as a defense to a lawsuit.

However, RFRA does not provide the same protections for religious organizations as the Civil Rights Act. In fact, RFRA's provisions are much narrower than the protection for religious organizations in the Civil Rights Act.

Moreover, RFRA defenses are difficult to win in court. Indeed, more than 80 percent of the time, courts rule in favor of the government and against the person seeking protection under RFRA.

The claim that the Civil Rights Act's longstanding religious organization protection does not need to be incorporated in H.R. 1065 because of RFRA is not persuasive. Indeed, the protection should be added to the bill to ensure it does not infringe on religious freedoms.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from dozens of religious organizations, including the Catholic Labor Network, Jewish Women International, National Council of Churches, Union for Reform Judaism, and United Church of Christ, Justice and Witness Ministries in support of the legislation as it is.

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. 1065). 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. 1065), 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 pregnant 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, the last year for which data is available, 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. In 2020, 77.5 percent of mothers with children under age 6 worked full time, and that number goes up to 81.2 percent for employed mothers with children ages 6 to 17. Millions of families rely on their earnings. In 2019, the last year for which data is available, 41 percent of mothers were the sole or primary breadwinners in their families, while 24.8 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.

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, Jewish Alliance for Law and Social Action, Jewish Family & Children's Service of Greater Boston, Jewish Women International, Justice Revival, Keshet, Leadership Conference of Women Religious, National Advocacy Center of the Sisters of the Good Shepherd, National Coalition Against Domestic Violence.

National Council of Churches, National Council of Jewish Women, NETWORK Lobby for Catholic Social Justice, Network of Jewish Human Service Agencies, Pax Christi USA, T'ruah: The Rabbinic Call for Human Rights, Union for Reform Judaism, United Church of Christ, Justice and Witness Ministries, Uri L'Tzedek.

---

MAY 11, 2021.

FAITH LEADER STATEMENTS. OF SUPPORT FOR PREGNANT WORKERS FAIRNESS ACT

''The Union for Reform Judaism is proud to support the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act. According to the ancient rabbis, workers should not be put in the position where they have ''to starve or afflict themselves in order to feed their children'' (Tosefta Bava Metzia 8:2). With reasonable workplace accommodations, pregnant workers can keep earning a livelihood while protecting their health, so no worker faces the agonizing choice between a healthy pregnancy and their family's financial security. As the inequitable impact of the pandemic has highlighted, People of Color are more likely to hold demanding, inflexible jobs where they face tradeoffs between their work and their health. Illegal pregnancy discrimination and denial of workplace accommodations, which disproportionately affect pregnant People of Color, contribute to the Black maternal health crisis and other forms of racial inequity. Congress must protect expectant parents and pass the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act, which will help to mitigate the racial and economic injustices that pregnancy discrimination perpetuates.''—Rabbi Jonah Dov Pesner, Director, Religious Action Center of Reform Judaism

NETWORK Lobby for Catholic Social Justice urges all members of the House of Representatives to vote yes on the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act (PWFA). In just the fall of 2020, this critical legislation received more than 300 affirmative votes in the House and now is the time to show the same overwhelming support for pregnant workers. This common sense, bipartisan legislation is faithful to the principles of Catholic Social Teaching—and the dignity of the human person in particular—by caring for the health and economic security of pregnant people and their families. Forcing workers to choose between a healthy pregnancy and a paycheck is immoral and the PWFA ends this injustice. NETWORK Lobby calls on the House of Representatives to quickly send the PWFA to the Senate to support working people in the United States who are bringing new life into the world.''—Mary J. Novak, Executive Director, NETWORK Lobby for Catholic Social Justice

The Catholic Labor Network strongly supports the Pregnant Workers' Fairness Act. Pro-life and proworker, this essential legislation protects worker justice and honors families. No woman should have to choose between her job and her unborn child.''—Clayton Sinyai, Executive Director, Catholic Labor Network

''National Council of Jewish Women knows that pregnancy discrimination is a racial justice issue. Black women, Latinas, and immigrant women are more likely to hold inflexible and physically demanding jobs that present specific challenges for pregnant workers and are less likely to provide reasonable pregnancy accommodation. The Pregnant Workers Fairness Act would ensure that pregnant people do not have to choose between a healthy pregnancy and their economic security.''—Jody Rabhan, Chief Policy Officer, National Council of Jewish Women

''In so many of our homes, children depend upon their mothers for placing food on the table. Moms work; that's been the case for years. Yet our laws and regulations are not keeping up. Too often, working women who are pregnant are not given appropriate accommodations while they are pregnant. Congress must pass the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act that would ensure that pregnant workers are able to continue working safely, in the same way as workers with disabilities are accommodated''—Lawrence E. Couch, Director, National Advocacy Center of the Sisters of the Good Shepherd

''Women of Reform Judaism is proud to support the Pregnant Workers' Fairness Act. The COVID–19 pandemic has heightened the urgent need to establish policies to protect essential workers—overwhelmingly Black women, Latinas, immigrant women, and other Women of Color. Today, far too many of these essential workers are denied temporary job-related accommodations in order to maintain a healthy pregnancy and are forced to make the heartbreaking choice between their family's economic security and their health. No worker should ever be forced to make such a choice. Passing the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act is a moral imperative and we urge members of Congress to support its swift passage.''—Rabbi Marla Feldman, Executive Director, Women of Reform Judaism

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN).

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, much has been said about the Civil Rights Act. Well, what do the organizations that protect and promote the Civil Rights Act actually say?

More than 220 of them, I might add, say that the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act is critical to promoting economic security for pregnant workers and their families.

They say that women of color—more than two-thirds of Black women, 55 percent of Native American women, and 41 percent of Latina women—are the sole primary breadwinners for their families. They say that they support reasonable accommodations.

They say that a woman ought not be fired or be threatened with being fired for simply coming to work bearing a child, having a child.

They say that they support this legislation.

But the question really is, who are they? They are the Human Rights Campaign. They are the Anti-Defamation League. They are the League of Women Voters of the United States. They are the NAACP. They are the American Civil Liberties Union. They are the AFL–CIO. They are Mary Kay Henry. They are the Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law. They are the NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund. They are Rabbi Jonah Pesner. And they are for this legislation.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, could you advise as to how much time is remaining on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia has 7½ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from North Carolina has 12½ minutes remaining.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the majority leader of the United States House of Representatives.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I would say in response to Mr. GREEN's passionate speech: Me too.

I rise in strong support of this bill, and I am proud to bring it to the floor for consideration, Mr. Speaker.

I appreciate Chairman NADLER's leadership in sponsoring and shepherding it through the committee.

I thank Chairman SCOTT, as well, for his efforts on behalf of this very important piece of legislation.

America still has a long way to go when it comes to making our economy work for women and mothers. We have seen that dramatically during COVID–19.

Too often, women are pressured to leave the workforce when they start a family.

Women should not face discrimination or adverse actions as a result of pregnancy. I think everybody would, I hope, agree with that.

This legislation would prevent that from happening by requiring employers, Mr. Speaker, to make reasonable accommodations so that pregnant workers can remain on the job, earning their incomes.

Now, I know a thing or two about reasonable accommodations, frankly, as the principal sponsor of the Americans with Disabilities Act signed by President Bush on July 26, 1990. When I sponsored the bill more than 30 years ago, that legislation incorporated the concept of reasonable workplace accommodations, in that case, for employees with disabilities.

Pregnancy, of course, is not a disability. It is a joy. But there are certainly dangers faced by pregnant workers that could threaten the health of the woman and her unborn child, including heavy lifting and exposure to toxic substances.

That is why it is essential for pregnant workers to receive reasonable accommodations that protect their safety in the workplace without being demoted or losing their jobs and, of course, to protect the rights and safety of their babies.

Protecting the rights and safety of pregnant workers in our economy is something Democrats have championed for a very long time, Mr. Speaker, and we passed this legislation last Congress, as well.

But I hope that this is an issue where Democrats and Republicans—Mr. FORTENBERRY just spoke very well—can come together, in a bipartisan way, to protect mothers-to-be and their children.

I hope that the Senate will join the House in adopting these protections, which are so essential at a time when millions of women are eager to rejoin the workforce and continue pursuing careers that bring them and their families opportunity and economic security.

I thank Chairman NADLER again for his leadership. I thank Mr. SCOTT for his leadership, as well.

I urge a ''yes'' vote on this legislation.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN), the chair of the Subcommittee on the Constitution, Civil Rights, and Civil Liberties of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong 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 in my district in Memphis, Tennessee.

In 2018, I was shocked to read of the disturbing workplace abuses in an XPO Logistics warehouse in Memphis, which was reported in The New York Times. Warehouse workers were denied minor and reasonable accommodations, like less taxing workloads and shortened work shifts. These were pregnant workers.

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 97 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.

I also participated in the Education and Labor Committee's subcommittee hearing on this bill last Congress.

Many pregnant workers are being forced to choose between maintaining a healthy pregnancy and losing their jobs at a time when both their healthcare and their economic security are crucial.

The Pregnant Workers Fairness Act will ensure that pregnant workers get accommodations when they need them without facing discrimination or retaliation in the workplace by putting in place a clear, explicit pregnancy accommodation framework similar to the accommodation standard that has been in place for decades for workers with disabilities.

I urge passage of this bill. I include in the RECORD the Better Balance report on the need for this law in spite of inaction by the State and the need for the 14th Amendment to be invoked. About eight States are included here.

MAY 13, 2021.

A BETTER BALANCE LEGAL ANALYSIS OF STATE ACTOR PREGNANCY-RELATED GENDER DISCRIMINATION

Decades after Congress passed the Pregnancy Discrimination Act (''PDA''), pregnant workers continue to face pernicious and unconstitutional gender discrimination at the hands of their employers, including state actors.

Evidence of persistent discrimination by state actors against pregnant workers in need of accommodation warrants—and indeed demands—Congress's exercise of its Section 5 power under the Fourteenth Amendment to remedy and deter violations of equal protection.

In the 21st century, sex discrimination against pregnant workers often takes the form of reliance on insidious gender role stereotyping concerning women's place in the home and in the workplace. Too often, such stereotypes—such as, that motherhood and employment are irreconcilable—force pregnant women ''to choose between having a child and having a job.'' Stereotyping surrounding pregnancy and motherhood is pervasive, and biases can be intentional, implicit, unconscious, or structural. For instance, a study published in June 2020 surveying pregnant women who work in physically demanding jobs found that 63 percent of women surveyed worried about facing negative stereotypes related to their pregnancy, and many avoided asking for accommodations, sensing instead that they needed to overexert themselves physically in order to avoid stereotyping. As a result, the study's authors recommended ''creat[ing] better social support for utilizing pregnancy accommodation.'' Those pregnant women who are let go or pushed out for needing accommodation face a double burden based on stereotyping: After losing critical income at the very moment their growing family needs it most, they must then fight to re-enter a job market that assumes new mothers are less competent and committed than fathers and their childless peers.

As the Supreme Court has repeatedly reaffirmed, such sex role stereotyping is a problem of constitutional magnitude. Indeed, the constitutional right to be free of invidious sex stereotyping ''at the faultline between work and family'' is now well-established For instance, in Nevada Department of *Human Resources* v. *Hibbs*, the Court rejected the ''sex-role stereotype'' that ''women's family duties trump those of the workplace. *Craig* v. *Boren*, the Court rejected ''outdated misconceptions concerning the role of females in the home rather than in the 'marketplace and world of ideas.'' And, in *Califano* v. *Westcott*, the Court rejected ''the baggage of sexual stereotypes that presumes the father has the primary responsibility to provide a home and its essentials, while the mother is the center of home and family life.''

Yet state employers continue to participate in and foster unconstitutional sex discrimination, including gender-role stereotyping, by failing to provide reasonable accommodations to allow pregnant women to be both mothers and wage earners. The problem is pervasive. To offer just a handful of examples:

In Alabama, Devyn Williams, a correctional officer trainee, informed her employer, the Alabama Department of Corrections, that she was pregnant. Corrections officials immediately began to discuss how to terminate Williams, with one deputy commissioner commenting in an email, ''Let me guess, we have to pay this person [Williams] through the entire pregnancy[?]''. At officials' urging, Williams provided a doctor's note recommending she be excused from the state's monthly physical training session due to her pregnancy. Upon receipt of the note, one corrections official emailed the others, ''[t]his [doctor's note] will give us grounds to separate [Plaintiff] from service.'' The state promptly fired Williams. In one sense, Williams was lucky: Alabama officials had the poor judgment to document their animus. Their emails made explicit the unconstitutional sex stereotypes motivating their refusal to accommodate. Employers do not always put the animus underlying their failures to accommodate in discoverable emails. The PDA has failed to root out such intentional yet ''subtle [forms of] discrimination that [are] difficult to detect on a case-by-case basis,'' thanks in part to a proof structure that demands onerous and lengthy litigation. (Williams was still litigating her case nearly five years after she requested accommodation.)

In Oklahoma, Clarisa Borchert, a childcare attendant, informed her employer, a state university child care center, that she was pregnant. When Borchert's doctor recommended a 20-pound lifting restriction—which Borchert believed would allow her to continue to care for infants—the state told her that she would not be permitted to work ''with restrictions of any kind.'' The gender-based animus underlying the state's blanket refusal to accommodate Borchert's pregnancy was revealed by the ''daily disparaging comments'' made by Borchert's boss and other employees about her pregnancy. For instance, in response to Borchert's ''severe and ongoing nausea and vomiting caused by her pregnancy,'' her boss told her to ''get over it'' and accused her of feigning illness, telling Borchert that she ''wasn't

really sick.'' Soon thereafter, the state issued Borchert a Separation Notice.

In New York, Lakia Jackson, a nurse technician, informed her employer, a state university, that she was pregnant. Jackson repeatedly requested assistance changing patients, which her state employer denied because, in the words of her supervisors, the university ''does not accommodate pregnant women.'' As a result of the strain of changing one patient, Jackson had to be rushed to the emergency room and ''nearly [went] into pre-term labor.'' In defense of its refusal to accommodate Jackson's pregnancy, her state employer invoked a common sex stereotype about pregnant women: that she was simply ''using her pregnancy as an excuse for not doing her work.'' The state terminated her shortly thereafter.

In Tennessee, Amber Burnett, a veterinary assistant, informed her employer, a state university, that she was pregnant. When Burnett alerted her employer that she could still work but that her physician had advised minimal or no contact with diseased animals placed in isolation, her employer told her that ''she should begin looking for another job.'' Shortly thereafter, the state terminated her. In justifying the termination, the state claimed concern for the potential for harm to Burnett's pregnancy—a rationale that the Supreme Court recognized decades ago is rooted in impermissible sex discrimination.

In North Carolina, Lauren Burch, a special agent, informed her employer, the state alcohol enforcement agency, that she was pregnant. On her doctor's advice, Burch requested light duty status to avoid ''situations that would put her at risk for physical altercations.'' Her state employer approved the request but assigned her to a worksite that ''required a daily, six-hour round-trip commute'' (for which she was provided ''no work credit for travel time'' and was forced to use ''her personal vehicle at her own expense''). The state refused to grant her an assignment with a shorter commute—despite Burch's doctor's recommendation that she travel no more than 1.5 hours—and pushed her onto unpaid leave.

In Illinois, Tracy Atteberry, a police officer, informed her employer, the Illinois State Police, that she was pregnant. Upon the advice of her doctor, she requested light duty, which the state denied, despite providing light duty to other non-pregnant employees with medical needs. Instead, the state forced Atteberry to use up her personal time prior to giving birth to her child.

In Oregon, Maricruz Caravantes, a caregiver, informed her employer, a state agency, that she had a high-risk pregnancy. Upon the advice of her doctor, Caravantes requested—and was denied—assistance with lifting patients, causing her to ''seriously injure[]'' her back.

In Kansas, Deanna Porter, a psychiatric aide, informed her employer, a state hospital, that she was pregnant. When Porter's doctor advised that she avoid lifting more than 40 pounds, the state refused to allow Porter to work with the lifting restriction in place and sent her home. Shortly thereafter, she was terminated.

Due to a combination of gaps in the law and narrow judicial interpretations, Congress's efforts through the PDA to eradicate ''the pervasive presumption that women are mothers first, and workers second'' have ''proved ineffective for a number of reasons.'' First, as described in A Better Balance's report, ''Long Overdue,'' two-thirds of women lose their PDA pregnancy accommodation claims in court. A high percentage of these losses can be traced to courts' rejection of pregnant workers' comparators or to workers' inability to find a comparator, under the Supreme Court's *Young* framework. The *Young* standard also has done little to create clarity in the law, sowing confusion among lower courts, juries, and litigants alike. As A Better Balance co-president Dina Bakst testified earlier this year:

[R]ecent decisions further illustrate how steep a barrier Young and its comparator standard have erected to proving pregnancy discrimination in court. Workers, especially low-wage workers—and particularly women of color—typically do not have access to their coworkers' personnel files and do not otherwise know how they are being treated. Often, this information is rightly confidential, which means a pregnant worker would be unable to find the information needed to show they are entitled to an accommodation.

Second, litigating accommodation cases under the PDA has proven so onerous and timeconsuming as to be wholly ineffective in the lives of real women. As noted above, Devyn Williams was still litigating her accommodation case nearly five years after she requested accommodation. Such delay has devastating consequences for pregnant workers who need accommodation promptly, not five years later. As our co-president testified:

Most pregnant workers do not have the resources, time, or desire to engage in timeconsuming and stressful litigation to attempt to obtain such information. They want, and need, to be able to receive an accommodation promptly, so they can continue earning income while maintaining a healthy pregnancy.

Finally, even when pregnant workers win their PDA accommodation cases, it is because they are lucky enough to find the perfect comparator or, like Devyn Williams, to have a state employer foolish enough to document their gender animus in a ''smoking gun'' email—the kinds of evidence courts have deemed necessary to prevail under the PDA. The many pregnant women who lack such evidence—but who nevertheless are denied the accommodations they need due to their state employers' animus and stereotypes—do not bring suit at all, a reality A Better Balance often hears from workers on its legal helpline. If a standard is so onerous as to prevent workers from seeking justice, that means current law offers no adequate remedy for a pernicious, unconstitutional form of discrimination.

The PDA's failure to combat states' record of unconstitutional gender discrimination demands further action by Congress. Where, as here, ''Congress ha[s] already tried unsuccessfully'' to remedy violations of equal protection and such ''previous legislative attempts ha[ve] failed,'' then ''added prophylactic measures'' are justified and, indeed, imperative. The Pregnant Workers Fairness Act (PWFA) is just such a measure.

The PWFA is narrow, tailored, and targeted to combat gender discrimination, including invalid sex role stereotypes about the place of ''mothers or mothers-to-be'' in the work sphere. By requiring reasonable accommodation of pregnant workers only where doing so would not cause employers undue hardship, the PWFA is carefully crafted to deter and quickly remedy unconstitutional sex discrimination in the hiring, retention, and promotion of young (potentially-pregnant) women and soon-to-become mothers. Moreover reasonable accommodations for pregnancy are inherently time-limited, and the vast majority of accommodations pregnant workers need, like the right to carry a water bottle or sit on a stool at a retail counter, are low-cost or no-cost. The minimal (or non-existent) economic cost of a pregnancy accommodation is one reason major industry groups, such as the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, champion the PWFA.

We urge Congress to pass this much-needed legislation:

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia has 5½ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from North Carolina has 12½ minutes remaining.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 4½ minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act is based on the simple idea that no one in this country should have to choose between financial security and a healthy pregnancy.

This concept of fairness for pregnant workers is precisely why both Democrats and Republicans came together to pass the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act in the last Congress.

Let's be clear. Reasonable protections for workers are nothing new in our Nation's workplaces. Employers already have several decades of experience providing reasonable accommodations for workers with disabilities under the Americans with Disabilities Act.

We have heard about the fact that it doesn't include a religious exemption. Well, the Religious Freedom Restoration Act still applies. The First Amendment still applies. But there is no reason to give a wholesale exemption to religious organizations, because what are you exempting them from? Providing water for pregnant workers, giving a bathroom break to a pregnant worker, is that what they need an exemption from?

We need to make sure that those accommodations are available to all pregnant women who are working and that organizations with at least 15 workers are guaranteeing protections for pregnant workers in Federal law.

□ 1015

By doing that, this bill will eliminate the confusing patchwork of State and local workplace standards that workers and employers are currently forced to navigate. This legislation has broad support across the political spectrum and our communities.

In a recent nationwide survey, 89 percent of voters say they support the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act. Labor unions; civil rights groups, as we have heard; and the business community, including the Chamber of Commerce, have all endorsed this proposal as it is. It is imperative that we finally guarantee pregnant workers access to reasonable workplace accommodations.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter signed by over 250 organizations in support of H.R. 1065, the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act.

MAY 11, 2021.

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 workers 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 pregnancies. The simple reality is that some pregnant workers—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 pregnant workers with an accommodation, employers will fire or push them onto unpaid leave, depriving them of a paycheck and health insurance at a time when it may be most needed.

Additionally, discrimination affects pregnant workers 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 workers 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 workers can obtain necessary reasonable accommodations in a timely manner, which keeps pregnant workers healthy and earning an income when they need it most. Workers should not have to choose between providing for their family and maintaining a healthy pregnancy, and the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act would ensure that all those 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 Washington. 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 workers to continue to work, they can maintain income and seniority, while forced leave sets new parents back with lost wages and missed advancement opportunities. When pregnant workers 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 those who are pregnant and unemployed.

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. Pregnant workers 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 pregnant workers 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, if workers are not forced to use their leave during pregnancy, they may have more leave available to take following childbirth, which in turn facilitates lactation, 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, 2020 Mom, 9to5, ACTION OHIO Coalition For Battered Women, Advocates for Youth, AFL-CIO, African American Ministers In Action, Alaska Breastfeeding Coalition, Alianza Nacional de Campesinas, All-Options, Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics, American Academy of Pediatrics, American Association of University, Women (AAUW), American Association of University, Women (AAUW) Indianapolis, American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees.

American Federation of Teachers, American Public Health Association, AnitaB.org, Asian Pacific American Labor Alliance, AFL-CIO, Association of Farmworker Opportunity Programs, Association of Maternal & Child Health Programs, Association of State Public Health Nutritionists, Autistic Self Advocacy Network, Baby Cafe USA, Beaufort-Jasper-Hampton Comprehensive Health Services, Black Mamas Matter Alliance, Black Women's Roundtable, Bazelon Center for Mental Health Law, Bloom, Baby! Birthing Services, Bread For the World.

Breastfeeding Coalition of Delaware, Breastfeeding Family Friendly Communities, Breastfeeding Hawaii, BreastfeedLA, Building Pathways, Inc, California Breastfeeding Coalition, California WIC Association, California Work & Family Coalition, California Women's Law Center, Casa de Esperanza: National Latina@ Network for Healthy Families and Communities, Center for American Progress, Center for Law and Social Policy (CLASP), Center for LGBTQ Economic, Advancement & Research, Center for Parental Leave Leadership, Center for Public Justice, Center for Reproductive Rights, Chosen Vessels Midwifery Services, Church World Service, Clearinghouse on Women's Issues, CLUW.

Coalition for Restaurant Safety & Health, Coalition of Labor Union Women (CLUW), Coalition on Human Needs, Congregation of Our Lady of Charity of the Good Shepherd, U.S. Provinces, Connecticut Women's Education and Legal Fund (CWEALF), DC Dorothy Day Catholic Worker, Disability Rights Education & Defense Fund, Disciples Center for Public Witness, Economic Policy Institute, Equality Ohio, Equal Pay Today, Equal Rights Advocates, Every Texan, Every Mother, Inc., Family Equality, Family Values @ Work, Farmworker Justice, Feminist Majority Foundation, First Focus Campaign for Children.

Futures Without Violence, Gender Equality Law Center, Gender Justice, Grandmothers for Reproductive Rights (GRR!), Hadassah, The Women's Zionist, Organization of America, Inc., Hawai'i Children's Action Network Speaks!, Health Care For America Now, Healthier Moms and Babies, Healthy Children Project, Inc., Healthy and Free Tennessee, Healthy Mothers, Healthy Babies Coalition of Georgia, HealthyWomen, Hispanic Federation, Hoosier Action, Human Rights Watch, ICNA CSJ, In Our Own Voice: National Black Women's Reproductive Justice Agenda, Indiana Chapter of the American Academy of Pediatrics, Indiana Institute for Working Families.

Indianapolis Urban League, Institute for Women's Policy Research, Interfaith Workers Justice, Justice for Migrant Women, Kansas Action for Children, Kansas Breastfeeding Coalition, KWH Law Center for Social Justice and Change, La Leche League Alliance, La Leche League USA, LatinoJustice PRLDEF, LCLAA, Legal Aid at Work, Legal Momentum, The Women's Legal Defense and Education Fund, Legal Voice, Mabel Wadsworth Center, Main Street Alliance, Maine Women's Lobby, Make It Work Nevada, Mana, A National Latina Organization.

March of Dimes, Maternal Mental Health Leadership Alliance, MCCOY (Marion County Commission on Youth), Methodist Federation for Social Action, Michigan Breastfeeding Network, Michigan League for Public Policy, Midwives Alliance of Hawaii, Minus 9 to 5, Mississippi Black Women's Roundtable, Mom Congress, MomsRising, Monroe County NOW, Mother Hubbard's Cupboard, Mothering Justice, Mother's Own Milk Matters, MS Black Women's Roundtable & MS, Women's Economic Security Initiative, NAACP, NARAL Pro-Choice America, National Advocacy Center of the Sisters of the Good Shepherd, National Asian Pacific American Women's Forum (NAPAWF).

National Association of Pediatric Nurse Practitioners, National Association of Social Workers, National Association of Social Workers NH Chapter, National Advocates for Pregnant Women, National Birth Equity Collaborative, National Center for Law and Economic Justice, National Center for Lesbian Rights, National Center for Parent Leadership, Advocacy, and Community Empowerment (National PLACE), National Coalition for the Homeless, National Coalition of 100 Black Women, Inc., Central Ohio Chapter, National Coalition Against Domestic Violence, National Consumers League, National

Council for Occupational Safety and Health (National COSH).

National Council of Jewish Women, National Council of Jewish Women Cleveland, National Council of Jewish Women (NCJW), Atlanta Section, National Domestic Workers Alliance, National Education Association, National Employment Law Project, National Employment Lawyers Association, National Health Law Program, National Hispanic Council on Aging, National Network to End Domestic Violence, National Organization for Women, National Urban League, National WIC Association, National Women's Health Network, NETWORK Lobby for Catholic Social Justice, New Jersey Breastfeeding Coalition, New Jersey Citizen Action, New Jersey Time to Care Coalition.

New Mexico Breastfeeding Task Force, New Working Majority, North Carolina Justice Center, Northwest Arkansas Breastfeeding Coalition, Nurse-Family Partnership, Nutrition First, Ohio Alliance to End Sexual Violence, Ohio Coalition for Labor Union Women, Ohio Domestic Violence Network, Ohio Federation of Teachers, Ohio Religious Coalition for Reproductive Choice, Ohio Women's Alliance, Oxfam America, Paid Leave For All, Partnership for America's Children, Peirce Consulting LLC, Philadelphia Coalition of Labor Union, Women Philly CLUW, Philadelphia NOW Education Fund, Philaposh, Physicians for Reproductive Health, Planned Parenthood Federation of America.

PL+US: Paid Leave for the United States, Poder Latinx, Pontikes Law LLC, PowHer New York, Pray First Mission Ministries, Pretty Mama Breastfeeding, LLC, Prevent Child Abuse NC, Public Advocacy for Kids (PAK), Restaurant Opportunities Center United, RESULTS, RESULTS DC/MD, Shriver Center on Poverty Law, SisterReach, SPAN Parent Advocacy Network (SPAN), Solutions for Breastfeeding, Speaking of Birth, Southwest Women's Law Center, The International Union, United Automobile, Aerospace and Agricultural Implement Workers of America (UAW), The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights,

The Little Timmy Project, The National Domestic Violence Hotline, The Ohio Women's Public Policy Network, The Women and Girls Foundation of Southwest Pennsylvania, The Women's Law Center of Maryland, The Zonta Club of Greater Queens, TIME'S UP Now, U.S. Breastfeeding Committee, Ujima Inc: The National Center on Violence Against Women in the Black Community, UltraViolet, Union for Reform Judaism, United Church of Christ Justice and Witness Ministries, United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America (UE), United Food and Commercial Workers International Union (UFCW), United Spinal Association, United State of Women, United Steelworkers, United Today, Stronger Tomorrow.

Universal Health Care Action Network of Ohio, VA NOW, Inc., Virginia Breastfeeding Advisory Committee, Virginia Breastfeeding Coalition, Voices for Progress, Wabanaki Women's Coalition, We All Rise, West Virginia Breastfeeding Alliance, Western Kansas Birthkeeping, William E. Morris Institute for Justice (Arizona), Women and Girls Foundation of Southwest Pennsylvania, Women Employed, Women of Reform Judaism, Women's Fund of Greater Chattanooga.

Women's Fund of Rhode Island, Women's Law Project, Women's March, Women's Media Center, Women's Rights and Empowerment Network, Women4Change, Workplace Fairness, Workplace Justice Project at Loyola Law Clinic, Worksafe, WV Breastfeeding Alliance, WV Perinatal Partnership, Inc., YWCA Dayton, YWCA Greater Cincinnati, YWCA Mahoning Valley, YWCA McLean County, YWCA Northwestern Illinois, YWCA USA, YWCA of the University of Illinois, ZERO TO THREE.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, lastly, I thank Chairman NADLER and Congressman KATKO for their leadership on this important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a ''yes'' vote, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the committee just said that this is going to stop the patchwork of laws related to this issue.

Au contraire, Mr. Chairman. This is going to add to the confusion, which is the point I have been making over and over and over again. Simple addition of the reference to the Civil Rights Act would keep us from adding to the patchwork of laws and the confusion that this bill is going to create. And I am sorely disappointed that we could not work out this last little accommodation.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I have one last speaker, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, House Republicans will not stand for discrimination of any kind. As a mother, a grandmother, and a very strong pro-life advocate, workplace protections for pregnant women are particularly important to me. My Republican colleagues and I have long been committed to policies and laws that empower all Americans to achieve success, and this includes current protections in Federal law for pregnant workers.

While meaningful and necessary bipartisan improvements were made to H.R. 1065, it falls short in protecting one of the Nation's most treasured rights: Freedom of religion.

Democrats' refusal to include a commonsense, current-law provision that protects religious organizations from being forced to make employment decisions that conflict with their faith is shortsighted and disappointing. Congress should not be in the business of taking away rights from the American people.

In fact, as we all know, the Constitution starts with the three most important words outside the Bible: We the People.

And then in the First Amendment to the Constitution—and I want to jog the memories of my colleagues—the Constitution enshrines the right of religious freedom by saying: ''Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion''—and this is very important, the next part—''or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.''

That is what we are talking about here today. We are talking about the free exercise of religion. I will say again: Congress should not be in the business of attempting to take away rights from the American people. The Constitution does not give us that right.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a ''no'' vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for the recognition and for his leadership, and that of the committee in bringing this important bipartisan legislation to the floor.

I salute the gentleman; I salute JERRY NADLER, an author of this legislation, the chair of the Committee on the Judiciary; Mr. KATKO for his lead cosponsorship; among other Republican members, to make this strongly bipartisan.

Mr. Speaker, I am excited about this legislation as a mother of five children—four daughters, one son—nine grandchildren. This is about a recognition of being family-friendly in our legislation, as more women are a part of the economic success of our country.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act, a strong bipartisan step to ensure that women are no longer forced to choose between maintaining a healthy pregnancy and paycheck—a choice that, for many, has serious health consequences.

This landmark legislation advances the health of women and children, the financial security of families, and, really, the dynamism of our American economy. And its passage—while long overdue—is particularly urgent, as the lives and livelihood of so many are under threat from the coronavirus.

Again, I thank the chairman and Mr. KATKO, Mr. NADLER, and so many others for their leadership in passing this bill. And I thank all the cosponsors.

Again, as a mother of five, I am especially proud to support the bill. And I want to salute all the mothers and women who have spoken out, often risking professional retaliation, to end pregnancy discrimination in the workplace.

This is what this means: It means that too often when a pregnant worker asks for a temporary job-related accomodation, she will be fired or pushed onto unpaid leave, deprived of her paycheck and health insurance when she needs them most.

This is particularly true in many physically taxing jobs, which tend to be low wage and traditionally dominated by women. And that is why we must pass the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act, putting in place a clear, explicit pregnancy accommodation framework, similar to the standard that has been in place for decades for workers with disabilities, which I was proud to be part of. Our distinguished leader, Mr. HOYER, has been a major leader in that regard.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is also a matter of justice. As nearly 300 groups from the ACLU to Zero To Three recently wrote to Congress—from A to

Z—''Discrimination affects pregnant workers 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. . . . This can make reasonable accommodations on the job even more important, and loss of wages and health insurance due to pregnancy discrimination especially challenging.''

I think it is important to note that this legislation is important also from the standpoint of hiring. We want to make sure that employers who are hiring someone know there is a level playing field should the woman of childbearing age—or even already blessed with a pregnancy—that this is a positive initiative for their workplace and their treating that person with respect is not placing them at any disadvantage if the playing field is level.

This comes at a time when—I mentioned about the pandemic—around 2 million women were pushed out of the labor force. One out of four women report they are still worse off financially than a year ago. Studies show it will take 18 months longer for the women's employment to rebound from the pandemic than for men's. And the reduction of women's work hours and labor force participation is said to erase tens of billions of dollars from our economy.

American women are part of the engine of America's economy and the key to building back better after this crisis. And again, as we all say: When women succeed, America succeeds.

And we can apply that to say: When women of childbearing age succeed, America certainly succeeds.

And for mothers and women who are pregnant, the challenges are even graver because our Nation still lacks sufficient workplace protections against pregnancy discrimination.

Mr. Speaker, that is why this legislation is so very important and is consistent with what we pledge—liberty and justice for all women.

I am very excited about this because, as we all know, pregnancy is a blessing to any family, and we do not want any intervention that can be avoided in terms of accommodating the needs of women who are pregnant.

Mr. Speaker, I salute all of you. I am very excited about this legislation and I am so glad it will have strong bipartisan support.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 380, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on passage of the bill.

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

Ms. FOXX. 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 315, nays 101, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 143]

YEAS—315

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Amodei
Auchincloss
Axne
Bacon
Balderson
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bentz
Bera
Beyer
Bice (OK)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bost
Bourdeaux
Bowman
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brown
Brownley
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bush
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson
Carter (LA)
Cartwright
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Comer
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crenshaw
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Curtis
Davids (KS)
Davis, Danny K.
Davis, Rodney
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Emmer
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Evans
Feenstra
Ferguson
Fischbach
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fletcher
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel, Lois
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gallego
Garamendi
Garbarino
Garcia (CA)
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Gimenez
Gomez
Gonzales, Tony
Gonzalez (OH)
Gonzalez, Vicente
Gottheimer
Granger
Graves (LA)
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harder (CA)
Hayes
Herrera Beutler
Higgins (NY)
Hill
Himes
Hinson
Hollingsworth
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Hudson
Huffman
Huizenga
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jacobs (CA)
Jacobs (NY)
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson (TX)
Jones
Joyce (OH)
Kahele
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim (CA)
Kim (NJ)
Kind
Kinzinger
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster
Kustoff
LaMalfa
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Leger Fernandez
Lesko
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lieu
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lucas
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Malliotakis
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Manning
Matsui
McBath
McCarthy
McCaul
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McKinley
McNerney
Meeks
Meijer
Meng
Mfume
Miller-Meeks
Moolenaar
Mooney
Moore (UT)
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Moulton
Mrvan
Mullin
Murphy (NC)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Newhouse
Newman
Norcross
Nunes
O'Halleran
Obernolte
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Owens
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Reed
Rice (NY)
Rogers (KY)
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Rutherford
Ryan
Salazar
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scalise
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (MO)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Spartz
Speier
Stanton
Stauber
Steel
Stefanik
Steil
Stevens
Stewart
Strickland
Suozzi
Swalwell
Takano
Tenney
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiffany
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Trone
Turner
Underwood
Upton
Valadao
Van Drew
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Wagner
Walorski
Waltz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wenstrup
Wexton
Wild
Williams (GA)
Williams (TX)
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yarmuth
Zeldin

NAYS—101

Aderholt
Allen
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Baird
Banks
Barr
Bishop (NC)
Boebert
Brady
Brooks
Buck
Budd
Burchett
Cammack
Carl
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cawthorn
Cheney
Cline
Cloud
Clyde
Crawford
Davidson
DesJarlais
Donalds
Duncan
Dunn
Fallon
Fitzgerald
Foxx
Franklin, C. Scott
Fulcher
Gibbs
Gohmert
Good (VA)
Gooden (TX)
Gosar
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Greene (GA)
Grothman
Guest
Harris
Harshbarger
Hern
Herrell
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Jackson
Johnson (LA)
Jordan
Joyce (PA)
Keller
Kelly (PA)
LaHood
Lamborn
LaTurner
Letlow
Long
Loudermilk
Luetkemeyer
Mace
Mann
Massie
Mast
McClain
McClintock
McHenry
Miller (IL)
Miller (WV)
Moore (AL)
Nehls
Norman
Palazzo
Palmer
Pence
Perry
Pfluger
Posey
Reschenthaler
Rice (SC)
Rodgers (WA)
Rogers (AL)
Rose
Rosendale
Rouzer
Roy
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Smith (NE)
Smucker
Steube
Taylor
Timmons
Van Duyne
Walberg
Weber (TX)
Westerman

NOT VOTING—14

Bergman
Biggs
Estes
Golden
Griffith
Hartzler
Kelly (MS)
Meuser
Murphy (FL)
Simpson
Stivers
Thompson (PA)
Webster (FL)
Young

□ 1103

Messrs. RICE of South Carolina, MAST, and Mrs. RODGERS of Washington changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. WITTMAN and Mrs. FISCHBACH 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.

Stated for:

Mr. CARTER of Texas. Madam Speaker, I voted in error on rollcall 143. I mistakenly voted no when I intended to vote yes.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, today I am absent due to a family matter. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 143 (H.R. 1065).

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I voted no on H.R. 1065, however, this

vote was a mistake. I support H.R. 1065, the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act.

Stated against:

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 143 on H.R. 1065, I am not recorded because I had to return home to my district to attend the funeral of a close family friend. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 143.

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I was absent from votes today due to Mississippi National Guard obligations. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 143.

Mr. BERGMAN. Mr. Speaker, please accept this personal explanation as I was unexpectedly detained during vote proceedings. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 143.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Allred (Stevens) | Jones (Jacobs (CA)) | Rush (Underwood) |
| Beatty (Lawrence) | Kirkpatrick (Stanton) | Sewell (DelBene) |
| Bilirakis (Fleischmann) | Lawson (FL) (Evans) | Sires (Pallone) |
| Cárdenas (Gallego) | Lieu (Beyer) | Slotkin (Stevens) |
| Comer (Cammack) | Lofgren (Jeffries) | Smith (WA) (Kilmer) |
| Correa (Vargas) | Lowenthal (Beyer) | Speier (Scanlon) |
| Crenshaw (Pfluger) | McEachin (Wexton) | Strickland (Del Bene) |
| Doyle, Michael F. (Cartwright) | McHenry (Banks) | Timmons (Gonzalez (OH)) |
| Grijalva (Garcia (IL)) | Meng (Clark (MA)) | Torres (CA) (Barragán) |
| Huffman (Thompson (CA)) | Moore (WI) (Beyer) | Wagner (Walorski) |
| Johnson (GA) (Cohen) | Napolitano (Chu) | Welch (McGovern) |
| Johnson (TX) (Jeffries) | Payne (Pallone) | Wilson (FL) (Hayes) |
| | Porter (Wexton) | |
| | Ruiz (Aguilar) | |
| | Ruppersberger (Raskin) | |

## HONORING THE SERVICE OF MICHAEL LONG

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

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride and some emotion that I rise to honor an outstanding and longstanding member of my staff who has been a pillar of my office for nearly 15 years, my Senior Advisor and Director of Member Services, Michael Long.

To Members of Congress and all who work and serve in this Chamber, the name Michael Long is synonymous with excellence.

Michael is a coalition-builder and a communicator, a liaison and a leader with an extraordinary talent for forging enduring, effective connections, both within and outside the Capitol. I have watched him with great pride over the years as he welcomed young people to the Capitol, including the Boy Scouts, as an Eagle Scout himself, showing his leadership from early on, whether it is his communication with his many friends and admirers in the Congressional Black Caucus or with the Members across the Congress on both sides of the aisle.

We all know and are grateful for his unwavering patience and perseverance and his remarkable ability to anticipate and meet the needs of Members.

Michael comes from a family that is committed to the civil rights movement. He has it in his DNA, although he is younger than the movement.

For this and other reasons, many of us were privileged that Michael came with us, under the leadership of KAREN BASS and the Congressional Black Caucus, to Ghana.

Mr. Whip, you were a leader in that delegation, and you know how moving it was.

But Michael brought, in his DNA, the spirit of his father, Isaac, who was watching down from Heaven and saw Michael be part of that historic trip. The whole time, he wore Isaac's cufflinks as Isaac looked down with pride, and his mother, Naomi, and sister, Veronica, looked on with love from here, taking great pride in Michael.

Mr. Whip, it is such an honor that you are in the Chair as I pay tribute to Michael, a real tribute to him and his work.

Michael has been a tremendous asset to the Speaker's Office and my leadership team over the years, and to the entire Democratic Caucus and the entire Congress, ensuring that we can deliver progress For the People.

He can take pride, as I do, in knowing the key role that he has played in our passing legislation to lift up working families across America. That happened because of his leadership.

While Michael's trusted presence on this floor and on Capitol Hill will be missed, we are grateful for his service, as well as for his work as a mentor and leader to forge a path for others to follow. Indeed, his tenure has been both historic and impactful.

On behalf of the House of Representatives, I thank Michael Long and wish him the best in the next stages of his journey.

With great admiration and appreciation, thank you, Michael Long.

## LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. FERGUSON. Madam Speaker, I rise for the purpose of inquiring to the majority the schedule for the week to come.

I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. AGUILAR), my friend and colleague, the vice chair of the Democratic Caucus.

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

On Monday, the House will meet at 12 p.m. for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business, with votes expected no earlier than 6:30 p.m.

On Tuesday and Wednesday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate and 12 p.m. for legislative business.

On Thursday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business, with last votes no later than 3 p.m.

We will consider several bills under suspension of the rules. A complete list of the suspension bills will be announced by the close of business today.

In addition, we will consider bills rejecting hate toward the Asian-American and Pacific Islander community, including S. 937, the Senate-passed COVID–19 Hate Crimes Act, which addresses the dramatic increase in hate crimes targeting the AAPI community since the start of the pandemic.

H. Res. 275, a resolution condemning the horrific shootings in Atlanta, Georgia, on March 16, 2021, and reaffirming the House of Representatives' commitment to combatting hate, bigotry, and violence against the AAPI community.

□ 1115

We will also consider H.R. 1629, the Fairness in Orphan Drug Exclusivity Act, which closes the loophole that blocks pharmaceutical competition and prevents innovative treatments for opioid use disorder from coming to market, and would help millions of Americans suffering from opioid addiction.

Next week, the House will also consider the Emergency Security Supplemental to Respond to January 6th Appropriations Act, 2021, which addresses enhanced security needs for the Capitol complex; and House Resolution 3233, the National Commission to Investigate the January 6 Attack on the United States Capitol Complex Act, which establishes a commission to investigate the insurrection at the Capitol on January 6.

This is bipartisan legislation. I want to thank Chairman THOMPSON and Ranking Member KATKO for their leadership in announcing this bill, and I hope that it will have broad bipartisan support next week.

Mr. FERGUSON. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the majority for those remarks on the schedule.

I also want to take a minute to thank the leader, and others over there, for helping pass H.R. 2877, the Behavioral Intervention Guidelines Act. It is a really good bill that will go a long way in supporting school safety. I know there were many questions about it, and everybody worked to get it to a good spot. I would like to, again, extend my appreciation for all of the help from my Democratic colleagues.

Turning to the operations of the House, as the gentleman knows, the CDC has now lifted all mask and social distancing requirements. President Biden has lifted the mask requirements for the White House staff. But, amazingly, here in the House of Representatives, we still must wear the mask, stagger the vote times, have these long vote times. We should be going back to a 5-minute and a 2-minute schedule so we can do the work of the House.

When can we expect these restrictions to be lifted?

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. AGUILAR. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for the question and for acknowledging the extraordinary success of the Biden-Harris administration in putting millions of shots in arms at a historic pace.

Mr. FERGUSON. Madam Speaker, reclaiming my time.

We, as Americans, should all celebrate Operation Warp Speed and the work done by the administration to be able to do that and to follow through. We greatly appreciate the Biden administration's following up on the really great work of Operation Warp Speed and the Trump administration.

Mr. AGUILAR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. AGUILAR. Madam Speaker, that success that the gentleman talked about was fueled by this Congress last year and this year and by a science-based investment approach that the American Rescue Plan offered. As evidenced by this guidance, we are building back.

But I want to call particular attention to the ''Dear Colleague'' letter that Dr. Monahan sent out to everyone on the Capitol complex campus. It says: ''The present mask requirement and other guidelines remain unchanged until all Members and floor staff are fully vaccinated.''

Mr. FERGUSON. Madam Speaker, reclaiming my time.

That is in direct contradiction to CDC guidelines.

And on top of that, will the gentleman explain how in the world you are going to get that information that every member of this body has been vaccinated without violating HIPAA laws?

Mr. AGUILAR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. Please. I would love an answer.

Mr. AGUILAR. The centerpiece of this strategy that the gentleman just acknowledged is vaccinations.

It is important that we continue to get as many Members as we can vaccinated. That is the strategy that Dr. Monahan, Rear Admiral Monahan, a distinguished physician, the strategy that he has laid out.

Mr. FERGUSON. Reclaiming my time.

Of course, we would like all Americans to be vaccinated. But, again, you will never be able to understand or know how many Members are actually vaccinated unless you require them to give you that information. If you require them to give you that information, then the majority will be in violation of the HIPAA privacy laws.

How in the world can you violate the HIPAA privacy laws on this? What does that mean for future pandemics and future diseases?

There are laws in place that say that Members do not have to disclose their health information. And if the gentleman could please explain how you force a Member of this body to disclose their personal health information without violating HIPAA laws, I would love to hear that answer.

Mr. AGUILAR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. AGUILAR. Madam Speaker, the cornerstone of the strategy is vaccinations. What the gentleman is asking is an important question. What the majority is saying is, let's follow the guidance of the Office of the Attending Physician.

We have no interest in knowing individually what Members and what staff members are vaccinated. Our interest is in governing this House and the operations of this body, and we trust that Dr. Monahan will work with both parties and both sides of the aisle and will give us a report when this House is fully vaccinated. That becomes our guidance.

Mr. FERGUSON. Reclaiming my time.

So the President, the leader of the Democratic socialist movement right now here in America, has said that it is good enough for the White House, yet you are going to defer to the House physician over the President of the United States.

Mr. AGUILAR. Will the gentleman yield? We will talk about the Constitution.

Mr. FERGUSON. No.

My point is that there is so much inconsistency here. You will never, ever get to the point, Madam Speaker, that you will ever be able to get every Member to show some sort of vaccination card without violating the HIPAA privacy protections.

Again, I am listening to the rhetoric. It is a simple question: How do you compel Members of this body to disclose their private health information without violating HIPAA laws?

Not strategy. Not theoretical. How are you going to do that?

What provision in the law, in the HIPAA protections of an American's private information regarding their healthcare record, are you going to waive to compel Members of the House to show that they have been vaccinated?

I yield to my colleague from California.

Mr. AGUILAR. I appreciate the gentleman from Georgia yielding once again. I will try to be as clear as I possibly can.

We will follow the guidance of the Office of the Attending Physician, a decorated rear admiral, who is hoping, with the Sergeant at Arms, to govern the Capitol complex.

As the CDC guidelines mention—and I am sure my colleague has read the full CDC guidance, which specifically says government buildings and local governments and State governments may make separate——

Mr. FERGUSON. Reclaiming my time.

I will wrap this topic up with a couple of observations.

Our colleagues across on the other side of the building are certainly following different guidelines than we are here. I think it is important to note that what the majority is doing here is that they are undermining the vaccination program. They are committing public health malpractice by saying, if you get the vaccine, it doesn't work.

What is the incentive to do this?

I am going to move on to the next topic. I believe we have beat this dead horse enough and there is no answer.

Mr. AGUILAR. The gentleman knows I am happy to talk about HIPAA and your role with it.

Mr. FERGUSON. Please.

Mr. AGUILAR. What I would say is, the CDC guidelines, as my colleague from Georgia understands, specifically mentions workplaces can set their own guidelines. We are following workplace guidance given by the Office of the Attending Physician and the Sergeant at Arms. Those are the processes that govern this body, whether Democrats are in control or Republicans are in control. We should be guided by public health guidance. That is exactly what we are doing here.

Mr. FERGUSON. Could the gentleman answer one question: Is President Biden wrong? Or is Dr. Monahan wrong?

I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. AGUILAR. And I appreciate the question. Because as the gentleman knows, we are a co-equal branch of government here in the Capitol. So I appreciate his love of the executive branch of government; I really do. However, we are governed by different rules. As a co-equal branch of government, we should be.

Mr. FERGUSON. I will say this before we move on to the next topic. It does appear that many of us are governed by different rules along the way.

So let's move on to one final thing.

As you know, this has been police reform week. I was happy to see that President Biden set the deadline for May 25 to sign a police reform bill. I was also extremely happy to see that Democrat leadership has dropped its request to eliminate qualified immunity. I thought that was a very strong statement and very positive.

As the majority whip said on May 9: I know what the perfect bill will be. We have proposed that. And I want to see good legislation. I know that sometimes you have to compromise. And if we don't get qualified immunity now, we can come back and try to get it later. But I don't want to see us throw out a good bill because we can't get a perfect bill, good legislative action.

Now, in order to get this bill done by the May 25—that is a fairly short timeline. I know that Representative PETE STAUBER has a bill ready to go—a really good bill—that addresses the things in a very bipartisan way that I think we would like to see.

Based on the schedule that you laid out, do you anticipate that the majority would take up Mr. STAUBER's bill so that we can meet President Biden's deadline of May 25?

Mr. AGUILAR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. AGUILAR. I appreciate the question, and this is such a timely and important topic that the country needs to address. I am incredibly pleased with the bipartisan success that the negotiations have led to, to date.

As the gentleman knows, those conversations continue to be ongoing, but the majority believes that those conversations are progressing in a way that is hopeful toward addressing this issue.

I think both sides realize, and I hope the minority realizes, the importance of making changes to protect our communities. I know the gentleman is a former mayor, as I am as well. So we have dealt with a lot of these issues at the local level.

So what I would say is, Senator SCOTT, Congressman STAUBER, and Congresswoman KAREN BASS have been engaged in this discussion. We want to give them the latitude and the flexibility to continue those discussions. I wouldn't agree with the characterization that the gentleman from Georgia made about where the negotiations are, but I can tell you that we are committed to seeing this done. We are committing to getting this done and putting a bill on the floor that will have strong bipartisan support.

Mr. FERGUSON. Reclaiming my time.

I implore the majority to put Mr. STAUBER and Mr. SCOTT's bill onto the floor as soon as possible so that we can reach a bipartisan vote and consensus on this.

I just want to make one other observation here, knowing that it is police week. We have got men and women around this country—you and I, again, both as mayors, had the honor of being involved in that, seeing the sacrifice that they make, whether it is local police officers or deputies out patrolling our country roads in many parts of my district; the men and women of the Customs and Border Patrol Agency who are down there putting their lives on the line every single day to stop the grossness of human trafficking and the horrors of narcotic trafficking; or looking around this very building that we are in right now, looking at the men and women who have been here, that will continue to be here to serve us and protect us.

What I found very interesting about this week is that the silence from the majority is deafening. Not bringing a resolution to honor our men and women in law enforcement says an awful lot about how you feel.

And I will say this: I think the majority should come back in—and I think we would all agree to do this next week—to put a resolution on the floor to honor the men and women of law enforcement, because I can't imagine which group is not worthy of that.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. AGUILAR. As the gentleman knows, there was a lengthy Special Order hour led by our colleague from Florida, former police chief herself, talking about the importance of these issues, the importance of honoring heroes, the importance of honoring people who put themselves in harm's way each and every day and are behaving well.

What I would ask the gentleman from Georgia is, in that similar vein, honoring police week, honoring those folks who helped us, who looked out for us January 6, I hope the gentleman will encourage the minority leader to meet with Officer Fanone from the Metropolitan Police Department, who has requested a meeting with the minority leader to talk about the events of January 6 and to talk about his experiences, which were so impactful as he shared them on national television and as he talked about the role that he played and the role that his colleagues played in protecting this temple of democracy.

I hope that the minority leader has the time to meet with Officer Fanone. I signed a letter to the minority leader from my colleagues encouraging him to do so, and I hope that the gentleman from Georgia reiterates the importance to meet with law enforcement heroes.

□ 1130

Mr. FERGUSON. But, again, I want to go back to it, with the morale of the officers here in the Capitol as low as it is right now, the tremendous stresses that they are under, the staffing problems that they have, wondering whether or not this entire body at times has their back.

Mr. AGUILAR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. No, not yet. I think it is important that this body bring a resolution to the floor supporting the men and women in law enforcement around the Nation, but particularly right here in this Capitol. I will be the first one, along with the rest of my colleagues, to support that resolution.

And, so again, it is very simple. A lot of words. And I do appreciate the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. DEMINGS), for leading the Special Order. She certainly knows, as a former law enforcement officer and leader of a department, how tough that is. But, again, the silence here is deafening.

With that, Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

## DEVASTATING IMPACTS OF CLIMATE CHANGE

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

Mr. COSTA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to talk about the devastating effects of climate change in California, and obviously throughout the country.

Following one of the driest years on record, the State is facing yet another water crisis. This week, Governor Newsom declared a drought state of emergency for the majority of California, a declaration which has become, sadly, all too common in the last decade.

The availability of a clean, reliable water supply forms the foundation of the economy of not only all of California, but home to the San Joaquin Valley that I proudly represent. Our farmers feed the world, and they can't do it without a reliable water supply. We like to say, ''Where water flows, food grows.''

We must use every tool in the water toolbox to find new ways to store water for agriculture and deliver water, clean drinking water for our communities.

I have introduced legislation to help build on my previous efforts to build additional water resiliency by providing funding needed to repair our aging water infrastructure, and now this is the year.

I will continue to push for water resources necessary to help California weather the severe impacts of this repeated drought. Climate change is real, it is happening now. It is time to act. Our future depends on it.

## BACK THE BLUE

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

Mr. GOSAR. Madam Speaker, this week is National Police Week. I rise today to honor the courageous men and women in blue.

We know that a single week is simply not enough to recognize the service and sacrifice that police officers and their families make. Thank you for your dedication and thank you for putting your lives on the line in order to make our communities safer each and every day.

Unfortunately, our brave law enforcement officers have come under attack by the liberal media and leftists who dangerously and wrongfully suggest that the answer to all problems is to defund the police. This growing antipolice rhetoric is disgusting, and it threatens the safety and security of communities across America.

Members of our law enforcement community regularly face dangerous and demanding circumstances, yet they possess a willingness to set aside their own safety for the sake of others.

Let me be perfectly clear, I back the blue 100 percent. You have our unwavering support and gratitude. Once again, during National Police Week, thank you for your sacrifices and leadership you provide our communities. May we never forget how appreciated you are every single day.

## REASONABLE ACCOMMODATIONS DURING PREGNANCY

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

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong

support of H.R. 1065, the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act that just passed this House of Representatives.

Pregnancy discrimination holds working parents back and threatens financial stability, with women of color being disproportionately harmed by the lack of workplace protections.

It is long past time we ensure that every worker is entitled to reasonable accommodations to support a healthy pregnancy.

We just celebrated Mother's Day. What if, in addition to flowers one day a year, we make sure that during pregnancy, workers have fair working conditions and are never in the position of risking their safety to continue providing for themselves and their families?

This bipartisan bill simply requires reasonable accommodations for pregnant workers, like adequate breaks, and protects them from discrimination that can drive them from the workplace. No pregnant worker should have to choose between their and their baby's health or their job.

## FOLLOW THE SCIENCE

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

Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, as we all know, the CDC finally altered the mask mandates to reflect the science that we have known for months. People who are vaccinated do not need to wear masks indoors, outdoors in most settings. Follow the science.

As a physician of 30 years, I believe that people should get vaccinated, but at the end of the day it is a personal choice and a decision that should be made between patient and doctor, not person and Speaker.

At this point practically everyone has had the opportunity to get vaccinated if they want it. The infinite majority of the at-risk population in the United States has been vaccinated. I have been vaccinated for months now, but when I get done with this speech, I have to put my mask back on despite what the science says because the Speaker mandates it. That is not the doctor-patient relationship.

Back in North Carolina, my constituents will still be required to wear a mask in grocery stores because Governor Cooper mandates it. Again, not the doctor-patient relationship.

So much for following the science.

## THE CLIMATE CRISIS ISN'T JUST ABOUT WEATHER

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

Mr. CASTEN. Madam Speaker, wildfires, flooding, and superstorms are the most tangible signs of a warming planet, but the climate crisis is not just about weather. It is about wealth.

A recent study by Swiss Re found that if we remain on our current trajectory, global GDP will fall by 18 percent by 2050. Investors understand this. They care about climate change because it is in their economic self-interest.

As BlackRock CEO Larry Fink said, ''Climate risk is investment risk.'' Main Street investors have put $37 trillion, roughly one-third of all assets under management, into climate-focused ESG investments.

Unfortunately, our regulation has not kept up with that demand. There is no consistent definition of how to quantify a firm's contribution to, or protection from, a warming globe. Left to choose from a menu of methodologies, companies often just pick what is most favorable to them.

We don't allow companies to pick their own financial accounting standards. Investors are asking us to provide the same consistency for their climate accounting. That is why I introduced the Climate Risk Disclosure Act, which directs the SEC to create consistent mandatory climate reporting standards for all public companies.

This will allow companies to compete for capital on a level playing field, providing investors with the certainty they need to hedge their financial risk. Yesterday my bill passed committee and will now come to the floor.

The right time to safeguard our financial system against climate change was decades ago, but our last chance is now.

## CHRIST LUTHERAN CHURCH CELEBRATES 150 YEARS

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

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Madam Speaker, I wish to congratulate Pastor Mike Moreno and the entire congregation of Christ Lutheran Church in Norfolk, Nebraska, on their 150th anniversary.

With a shared mission to share God's word, share God's love, and as they say, ''Do it now,'' the community of Christ Lutheran Church is a family. As one member of the congregation said, ''When one is hurting, all are hurting. When one is joyful, we celebrate together.'' How beautiful.

The church also oversees Christ Lutheran School, educating 225 students in grades K–8, in an environment that develops a child spiritually, emotionally, physically, socially to know the personal story and potentiality of each student.

Though we have many hardships and challenges in the world today, Madam Speaker, I am quite certain that Christ Lutheran Church and their community will remain a place of solace and hope for those seeking to hear good news.

## MOURNING THE LOSS OF MARY BISHOP

(Ms. CLARKE of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Madam Speaker, I rise today with profound sadness to mourn the loss and celebrate the life of Ms. Mary Bishop, director of constituent services for the Ninth District of New York and my dear friend.

Mary has been with our office and me for more than 15 years. She was extraordinary and compassionate, with a heart of gold. She embodied what it meant to be an advocate for the people, and her passing has been felt across our district.

On a personal note, I will dearly miss Mary. We celebrated together, laughed together, and shared a passion for the people of the Ninth District together. Mary Bishop worked hard, played hard, and was a God-fearing Caribbean American woman who loved her family immensely.

On behalf of the people of the Ninth District and the Clarke family, I want to extend my thoughts and prayers to the family, loved ones, friends who were touched by the life and legacy of the incomparable Mary Bishop.

In closing, when I think of Mary, I am reminded of Mahalia Jackson's ''If I Can Help Somebody.''

If I can help somebody as I travel along,
If I can help someone with a word or a song,
If I can help somebody from doing wrong,
Then my living shall not be in vain.

My dear friend Mary, your living was not in vain. You will be dearly missed.

## WE MUST STAND WITH ISRAEL

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

Mr. ALLEN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to express my strong support for our vital ally, Israel. The recent rocket attacks launched by Hamas terrorists against innocent Israelis must be unequivocally condemned, and our support for Israel's right to defend herself must be crystal clear.

Between President Biden's weak leadership and anti-Semitic comments made by Members of this very body, terrorist organizations like Hamas feel that they can get away with attacking our ally. They have emboldened them.

The world is watching, and there is no room for silence or appeasement of terrorists. Congress and the Biden administration must immediately reaffirm America's longstanding commitment to Israel and offer any and all support.

Mr. President, wake up. There is only one democracy in the Middle East, and we must stand with Israel.

## NOT A TYPICAL TOURIST DAY

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

Mr. COHEN. I remind the House that we were under attack on January 6.

Earlier this week a freshman Republican said that January 6 could have

been seen as just a typical tourist day in the Capitol.

Well, let me tell that gentleman that on typical tourist days in the Capitol, 100 policemen aren't beaten by people who try to enter the Capitol when it is closed to public attendance because of the coronavirus.

On typical tourist days, people don't put excrement on the walls of the Capitol of the United States.

On typical tourist days, people don't urinate on the floors of the Capitol of the United States.

On typical days, people don't batter down the windows on the outside to breach the Capitol.

On typical days, people don't batter down the doors and the glass entering the Speaker's lobby, resulting in one person's death. And if that person wasn't dead, they would have breached the floor of the House and God knows what they would have done if they could have found a person in the House.

They were hollering, ''Hang Mike Pence,'' ''NANCY PELOSI, where are you? We are here.'' That was an insurrection. That was an attack on our Constitution. It should never be forgotten by anybody who was serving in the Congress, by any American because our liberty, our Constitution, our country, our values were on the line.

□ 1145

## HONORING LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS

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

Ms. VAN DUYNE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor and recognize our men and women in uniform who dedicate their lives to keeping communities across our Nation safe.

This past year was the deadliest year for police officers in decades; 264 law enforcement officers died in the line of duty.

As mayor or Irving, I was a proud advocate of our local police department. And as the Representative of the 24th District in Texas, I will continue to stand with our law enforcement.

Rather than defunding and devaluing those in uniform, I know from experience that community policing works and community policing only exists with the support of our officers, higher retention, and improved recruitment.

I thank our police officers, first responders, and their families. Getting up every morning and putting on the badge is a level of courage few will ever understand.

We join you in respecting, honoring, and remembering your fallen brothers and sisters in blue.

## HONORING OFFICERS WHO MADE ULTIMATE SACRIFICE

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

Ms. STEVENS. Madam Speaker, this week honors law enforcement officers who have made the ultimate sacrifice in service to their communities, and it also recognizes the incredible contributions, hard work, dedication, and loyalty of our law enforcement officers.

I rise to recognize the nine law enforcement officers who lost their lives last year while serving Michigan: Stephen Splan, of Bloomfield Hills, Michigan; Jonathan Parnell, of Wayne County; Waldis Johnson, of Wayne County; William Darnell, of DeWitt Township; Caleb Starr, of the Michigan State Police; our beloved Benny Napoleon, of Wayne County; Bryant Searcy, of Wayne County; Dean Savard, of Wayne County; and Donafay Collins, of Wayne County.

We also remember our beloved Collin Rose, who lost his life in 2016 to gun violence while serving at Wayne State. Our community rose up to support his family. We honor his contributions.

My friend, Eddie Osmond, the owner of a Marathon gas station, used pennies on the dollar as people were pumping their gas to raise $10,000 for this man's family.

That is part of what we are here to recognize, the contributions of our law enforcement officers.

## RECOGNIZING NATIONAL PEACE OFFICERS MEMORIAL DAY

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

Mr. NEHLS. Madam Speaker, tomorrow, May 15, is National Peace Officers Memorial Day, a day to honor and remember the more than 22,000 brave law enforcement officers who made the ultimate sacrifice in the line of duty.

Having served in law enforcement for 30 years, I am proud to see so many of my colleagues recognizing the sacrifice of these brave officers this week. They certainly deserve it.

But truly honoring their sacrifice means doing so every day, not just on May 15 and not just this week. That means giving law enforcement the tools necessary to keep our communities safe, pushing back against any and all attempts to demonize and diminish their service, and doing everything we can to reduce the attacks against law enforcement.

Now more than ever, law enforcement across our country needs true Americans to boldly stand with them. That is what I am proud to do here today. And I ask every one of my colleagues and the American people to do so, as well.

## RECEIVING CHILD TAX CREDIT PAYMENTS

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

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Speaker, this week was designated as the Child Tax Credit Week of Action. The outpouring of stories and news articles coming from across the country describing just how transformational this assistance will be for families is heartwarming.

I am so proud that in the American Rescue Plan we fought for and won the expansion and improvement of the child tax credit. Its inclusion was historic but just a first step. We must make this expansion permanent.

The child tax credit is a lifeline to the middle class, cuts child poverty by 55 percent this year, and provides children and their families with additional payments throughout the year that help them with the costs of food, childcare, diapers, healthcare, clothing, and taxes. Poor, working, and middle-class families—90 percent of our children—will receive the same monthly benefits.

We must spread the word about the benefits of the child tax credit, how families can start to receive that monthly check starting in July. If people have filed a tax return, they are all set. If they have not filed their tax return, and their family is eligible for the tax credit, they must file by May 17. Even if they typically do not file, this ensures that they will receive a monthly benefit.

Let's get the word out. Let's get people signed up.

## ESCALATING ATTACKS ON ISRAEL

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Speaker, I rise today with deep concern over the escalating attacks on the Israeli people by Palestinian terror groups like Hamas.

After a period of relative stability in the region, these attacks threaten to create an all-out war that will endanger millions. This is an avoidable outcome born of inattention and incompetence.

It is no coincidence that this violence has erupted as the Biden administration has pivoted away from the Middle East. The leadership vacuum created by this absence can only allow radical elements who would harm us and our allies. It is maddening to see the progress made under the Trump administration toward stabilizing the Middle East undone.

It was less than a year ago that the Abraham Accords, perhaps the most significant move toward peace in the region in over a decade or longer, were signed. We cannot let these gains be wasted.

The American people stand firmly behind the people of Israel. They have every right to defend themselves. Their existence depends on it.

The Biden administration must abandon its retreat and reengage on the previous successful peace process in the

Middle East. We cannot abandon our strong ally in Israel by our indifference or inaction, especially when they need us most.

## PROTECTING ISRAEL IS DUTY OF UNITED STATES

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

Mr. CAWTHORN. Madam Speaker, the deadly conflict plaguing Israel becomes worse and worse each day.

Since Monday, the vile and despicable terrorist organization Hamas has launched over 1,000 rockets from Gaza into Israeli population centers.

The fact that Members of this body are speaking out in support of these terrorists leaves me sickened. The differences between these two sides are shocking. There is no debate that if Israel were to lay down their arms entirely, there would be a genocide. But if Hamas were to lay down their arms, there would be nothing but peace.

The fact that Representatives here in this Chamber would side with violent extremists is mind-boggling. I encourage these Members to go to Gaza, see how they murder members of the LGBTQ community, see how they marginalize and abuse women, how they treat those of different faiths.

Let me be clear: There is no moral equivalency between these two sides. It is our duty to protect Israel, and if anyone is to ever invade Israel, I promise you that there is no crevice on Earth that will conceal you from the wrath of God.

I would also be remiss to not recognize that some Members of this body in the majority party have spoken out against Hamas, and for that, I thank you.

## HONORING POLICE OFFICERS

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, it is good to be an American because as I stand here today during National Police Week, I can truly say that across America, we honor the police officer who holds a child's hand. We honor the police officer who comes to an emergency situation.

I honor the police officers who, throughout the COVID–19 pandemic, were on the front lines without testing or vaccination, helping many others. I know, Madam Speaker, because they helped me. They helped me with my testing sites. Now, they help me with my vaccination sites.

I want to remind them they will be helping me tomorrow, and that is Saturday the 15th, when we are at Key Middle School and Heights High School, vaccinating children 12 to 15 years old with the Pfizer vaccination, from 2 to 5 at Key Middle School and 10 to 1 at Heights High School.

We mourn those who have lost their lives in the line of duty. That is because we are Americans, and we stand united in that effort. There can be no divide. We know who we believe in and what we believe in. We thank them so very much, and we also believe in the liberties of all people.

## ISSUES OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2021, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, it has been interesting. I get to take my mask off under the rules now.

We haven't quite caught up with the science here in the House. The House of Representatives that has leadership proclaiming that we need to follow the science refuses to do so, so far. But we are hoping we will eventually get at least the majority of people here to follow the science.

It has been an interesting time, not a good time, not a wonderful, enriching time to be in the House of Representatives. It has been an exceedingly frustrating time.

After January 6, apparently, the number one goal here in the House was something referred to as optics. According to the Sergeant at Arms, the reason the National Guard was not brought up in advance on January 6, so there would be no one entering the Capitol that was not desired to enter the Capitol, was that word, ''optics.''

So, the Capitol Police, doing the best they could, were left to fend for themselves without the support they needed. It is a big place. But had the number one concern before January 6 by people here in Washington, at the Capitol, at least, if that number one concern had not been optics, there would have been no one coming into the Capitol that we didn't want to be in the Capitol.

Since then, we have been entertained by all kinds of false statements, false allegations. It has really been amazing. The number one thing we keep coming back to is, apparently, it is not about getting at the truth. It is all about optics.

The top person charged with the safety of Members of Congress, the head of the Capitol Police, months ago indicated that there was no intel from any source that any Member of Congress was at risk or a threat to any other Member of Congress. No Member of Congress was at risk from another Member of Congress.

Since then, as I understand it, there was an ethics charge leveled at MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE that she was encouraging a debate with another Member of Congress and somehow that is apparently an ethics violation.

I had a Democrat some years back come up and threaten to kick my buttocks. I think he used other language. But had he swung, I might have filed a complaint.

Here on the House floor, what we have are words. We get into very heated debates at times because we care deeply about the things we care deeply about. But those are not assaults.

There have been assaults in the Capitol, and I know memory is apparently a big question these days, but when the President of the United States stands right up here at the second level, as Presidents have since this opened before 1860, and have made speeches—in this case, it wasn't to a joint session; it was to an invitation-only session—but he indicated that what happened on January 6 was the worst attack on democracy since the Civil War.

□ 1200

So being an ongoing student of history since Coach Sam Parker instilled a love in me for history, especially American history—the good, the bad, the ugly, the incredible—I have continued to be a student of American history, and World history as well.

So sometimes it is helpful for those who don't know our history or can't remember our history to be reminded that since the Civil War put an end to slavery in America, even though it took an ordained Christian preacher resolutely, peacefully advocating for civil rights, and that the Constitution should be used as a document that means what it says.

And as the Declaration of Independence made clear, we are endowed not by government, but by our creator with certain unalienable rights.

And Dr. King's letters from the Birmingham jail, as he was unjustly incarcerated, pretty powerful words from a man full of vision. We miss his vision. I think things would be very different if he were still alive today. The assassin did great damage to the United States of America, and the benefits that we would have had from a visionary still if he were alive today.

Because there are some who say if you even use words to debate, that somehow you are an insurrectionists, you need to be jailed. And that has been happening since January 6. In fact, January 6 of 2017, I believe there were 11 different Democrats that stood up and forcefully objected to the results and to the electors that were voting for President Trump.

And there was not a single Republican I ever heard on our side of the aisle that accused them of trying to overthrow the government, insurrection—all these things that some of us have been accused of—simply wanting a fair election in which the votes of tens of millions of Americans were not disenfranchised. The very same thing even our current Speaker has said back in prior days about prior elections.

So imagine the shock for those of us who, for the last 20 years, had been preached to by people on the other side of the aisle about the unfairness of election, the vulnerability of electronic

elections, who seemed disgusted that some of us had the same kind of objections as they had about the election in November.

There is nothing illegal, improper, against the House rules of objecting, yet we had people on the other side of the aisle who were encouraging all kinds of punishment for those on this side of the aisle who did exactly what Democrats have been doing for 20 years or so—objecting, as they did January 2001. And we saw objection January 6 of 2005.

And these ''woke'' corporations that now want to punish anybody that objected to potentially—and there is evidence of fraud in the November 2020 election—and those who say there was no fraud in the election are either doing so knowingly, knowing that it is false what they are saying, or just because they bought in to what the mainstream/lame-stream media has reported. But there was fraud in that election. There usually is some fraud in national elections.

And in States where it was somewhat close compared to the number of people voting, like Arizona, they are doing the right thing. They are trying to have an audit. And, obviously, the efforts of the audit is being covered up. There is evidence being destroyed. I guess a bit like when you have a Secretary of State that destroys evidence that she has, that has been sought, has it destroyed with a hammer or with BleachBit, obstruction of justice.

But, fortunately, for some, we had a Justice Department that saw crimes committed by Democrats that did not need to be pursued or punished, and things that were not crimes that Republicans did needed to be punished.

People all across America are naturally going to be upset when they don't just perceive, they see and know that there is a two-tiered justice system—one for certain high-place Democrats and one for Republicans, or those who support Republicans. And Heaven help them if they support President Donald Trump.

That is what has been so amazing to someone like me, who has been part of the justice system and seeing the law enforced for so much of my adult life. It is unbelievable. And hearing from FBI agents around the country who repeatedly said, if anybody in our office, in this location, that location, different locations around the country had done a fraction of the things that were done by top FBI officials in Washington, D.C., then we would not only have been fired, but they would have been looking at coming after us with criminal charges. And they were despondent because they were devoting their lives to justice.

Republican and Democrat prosecutors in different parts of the country couldn't believe what they were seeing. The injustice coming from what was supposed to be the Justice Department. And what has happened since January 6 is quite sickening. It is a war. It is an assault on our Constitution.

Now, it is not new. Back when Mueller was head of the FBI, and the inspector general shocked everyone who was paying attention, that there had been over 3,000 abuses of the national security letter where FBI agents had just wanted to do fishing expeditions—no crime, no probable cause. They just wanted information about people when the Constitution did not permit it.

So they send a national security letter demanding that a bank accompany an individual, give them all the information on another American, just because they wanted it. Outrageous. And that, we know, occurred during President George W. Bush's administration, while Mueller was FBI Director.

Now, he made a statement: Gee, I will take all the blame.

Well, he should because he created an environment at the FBI that apparently encouraged lawlessness by top FBI agents. And if you look at Ted Stevens, Senator from Alaska, who was framed by the FBI, and you look at what Director Mueller did in the aftermath of finding out if he did not know all the time before that while it was going on, that Ted Stevens was framed, that he was not guilty of what was charged.

And the FBI had evidence that he was not guilty, and they covered that up and they helped create evidence to make it look like he was guilty. And they saw that he was tried right before his election. And the loss seemed like it was between 1,000–2,000 votes. He lost his seat.

The FBI did that. Mueller's FBI did that. And when one FBI agent with a conscience pointed that out in an affidavit, the injustice that had occurred by the FBI and his supervisor, well, Mueller's reward for that FBI's agency was to drive him out of the FBI. And his reward for the person that—according to the affidavit, helped frame Ted Stevens—was that that FBI agent was promoted, got a better job with the FBI.

Apparently, Mueller likes people who are quite good at framing somebody and getting them convicted, because that is what happened.

That should have been all the wake-up call we needed to have a house-cleaning at the top of the FBI, but that didn't happen. So the abuses got worse during the Obama administration, and you had things like fast and furious, where people actually encouraged the sale and distribution of weapons to drug cartels. And no one, even to this day, has ever been held accountable for that.

In fact, there was a cover-up by the Justice Department then. They wouldn't let us have the documents so we could see exactly what happened. In fact, Congress was so inane in its effort to obtain those documents, that the best job—both on fast and furious and on the Benghazi cover-up—was done by Judicial Watch. They got more documentation out of the Justice Department than Congress did, and we are charged with oversight.

Even when the Republicans had the majority, people were put in place who did not pursue justice and a cleanup of the Justice Department. So by the time President Trump came along, he had a number of people at the top who created the Russia hoax—a fraud.

And as others have said, when the Justice Department and the FBI can work as effectively at trying to frame the President of the United States, who happens to be a billionaire, then most of us would be in severe trouble. And that is the case, and we have seen it in the last few years.

We have seen a Justice Department—of course, Christopher Wray—my humble opinion—when he was put in there with a job of cleaning up the FBI, his idea of cleaning up the FBI was to sweep as much of the dirt under the rug so that people couldn't see it.

Just like now, Homeland Security and Health and Human Services, their job is not to just secure the border under this administration. Their job is to now get them away from the border as quickly as possible so that people don't see them. They are not in the news every night because they have moved them out.

As the border patrolmen have said, they are looked upon as the Mexican drug cartels' logistics. The drug cartels get paid money or agreements to pay money from people they bring, including unaccompanied minors; and then the U.S. Government is their logistics because the government ships future drug sailors, traffickers, human traffickers, sex traffickers. Our U.S. Government ships them around the United States so that they can get to the town the drug cartels want them doing their drug trafficking, human trafficking or sex trafficking.

□ 1215

The government has become a part of the process for the drug cartels, all to the damage and often the death of American citizens.

When Pancho Villa and his minions invaded, I believe it was New Mexico, John Pershing, General Pershing, was sent down. He had a lieutenant named Patton. They were sent down to Mexico, even invade Mexico, going after Pancho Villa and his troops because there were some families who they killed in New Mexico.

We have thousands of people dying from fentanyl coming from Mexico, and the answer of this administration, we heard in the last couple of days, the administration is going to add 13 miles to the wall but otherwise leave over 1,000 miles without wall.

The answer has not been to secure the border. The answer from this administration has been to say that the border is secure, when anybody with eyes to see or ears to hear knows that is not true.

The injustices that have occurred since January 6 appear to be a continuation of the goal of that one word, ''optics,'' the one word that prevented our

leadership from having the National Guard on hand to ensure that the Capitol was not invaded.

We heard in the Judiciary Committee—that is why I had videotape, which we are not allowed to have here on the House floor, obviously, but had the videotape of John Sullivan, a Trump-hater, who has been supportive of groups that wanted Trump pulled out of office, or as Mr. Sullivan—and I will paraphrase—wanted to yank him out of the White House and do things to him. But he was one of the first ones in the Capitol. He is on video. He was bragging: See, I told you we would be able to do this, getting into the Capitol. He was there egging on people, even at the shooting of the young lady who was shot by a Capitol policeman.

Many of us would like to know the full circumstances of so much that went on here, but the thousands of hours of tape are not being used. Now, some of us had heard that the wonderful Capitol policeman, Office Sicknick, that he had died of natural causes. Yet, it was all over the media that he was beaten with a fire extinguisher. It turned out that was completely false. There is an article about that by Julie Kelly in American Greatness, April 26.

Her article pointed out there is no reason to keep these men in jail, let alone in solitary confinement in a D.C. prison. The cause of Capitol Officer Sicknick's untimely death on January 7 is finally settled, but the prosecution of his alleged attackers rages on. After months of dishonest accounts about what happened to Officer Sicknick—first, that he was bludgeoned to death by insurrectionists with a fire extinguisher, and then that he died of an allergic reaction to bear spray.

The D.C. medical examiner's office confirmed that 42-year-old Officer Sicknick died of a stroke. The chemical sprayed in his direction during the chaos outside the Capitol on January 6 did not contribute to his death.

In its haste to bolster the new narrative, maintaining Sicknick was killed by rioters wielding bear spray, the Acting Attorney General was in on the lie from the start. The Justice Department charged two men with the chemical attack. George Tanios and Julian Khater were arrested March 14 and charged with several crimes, including four counts related to possession and use of a deadly or dangerous weapon and for conspiring ahead of time to use the spray against the officers. They have been behind bars ever since.

Both were transported to the Nation's Capital, where they joined dozens of January 6 detainees held in solitary confinement in a D.C. Jail. A judge on Tuesday, this was dated April 26, will consider motions filed by their attorneys to release both defendants as they await trial.

This says, as I have reported: For the past few months, Federal courts, at the direction of Joe Biden's Justice Department, are denying bond to nonviolent protestors as their cases continue a slow slog through an intentionally overloaded D.C. judicial system. The presumption of innocence has been suspended for Trump supporters involved in the January 6 protest, largely based on a supposed thought crime of doubting the legitimacy of the 2020 election.

Parenthetically, if that were a crime, there would be Democrats who would have been arrested and gone to jail going back to January 2001, when an objection was made to electors. There were no woke corporations back then saying they would no longer do business with those Democrats, nor did they do that after the Democrat objections on January 6, 2005, or after the significant number of objections on January 6, 2017.

Now, all of a sudden, it is supposed to be a crime, a heinous act, to object under the rules in the Constitution? Things have to turn around here if we are going to save this little experiment in self-government.

Anyway, dangerous evidence, the article questions, law enforcement officials have argued in court pleadings that defendants shouldn't have unfettered access to tens of thousands of hours of video evidence because they might pass along the information to those who wish to attack the Capitol again.

Instead, according to a recent Politico article, prosecutors are ''working to build an archive of video that would permit defendants to peruse relevant clips but sharply restrict their access and permit prosecutors a chance to object if they feel such footage could be misused or present a risk.''

Now, that sounds a great deal like what the prosecutors and the FBI were saying about Ted Stevens and their evidence, that they restricted him having access to his own evidence that would have proved his innocence had he been allowed all the evidence that was seized from his home and other places.

Anyway, toward the end of the article, it says:

''Khater's family is asking the court to release him on a $15 million bond guaranteed by 16 family members. As one journalist noted, that amount is three times higher than Harvey Weinstein's bail.

''Judge Thomas Hogan will hear the case on Tuesday and then decide whether to keep Khater and Tanios behind bars until their next court date or confine the pair to home detention.

''There is no reason to keep these men in jail, let alone in solitary confinement in a D.C. prison. Cherry-picked video evidence does not support the weapon charges against them. The chief investigator confessed no evidence exists to prove that the can of spray ever was used or that Khater sprayed it at anyone, including police officers. The Justice Department's refusal to allow access to the video evidence raises plenty of red flags.

''Neither man has a criminal record. George Tanios and Julian Khater pose no threat to society. Their only crime, as is the case with hundreds of nonviolent Capitol protestors, was supporting Donald Trump and daring to question the validity of the 2020 Presidential election, a doubt shared by tens of millions of Americans.''

So we have Federal judges that are playing along with this whole outrageous miscarriage of justice for hundreds of Americans who were concerned, as Democrats were in 2001, 2005, 2017. But fortunately for them, Republicans didn't try to create a Federal crime out of questioning election results.

Julie Kelly has done extraordinary research on what has occurred since January 6 and on January 6. Some points that she has found:

> On April 28, 2021, Paul Hopper heard a ruckus in his house. He was in his bedroom answering emails. Clad in his pajamas, he went downstairs to see what was happening. He was confronted by at least a dozen FBI agents, some pointing guns at him and his wife, Marilyn. The couple, along with their houseguests, including a teenager, were handcuffed.

Now, where is the outrage that we have been hearing in the Judiciary Committee about young people being unfairly treated? Where is the outrage about the treatment of people since January 6 by any Democrats? Even our Vice President was raising money to pay their bail in places where there was not just looting but there was burning, physical assaults, and, like in Missouri, even death of innocent people.

The Hoopers were placed in separate rooms in their home in Alaska, without legal counsel, without the chance to inspect a warrant. Paul and Marilyn were interrogated for hours about their trip to Washington, D.C., in January. They attended President Trump's speech and walked down to the Capitol. They committed no crime. They did not even enter the building.

They did what tens of thousands of Americans did on January 6. They traveled to their Nation's Capital, just like all the leftists did that did such damage, and tried to physically assault some of us here in the Capitol last year.

Yet, not only were they not punished, those of us who were being threatened and people running after us, we were not protected at all. But Paul and Marilyn, as they were so unfairly and unjustly treated by the FBI and the Department of Justice, the FBI claimed they were looking for NANCY PELOSI's stolen laptop.

They said Marilyn looked like a woman in the Capitol who was a suspect, but the photos—that anybody could clearly see—the photos that the FBI finally presented, eventually, it was clear, that wasn't Marilyn, and that wasn't Paul. They didn't take the laptop. Yet, their freedom was taken from them to teach a lesson.

□ 1230

Nonetheless, agents threatened both Paul and Marilyn Heupers, the teenager that was there. They threatened them with legal recourse. They ransacked their home, and they took their cell phones and their computers. They even took a copy of the Declaration of Independence. I wish they would read it and understand it.

The Huepers have not been charged with any crime, but more than 400 Americans have been charged with various offenses relating to January 6, but most face nonviolent trespassing and disorderly conduct charges.

Just yesterday, the Justice Department announced the arrest of an Active Duty United States Marine stationed at Quantico for his involvement in the protests that day.

Joe Biden's Justice Department is criminalizing political protest—but only political protest by Republicans or conservatives. They are destroying the lives of American families. They are weaponizing the events of January 6 to silence Trump-supporting Americans.

You don't have to take our word for it. Michael Sherwin, the acting U.S. Attorney who handled the first few months of the Capitol breach probe, bragged that his office arrested at least 100 people between January 6 and January 20 to stop people from coming to D.C. to protest Joe Biden's inauguration.

''I wanted to make sure there was shock and awe, that we could charge as many people as possible before the 20th, and it worked because we saw through media posts that people were afraid to come back to D.C. because if we go there, we are going to get charged.''

That is only part of what is happening. Dozens of Americans have been hauled out of their homes, transported to Washington, D.C. and held in solitary confinement for months awaiting delayed trials with no end in sight. Nearly all have no criminal record. Some are veterans and ex-law enforcement officers. But the Justice Department is throwing the book at them. Even worse, Federal judges and prosecutors argue that these folks are a danger to society because they doubt the outcome of the 2020 Presidential election.

In one case against a man who didn't even enter the building, a Federal judge nonetheless denied bond and said this:

''This is an offense that, at bottom, was an attempt to stop democracy from moving forward, because people were unhappy about the results of the election. I don't think that the defendant will follow my conditions if he believes I am part of this machine of the democratic process.''

Well, that judge ought to be part of the Democratic Justice Department, because that is how that judge is acting, not as a judge but as an advocate and as a part and parcel of what you could call a conspiracy because these people are working to silence anybody who has supported Donald Trump. That is one example of how government lawyers and judges are criminalizing someone's belief about the 2020 Presidential election. It is much like the U.S. Attorney who is saying that if they charge enough people, then Trump supporters are not going to be willing to come back out because they know they will get charged.

We have in this city political prisoners held hostage by their own government. They are victims of an unequal system of justice in a country where rioters and looters on the left are let off the hook—even considered heroes—while those on the right are considered hardened criminals without any record before trial can even begin.

Here is how one defense attorney described the conditions in the D.C. Correctional Treatment Facility: Detainees are held in solitary confinement for 23 hours a day. They cannot shower or shave regularly; some have been physically assaulted by prison guards.

They cannot play a role in their own defense. They have no regular access to tablets to communicate with their lawyers or family members. In-person meetings with counsel are nearly impossible; conversations between defendants and lawyers are overheard by other defendants and their lawyers in addition to prison guards.

At a detention hearing on May 11 for the two men accused of using pepper spray against police officers and against the late officer, Brian Sicknick, one defense lawyer told the judge he had not been able to speak with his client for 2 weeks.

Julian Khater and George Tanios—about whom we were speaking earlier—were arrested in March for allegedly spraying the officers. They are still being held in the D.C. jail for weeks awaiting trial.

This week, a Federal judge—one I spoke of earlier—denied bail to both defendants. Julian Khater's family was willing to put up a $15 million bond package. Neither man has a criminal record, but you have a judge and a Justice Department with an agenda, and so what these men are getting is not only not bond, but they are getting the most injustice the Department of Justice can throw at them. They never even went inside the building and the government has yet to prove their cases at all, but the judge basically tried the case himself this week without either defendant present. Judge Hogan said the men are a danger to society because they attempted to halt the democratic process.

Well, if that were a crime, we would have dozens of Democrats with a criminal record for coming in here. It was the first and only time in American history that one party came in, took over the House floor, and prevented a session from taking place. It never happened before, and it never happened since. Of course, the election didn't go too well for Democrats after that. We had a very weak Speaker of the House at the time who kept saying that those people will be punished for their improprieties and for their unethical and unruly behavior. There were at least a dozen or more rules of the House that were violated by most of the Democrats.

Madam Speaker, you are not supposed to sit on the House floor, on the floor itself. You are not supposed to bring food. Heck, food was catered in here. You are not supposed to take pictures in here. There were not only pictures taken, but there was a broadcast going on from the House floor. Rule after rule were broken. There could have potentially been criminal charges, but none were made. None of us filed any criminal charges.

Even though the insurrectionists and the Democratic Party came in here and prevented the House from doing business for 24 hours, PAUL RYAN kept saying he was going to do something about it. He never did. No one has ever been punished for the massive improprieties that took place.

Many of these people are finally being charged with preventing, or conspiring to prevent Congress from taking action. Well, that is exactly what many of the House Democrats did that day when they prevented, for 24 hours, us from going into session here. The fact is, I didn't and wouldn't advocate that any of the Democratic Representatives be charged or should have been charged criminally. There were rule violations. I felt like it should have been handled by Ethics, but I would not want criminal charges brought against other Members of the House for the very things that Trump supporters are being charged with.

I would have felt that was inappropriate against Democratic Members of Congress then, and I feel like it is inappropriate for those who were nonviolent—at least many of them. It is a misdemeanor, it should be, but they are trying to make it for optics purposes into some kind of justification for having metal detectors out here, even though they ought to be other places, and Capitol Police ought to be other places. But it is a great deal like I look around, and anybody who is not speaking has to wear a mask because of optics, that we want people to think there is this grave, great danger here.

That is why we have the fence. They took the outer fence down. The inner fence is still around here. We have National Guard troops that could be helping secure our border. That doesn't violate posse comitatus, because they would be enforcing our border against non-American citizens, so posse comitatus, as I hear people bring up, wouldn't come into play. They could be down there helping secure the border, but instead, they are stuck around here in parking garages. I see them in parking garages all the time. That is outrageous.

Why are they all here still after all this time?

Optics. Optics.

It was not as President Bush said when he signed the bill to be used against political protesters, but that is exactly what is being done right now. That bill did not apply to the thousands of people who occupied the Senate and tried to stop the confirmation of Brett Kavanaugh in 2018. It didn't apply to protesters who tried to stop his swearing-in by banging on the doors of the Supreme Court. It didn't apply to any of the protests we have seen over the years in Washington, D.C., but people who were here on that day are being charged with that offense, a felony punishable by up to 20 years in jail.

The media and Democrats continue to misrepresent what happened on January 6. But nearly 200 people have been charged with ''obstruction of an official proceeding.''

That is the vague law that President Bush signed into law in 2002. It was aimed at white-collar criminals after the Enron scandal, and yet, it is being used only against people who support President Trump, none of those who officially obstructed the House Chamber for 24 hours who were members of the Democratic Party.

Well, the claim about a fire extinguisher being used to murder Officer Sicknick even made it into the Democrats' impeachment memo. But it was a lie. We finally learned he died tragically at the age of 42 of a stroke.

The three other people did not die because of what happened that day. Two died of heart failure, and one died of a drug overdose. There is no evidence as has been said on January 7 that this was an armed insurrection—armed meaning with firearms. There were no firearms. Of course, Bruno Cua had a little baton. He didn't use it against anybody, but he still is being charged with using a deadly weapon.

Not one person has been charged with bringing a firearm to the Capitol. People have been charged with carrying or using things like Mace or a helmet, but no one brought a gun into this building, and we still have no one in custody for allegedly planting inoperable pipe bombs near the headquarters of the DNC and the RNC.

What was all of that about?

Some of us tried to get information about those bombs. Normally, people don't put bombs that don't work out where people can see them unless it is simply for the optics. Now, when they are serious, they do what Bill Ayers' people, the Weather Underground, did when they set off a bomb in the U.S. Senate. To me, that was more of an attack, more of a war or an attack on democracy. In this very room, terrorists from Puerto Rico came in here and shot four House Members. Four Members of Congress were shot in this room in 1954.

□ 1245

To me, that was more of an attack on democracy, for the President's information.

When Pearl Harbor occurred, that was more, thousands, 2,000 to 3,000 people were killed. That was more of an attack on democracy than the protest of January 6.

When 9/11 occurred—and I know it has been so long ago, there are a lot of people who have forgotten, apparently, about 9/11—3,000 people killed. The Pentagon was hit. The two World Trade Center buildings were hit. Thousands died. That was more of an attack on democracy.

I just want the President to understand there have been things worse than people without any firearms coming into a building.

Now, I have been a judge. I wouldn't put up with that kind of activity, disruption. Sure, people go to jail for that. They would not get charged a felony, normally, but certainly misdemeanors. So there is punishment that should and could be used, but not innocent people, not like Paul and Marilyn. FBI swarmed their home, took all their stuff. That is just so wrong.

The coverup of the video that was available here in the Capitol that could really establish what all went on is atrocious.

I have so many friends in the Capitol Police. They are wonderful people. I admire them greatly. But there are people in leadership positions, apparently, who are covering up video of what went on here. Now, even the news media is asking the D.C. District Court for access to video evidence presented in virtual court proceedings.

As one of my Republican colleagues said this week in the House Oversight and Reform Committee hearing, we need to release all the tapes so the American people can see what happened before, during, and after the disturbance on January 6.

There is no doubt people came here on January 6 to cause trouble. Most did not come here to cause trouble. Most came here to protest in the manner that I have advocated for years, and that is the effective manner that Dr. King advocated for. So much more is done by peaceful protest.

But Americans need to make their voices heard. This power-hungry group occupying positions of power in Washington, D.C., right now, they are wanting to intimidate and use injustice for their own political purposes.

The overwhelming number of people caught up in this ''unprecedented investigation,'' as the Justice Department promises, they are actually nonviolent, peaceful Americans. Their only crime was supporting Donald Trump and concern about the fraud Democrats have been telling us about in elections for many years.

An article from April 12, Julie Kelly, ''Indefinite Incarceration for Protesters with 'Wrong' Politics,'' a great article, documents about different people who are getting death threats. The press has helped bring about all kinds of calamities on people whose crime was being concerned about the election and being here and peacefully protesting.

It documents some of the travesties that are occurring with some people whose only crime was being concerned about fairness in the election in America.

Another, as ''Capitol Defendants Rot in D.C. Jail, Portland Rioters Get Leniency,'' documents how lenient the Justice Department—yes, the same Justice Department that is locking up in solitary confinement people who really didn't commit the actions they are charged with. That same Justice Department is going easy on the looters and destroyers in Portland.

An article from April 19, ''From 'Insurrectionists' to 'Interruptionists'''—that is probably going to be the charge that ends up sticking in most cases. They obstructed Congress from their jobs, not for 24 hours like the Democrat Members of Congress who kept us from having session in here for 24 hours. Not like that, but just for a matter of hours till things were under control. Then we were back in no time, back here in this Chamber, doing our business.

But the FBI raided the Hueper couple's home. That was with guns drawn.

Here is this 18-year-old, Bruno Cua, the complaint I have here. He is charged with assault on a Federal officer. Yet, there has been no evidence presented of any assault on a Federal officer—civil disorder, obstruction of an official proceeding. That is the one that probably is why Julie Kelly says they have gone from insurrectionist to interruptionist: enter or remain on the floor or gallery of either House of Congress; violent entry or disorderly conduct; engage in physical violence; obstruct or impede passage; and parade, demonstrate, or picket on Capitol Grounds.

That is what we have come to, locking up this 18-year-old with no criminal history whatsoever.

Interesting, in Bruno Cua's case, the Justice Department was arguing, since he had begun to be homeschooled before January 6, as thousands and thousands of American children have been since teachers are refusing in so many places to come teach them, that is used by the Justice Department to say you can't allow this guy to be released, this dangerous 18-year-old with no criminal history.

It says, oh, but look at his social media, and he is being homeschooled, so you can't release him home because, you know, that is where he came from. That would be terrible.

Yet, in Portland, they are letting people go, right and left, with long criminal histories and with actual violence that they have committed.

Anyway, Rick Manning has a good article from May 12 in Townhall, ''Biden's America Resembles the Bad Old Days of 1973.''

I keep expecting, at any time, our President to say that we need to put

out big pins with the letters W-I-N on them, as Gerald Ford did. That stood for ''Whip Inflation Now,'' and that didn't work. Wearing a pin with ''Whip Inflation Now'' did not whip inflation, nor did Jimmy Carter wearing a sweater heal or fix our problem with a lack of energy. That didn't work. But that looks like the kind of thing we are headed back to.

There is a great deal of injustice, and I would think, for all of those who obstructed an official proceeding here on the House floor, under the leadership of the Democrat Party leadership, that for far longer disrupted the House proceedings, violating countless House rules, I would think that with that in someone's background, that they have committed that crime that these people are being charged with, that we would get a lot more sympathy from our colleagues across the aisle.

Many were not here then. But the ones who were, who committed that crime being charged now, have it a little easier on those who interrupted us that day.

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

## ENSURING EQUAL ACCESS TO CREDIT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2021, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. TORRES) for 30 minutes.

Mr. TORRES of New York. Madam Speaker, in the United States, there are 1.4 million LGBTQ businesses contributing more than $1.7 trillion to the American economy. We have a vested interest in sustaining and strengthening those businesses with equal access to credit, which is the beating heart of the American economy.

As a former New York City Council member, I partnered with the National LGBTQ Chamber of Commerce to establish the Nation's largest municipal certification program for LGBTQ business enterprises, enabling those businesses to enjoy equal access to a $25 billion pool of government procurement. I am continuing in the United States Congress the advocacy that I began years ago in the New York City Council.

My legislation, the LGBTQ Business Equal Credit Enforcement and Investment Act, builds on a foundation laid by several statutes and regulations. The Equal Credit Opportunity Act, ECOA, prohibits credit discrimination, including but not limited to sex discrimination.

A new interpretive rule from the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau clarifies that ECOA's prohibition against sex discrimination applies to sexual orientation and gender identity.

Section 1071 of Dodd-Frank, which exists to enable and enhance the enforcement of ECOA, requires financial institutions to report information about the race, ethnicity, and sex of credit applicants who serve as the principal owners of small businesses.

My legislation would expand the 1071 reporting requirements to include not only sex but also sexual orientation and gender identity. In doing so, it would enable antidiscrimination enforcement where none might exist.

Even though the United States has made substantial strides toward LGBTQ equality, the mission is far from accomplished. Seventy percent of the LGBTQ community remains unprotected by antidiscrimination laws. When it comes to credit, in particular, according to the Williams Institute, more than 7.7 million LGBTQ adults live in States that offer no protection against credit discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity.

Francis Bacon once said that knowledge is power. Knowledge affords us the power to detect discrimination that might otherwise go undetected. Take, as an example, the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act, which is analogous to my legislation.

Both the National Community Reinvestment Coalition and Iowa State University reviewed data from the HMDA and found that same-sex couples were denied loans at higher rates than heterosexual couples, despite having comparable creditworthiness. It also found that those same-sex couples paid higher interest rates and higher fees.

The experience of the HMDA tells us that sunlight can be a powerful disinfectant against discrimination.

The Equal Credit Enforcement and Investment Act would make credit more accessible, credit laws more enforceable, and creditors more accountable. It would represent a triumph of transparency in the service of economic opportunity for all, regardless of who you are and whom you love.

□ 1300

### HATE NEVER BRINGS PEACE

Mr. TORRES of New York. Madam Speaker, earlier in the week, a public official posted on Twitter the following image of a map where the State of Israel is nowhere to be found. There is nothing accidental about the omission. Wiping Israel off the map is the objective of the BDS movement. Notice the image includes flowers to symbolize peace, as though peace meant the destruction of Israel itself.

When most Americans speak of peace, we mean the peaceful coexistence of an Israeli state and Palestinian state, not the existence of one to the exclusion of the other. Most Americans are anguished by the trauma of Israelis seeking refuge in bomb shelters in the face of relentless rocket fire. And most Americans are anguished by the deep suffering and death toll of Palestinians who live under the repressive rule of Hamas and who have fallen victim to the wretchedness of war.

The rapid-fire rhetoric that we have seen directed at Israel is so hyperbolic, so vitriolic, that it inflames rather than informs. It delegitimizes Israel rather than deescalates the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

Those propagating hate are not part of the solution, but part of the problem. Hate never brings peace. It never has. It never will.

You can either promote hate or you can promote peace, but you cannot advance both. Let us not be fooled by the pretense of peace. Let us find the wisdom to tell the difference between genuine peace and hate hidden under the guise of peace.

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

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. GRIFFITH (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today on account of a family matter.

## ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 11(b) of House Resolution 188, the House stands adjourned until noon on Monday, May 17, 2021, for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

Thereupon (at 1 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, May 17, 2021, at noon for morning-hour debate.

## OATH FOR ACCESS TO CLASSIFIED INFORMATION

Under clause 13 of rule XXIII, the following Member executed the oath for access to classified information:

Troy A. Carter

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

EC–1110. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter authorizing eight officers to wear the insignia of the grade of rear admiral or rear admiral (lower half), pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 777(b)(3)(B); Public Law 104-106, Sec. 503(a)(1) (as added by Public Law 108-136, Sec. 509(a)(3)); (117 Stat. 1458); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–1111. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of General Timothy M. Ray, United States Air Force, and his advancement to the grade of general on the retired list, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 1370(c)(1); Public Law 96-513, Sec. 112 (as amended by Public Law 104-106, Sec. 502(b)); (110 Stat. 293); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–1112. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Christopher P. Weggeman, United States Air Force, and his advancement to the grade of Lieutenant general on the retired list, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 1370(c)(1); Public Law 96-513, Sec. 112 (as amended by Public Law 104-106, Sec. 502(b)); (110 Stat. 293); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–1113. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Charles G. Chiarotti, United States Marine Corps, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 1370(c)(1); Public Law 96-513, Sec. 112 (as amended by Public Law 104-106, Sec. 502(b)); (110 Stat. 293); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–1114. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Timothy G. Fay, United States Air Force, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 1370(c)(1); Public Law 96-513, Sec. 112 (as amended by Public Law 104-106, Sec. 502(b)); (110 Stat. 293); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–1115. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Loretta E. Reynolds, United States Marine Corps, and her advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 1370(c)(1); Public Law 96-513, Sec. 112 (as amended by Public Law 104-106, Sec. 502(b)); (110 Stat. 293); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–1116. A letter from the Secretary, Department of State, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Scott A. Kindsvater, United States Air Force, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 1370(c)(1); Public Law 96-513, Sec. 112 (as amended by Public Law 104-106, Sec. 502(b)); (110 Stat. 293); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–1117. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the army, Installations, Energy and Environment, Department of the Army, Department of Defense, transmitting a report on the plan to finish remediation activities at the Umatilla Chemical Depot in Umatilla, Oregon, pursuant to Public Law 116-283; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–1118. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Air Tractor, Inc., Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2020-0710; Project Identifier 2019-CE-037-AD; Amendment 39-21457; AD 2021-05-14] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 7, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC–1119. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; International Aero Engines AG Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2020-0700; Project Identifier AD-2020-00238-E; Amendment 39-21461; AD 2021-05-18] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 7, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC–1120. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Rockwell Collins, Inc. Flight Display System Application [Docket No.: FAA-2020-0883; Project Identifier 2019-CE-034-AD; Amendment 39-21460; AD 2021-05-17] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 7, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC–1121. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Leonardo S.p.a. (Type Certificate Previously Held by Agusta S.p.A.) (Leonardo) Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2021-0194; Project Identifier MCAI-2020-01434-R; Amendment 39-21482; AD 2021-07-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 7, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC–1122. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31360; Amdt. No.: 3948] received May 7, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC–1123. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31359; Amdt. No.: 3947] received May 7, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC–1124. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Canada Limited Partnership (Type Certificate Previously Held by C Series Aircraft Limited Partnership (CSALP); Bombardier, Inc.) Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2020-0971; Product Identifier 2020-NM-083-AD; Amendment 39-21453; AD 2021-05-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 7, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC–1125. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2020-0914; Product Identifier 2020-NM-058-AD; Amendment 39-21463; AD 2021-05-20] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 7, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC–1126. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Leonardo S.p.a. Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0309; Project Identifier 2018-SW-014-AD; Amendment 39-21456; AD 2021-05-13] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 7, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC–1127. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bell Textron Canada Limited Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2021-0144; Project Identifier MCAI-2021-00255-R; Amendment 39-21473; AD 2021-06-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 7, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC–1128. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2020-0916; Product Identifier 2015-SW-055-AD; Amendment 39-21449; AD 2021-05-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 7, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC–1129. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2020-0903; Project Identifier AD-2020-00957-T; Amendment 39-21454; AD 2021-05-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 7, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC–1130. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revocation and Amendment of Class E Airspace; Orange City and Le Mars, IA [Docket No.: FAA-2020-0664; Airspace Docket No.: 20-ACE-15] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received May 7, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC–1131. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2020-1123; Project Identifier MCAI-2020-01294-R; Amendment 39-21448; AD 2021-05-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 7, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC–1132. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2020-1131; Project Identifier MCAI-2020-00613-R; Amendment 39-21445; AD 2021-05-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 7, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC–1133. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2021-0094; Project Identifier MCAI-2021-00100-R; Amendment 39-21437; AD 2021-04-15] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 7, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC–1134. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Textron Aviation Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2020-0811; Product Identifier 2019-CE-055-AD; Amendment 39-21431; AD 2021-04-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 7, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC–1135. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2020-1106; Product Identifier MCAI-2020-01065-T; Amendment 39-21435; AD 2021-04-14] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 7, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC–1136. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Dassault Aviation Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2020-1111; Product Identifier MCAI-2020-01374-T; Amendment 39-21442; AD 2021-04-20] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 7, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC–1137. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2020-0905; Project Identifier 2019-SW-102-AD; Amendment 39-21384; AD 2021-02-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 7, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC–1138. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2021-0133; Product Identifier AD-2021-00234-T; Amendment 39-21469; AD 2021-06-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 7, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC–1139. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's legislative proposal, Jamie Zapata Federal Officers and Employees Protection Act of 2021; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

Mr. TAKANO: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 2167. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for extensions of the time limitations for use of entitlement under Department of Veterans Affairs educational assistance programs by reason of school closures due to emergency and other situations, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 117–34). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state on 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. THOMPSON of Mississippi (for himself and Mr. KATKO):

H.R. 3233. A bill to establish the National Commission to Investigate the January 6 Attack on the United States Capitol Complex, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. DUNN:

H.R. 3234. A bill to amend section 30113 of title 49, United States Code, to clarify the granting of an alternate vehicle endorsement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. OWENS (for himself, Mr. BANKS, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. BABIN, Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina, Mrs. BOEBERT, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. BUCK, Mr. CAWTHORN, Mr. CLOUD, Mr. DONALDS, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. FALLON, Mr. GREEN of Tennessee, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mrs. HARSHBARGER, Mr. ISSA, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. JACOBS of New York, Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MAST, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. PERRY, Mr. RESCHENTHALER, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. ROY, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. STEWART, and Mr. TIFFANY):

H.R. 3235. A bill to restrict executive agencies from acting in contravention of Executive Order 13950; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform, and in addition to the Committees on Education and Labor, and Armed 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 Ms. SALAZAR (for herself, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. DONALDS, Mr. JACKSON, and Mr. BILIRAKIS):

H.R. 3236. A bill to prohibit the President from taking any action to support the waiver of obligations of members of the World Trade Organization under the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights in relation to the prevention, containment, mitigation, or treatment of COVID-19 unless a statute is enacted expressly authorizing such a waiver with respect to the prevention, containment, mitigation, or treatment of COVID-19, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 3237. A bill making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2021, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, 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. ESCOBAR:

H.R. 3238. A bill to amend the Safe Drinking Water Act and the Safe Drinking Water Act Amendments of 1996 to reauthorize certain grant programs providing assistance to colonias, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, 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. FITZGERALD:

H.R. 3239. A bill to make improvements in the enactment of title 41, United States Code, into a positive law title and to improve the Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AMODEI (for himself, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. FULCHER, Mr. RESCHENTHALER, and Mrs. LESKO):

H.R. 3240. A bill to require the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to more efficiently develop domestic sources of the minerals and mineral materials of strategic and critical importance to the economic and national security and manufacturing competitiveness of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. BUSH:

H.R. 3241. A bill to make improvements in the enactment of title 54, United States Code, into a positive law title and to improve the Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 3242. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to improve the American History for Freedom grant program; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CLEAVER (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. KATKO, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. CORREA, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. SWALWELL, Ms. TITUS, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mrs. LURIA, Mr. TORRES of New York, and Mr. GIMENEZ):

H.R. 3243. A bill to codify the Transportation Security Administration's responsibility relating to securing pipelines against cybersecurity threats, acts of terrorism, and other nefarious acts that jeopardize the physical security or cybersecurity of pipelines, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. CROW (for himself, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. MEIJER):

H.R. 3244. 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 Ms. ESCOBAR:

H.R. 3245. A bill to authorize the imposition of sanctions with respect to significant actions that exacerbate climate change, to reinforce comprehensive efforts to limit global average temperature rise, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, Financial Services, Oversight and Reform, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois (for himself, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. POCAN, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. BUSH, Ms. TLAIB, Ms. NORTON, Mr. EVANS, Mr. CARSON, Mr. TRONE, and Mr. KAHELE):

H.R. 3246. A bill to award funds to States and local areas for subsidized employment programs for youth; to the Committee on Education and Labor, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, 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. GARCIA of Texas (for herself, Ms. NORTON, Ms. ESCOBAR, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. OMAR, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. NEWMAN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. CARSON, Ms. PRESSLEY, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. EVANS, Mr. VICENTE GONZALEZ of Texas, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. BOWMAN, Ms. BASS, and Ms. JACKSON LEE):

H.R. 3247. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to limit the amount that the portion of a taxpayer's tax refund attributable to the child tax credit and the earned income tax credit may be reduced by reason of student loan debt; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GUEST:

H.R. 3248. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to establish a body-worn camera partnership grant program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HICE of Georgia (for himself, Mr. NORMAN, Ms. HERRELL, Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. BABIN, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. FALLON, and Mr. CLYDE):

H.R. 3249. A bill to codify the policy of Executive Order 13950 (relating to combating race and sex stereotyping), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH (for himself, Mr. BUDD, and Mr. RUTHERFORD):

H.R. 3250. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to permit uniformed law enforcement officers to carry agency-issued firearms in certain Federal facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. KUSTER (for herself, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. WELCH, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. GARAMENDI, and Mr. PAPPAS):

H.R. 3251. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to include biomass heating appliances in the energy credit and to extent the credit for residential energy efficient property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LAMB (for himself, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. KIND, Mr. STEUBE, and Mr. GOLDEN):

H.R. 3252. A bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to enhance penalties for certain thefts of a firearm from certain Federal firearms licensees, and to criminalize the theft of a firearm from a gun range that rents firearms or a shooting club; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. LESKO (for herself and Mr. MCNERNEY):

H.R. 3253. A bill to direct the Administrator of the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration to conduct a study on motor vehicle safety and impaired driving, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LOUDERMILK (for himself, Mr. MEUSER, Mrs. GREENE of Georgia, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. LATTA, Mr. HICE of Georgia, Ms. VAN DUYNE, Mrs. CAMMACK, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. CAWTHORN, and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio):

H.R. 3254. A bill to terminate Federal Pandemic Unemployment Compensation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NORCROSS:

H.R. 3255. A bill to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to develop guidance for identifying high-risk locations to focus lead reduction efforts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. PERRY (for himself, Mr. MAST, Mr. POSEY, Mr. RESCHENTHALER, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. TIFFANY, Mr. DUNCAN, Mrs. HARSHBARGER, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. STEUBE, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. CAWTHORN, Mr. VAN DREW, and Mr. JACKSON):

H.R. 3256. A bill to prohibit Federal funding to the Wuhan Institute of Virology; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SCHRADER (for himself, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BENTZ, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. DEFAZIO):

H.R. 3257. A bill to ensure that United States Government personnel, including members of the Armed Forces and contractors, assigned to United States diplomatic missions are given the opportunity to designate next-of-kin for certain purposes in the event of the death of the personnel; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. SEWELL (for herself and Mr. BILIRAKIS):

H.R. 3258. A bill to amend title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act to improve patient access to anti-cancer oral medications, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. SEWELL (for herself, Mr. MCKINLEY, Ms. KUSTER, and Mr. FITZPATRICK):

H.R. 3259. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to combat the opioid crisis by promoting access to non-opioid treatments in the hospital outpatient setting; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SHERMAN:

H.R. 3260. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to require that certain issuers make disclosures regarding general ledger accounts reconciliation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. SPANBERGER (for herself, Mr. MEIJER, Mr. GOLDEN, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. MCCAUL, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. JACOBS of California, Mr. MALINOWSKI, Mr. LIEU, Mr. BROWN, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. KIM of New Jersey, Mr. UPTON, Mr. COLE, Mrs. KIM of California, and Mr. STEUBE):

H.R. 3261. A bill to repeal the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. UPTON:

H.R. 3262. A bill to require the Secretary of Transportation to submit a report on cybersecurity risks to motor vehicle safety, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. OWENS (for himself, Mr. BANKS, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. BABIN, Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina, Mrs. BOEBERT, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. BUCK, Mr. CAWTHORN, Mr. CLOUD, Mr. DONALDS, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. FALLON, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mrs. HARSHBARGER, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. ISSA, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. JACOBS of New York, Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MAST, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. PERRY, Mr. RESCHENTHALER, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. ROY, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. STEWART, Mr. TIFFANY, and Mr. CALVERT):

H. Res. 397. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that Critical Race Theory serves as a prejudicial ideological tool, rather than an educational tool, and should not be taught in K-12 classrooms as a way to teach students to judge individuals based on sex, race, ethnicity, and national origin; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE (for herself, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. PAYNE, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. PINGREE, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. STEVENS, Ms. STRICKLAND, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. BASS, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. ESHOO, Mrs. BUSTOS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. MFUME, Mr. EVANS, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Ms. PRESSLEY, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. PALLONE, Mrs. LURIA, Mr. COOPER, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CRIST, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. JONES, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. RYAN, Ms. OMAR, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. RUSH, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. WATERS, Mr. CROW, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. COHEN, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. JACOBS of California, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. GALLEGO, Ms. NEWMAN, Mr. SAN NICOLAS, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. POCAN, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. BROWN, Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. TRONE, Mr. MCEACHIN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. GOMEZ, Mrs. FLETCHER, Mr. NADLER, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. CORREA, and Mr. JEFFRIES):

H. Res. 398. A resolution recognizing the forthcoming centennial of the 1921 Tulsa Race Massacre; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. CRAIG (for herself, Ms. TITUS, and Mr. FITZPATRICK):

H. Res. 399. A resolution recognizing ''National Public Works Week''; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. DEUTCH (for himself, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. POCAN, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. TORRES of New York, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Ms. BASS, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. EVANS, Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Ms. JACOBS of California, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. NORTON, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SOTO, Mr. TONKO, Mr. CRIST, and Mrs. DEMINGS):

H. Res. 400. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Honor Our LGBT Elders Day; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RUSH (for himself, Ms. BASS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Ms. JACOBS of California, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Ms. NEWMAN, Ms. NORTON, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. TORRES of New York, and Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia):

H. Res. 401. A resolution expressing support for designation of the month of May 2021 as ''National Child Poverty Prevention Month''; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. SHERMAN (for himself and Mr. CHABOT):

H. Res. 402. A resolution recognizing the devastating impact of COVID-19 in India and expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to COVID assistance to India; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

## 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. THOMPSON of Mississippi:
H.R. 3233.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8
By Mr. DUNN:
H.R. 3234.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8
By Mr. OWENS:
H.R. 3235.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18
By Ms. SALAZAR:
H.R. 3236.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I Section 8
By Ms. DELAURO:
H.R. 3237.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The principal constitutional authority for this legislation is clause 7 of section 9 of article I of the Constitution of the United States (the appropriation power), which states:
''No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law . . . .''
In addition, clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution (the spending power) provides:
''The Congress shall have the Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States . . . ''
Together, these specific constitutional provisions establish the congressional power of the purse, granting Congress the authority to appropriate funds, to determine their purpose, amount, and period of availability, and to set forth terms and conditions governing their use.
By Ms. ESCOBAR:
H.R. 3238.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Constitutional Authority—Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. I, Sec. 8, Clause 18)
THE U.S. CONSTITUTION
ARTICLE I, SECTION 8: POWERS OF CONGRESS
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. FITZGERALD:
H.R. 3239.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, section 8, clause 18.
By Mr. AMODEI:
H.R. 3240.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.
By Ms. BUSH:
H.R. 3241.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, section 1 of the Constitution
By Mr. BLUMENAUER:
H.R. 3242.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8
By Mr. CLEAVER:
H.R. 3243.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I of the U.S. Constitution
By Mr. CROW:
H.R. 3244.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuan to the following:
Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the Constitution
By Ms. ESCOBAR:
H.R. 3245.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8.
By Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois:
H.R. 3246.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I Section 8
By Ms. GARCIA of Texas:
H.R. 3247.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
''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; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;''
Article 1, Section 8
By Mr. GUEST:
H.R. 3248.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8
By Mr. HICE of Georgia:
H.R. 3249.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 9, Clause 7 and Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution of the United States, which together establish the congressional power of the purse, granting Congress the authority to appropriate funds, to determine their purpose, amount, and period of availability, and to set forth terms and conditions governing their use; and, Article I, Section 8, clause 18 of the United States Constitution, which grants the Congress 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 in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.''
By Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH:
H.R. 3250.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.
By Ms. KUSTER:
H.R. 3251.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution, the Taxing and Spending Clause: ''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 . . . ''
By Mr. LAMB:
H.R. 3252.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution
By Mrs. LESKO:
H.R. 3253.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution
By Mr. LOUDERMILK:
H.R. 3254.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8
By Mr. NORCROSS:
H.R. 3255.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8
By Mr. PERRY:
H.R. 3256.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section VIII of the United States Constitution
By Mr. SCHRADER:
H.R. 3257.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
U.S. Const. art. 1, §1; and
U.S. Const. art. 1, §8, cl. 18.
By Ms. SEWELL:
H.R. 3258.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.
By Ms. SEWELL:
H.R. 3259.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.
By Mr. SHERMAN:
H.R. 3260.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution.
By Ms. SPANBERGER:
H.R. 3261.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article l, Section 8
By Mr. UPTON:
H.R. 3262.
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

## ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 3: Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. WILD, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. SLOTKIN, Ms. CRAIG, Mr. CASTEN, and Mr. COOPER.
H.R. 58: Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina.
H.R. 82: Ms. DEAN.
H.R. 204: Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. ROSS, Mr. PERLMUTTER, and Mr. KILDEE.
H.R. 210: Mrs. AXNE, Ms. ROSS, Mr. COMER, Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN, Mr. FEENSTRA, and Mr. KILDEE.
H.R. 310: Mr. ARRINGTON.
H.R. 377: Mr. JACKSON.
H.R. 378: Mr. BUCSHON and Mr. JACKSON.
H.R. 503: Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia.
H.R. 571: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER and Mr. AUCHINCLOSS.
H.R. 669: Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin.
H.R. 787: Mrs. LESKO.
H.R. 815: Mr. SIRES, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Ms. MATSUI.
H.R. 825: Mr. LYNCH, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. DESAULNIER, and Mr. CARSON.

H.R. 859: Mr. GOOD of Virginia and Mr. DAVIDSON.
H.R. 921: Ms. JACOBS of California.
H.R. 959: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.
H.R. 1011: Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS.
H.R. 1018: Mr. RYAN.
H.R. 1022: Mr. HARDER of California and Mr. REED.
H.R. 1057: Mr. GUEST, Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS, and Mr. STAUBER.
H.R. 1068: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 1179: Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina and Mr. KIM of New Jersey.
H.R. 1193: Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. HARDER of California, Mr. DELGADO, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. VELA, Mrs. KIM of California, Mr. HUDSON, and Ms. CRAIG.
H.R. 1210: Mr. AMODEI.
H.R. 1238: Mrs. HAYES, Mr. CARSON, and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 1255: Mrs. KIM of California, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. NORCROSS, and Mr. YARMUTH.
H.R. 1297: Mr. LAMALFA.
H.R. 1346: Ms. KUSTER, Mrs. KIM of California, and Mrs. STEEL.
H.R. 1352: Mr. EVANS and Mr. CROW.
H.R. 1447: Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. PALLONE, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, Mr. TONKO, Ms. NEWMAN, Mr. KILMER, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. KILDEE, and Ms. ROSS.
H.R. 1455: Ms. TITUS, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia.
H.R. 1488: Ms. SPANBERGER.
H.R. 1551: Ms. NORTON and Mr. TRONE.
H.R. 1614: Ms. NORTON, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.
H.R. 1693: Ms. TLAIB and Mr. RASKIN.
H.R. 1699: Mr. BURGESS.
H.R. 1730: Ms. WILD.
H.R. 1745: Mr. MEUSER, Mr. CLINE, Mr. GARBARINO, Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr. HERN, Mr. FEENSTRA, Mr. TIMMONS, Mr. KIND, Mrs. LESKO, and Ms. KELLY of Illinois.
H.R. 1819: Mr. BROWN.
H.R. 1842: Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia.
H.R. 1863: Mr. SIRES.
H.R. 1884: Mr. KAHELE.
H.R. 1916: Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mrs. TORRES of California, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. CORREA, Mr. HIMES, Mr. STEIL, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. CASTEN.
H.R. 1931: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER and Mr. KIM of New Jersey.
H.R. 1960: Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. DEUTCH, and Mr. SOTO.
H.R. 1966: Mr. SABLAN.
H.R. 1986: Mr. GALLEGO.
H.R. 2027: Mr. CASE, Ms. ROSS, and Mr. KILDEE.
H.R. 2028: Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. NADLER, and Mr. LIEU.
H.R. 2030: Mr. TRONE, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. CAWTHORN, Mr. SABLAN, and Mr. LAHOOD.
H.R. 2033: Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 2085: Mr. PAPPAS.
H.R. 2096: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. TAKANO, and Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H.R. 2138: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 2143: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. KIM of New Jersey, Ms. SEWELL, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. MFUME, Ms. OMAR, Mr. SWALWELL, Mr. LAHOOD, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, and Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio.
H.R. 2198: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. SCANLON, Ms. JACOBS of California, and Ms. BONAMICI.
H.R. 2225: Mr. CASE, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. WILD, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Mr. PERLMUTTER.
H.R. 2229: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
H.R. 2258: Mr. DIAZ-BALART.
H.R. 2329: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 2347: Ms. MANNING and Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas.
H.R. 2480: Mr. VELA.
H.R. 2517: Mr. O'HALLERAN.
H.R. 2533: Mr. KILDEE.
H.R. 2558: Mrs. LESKO, Mr. GOODEN of Texas, Mr. MOORE of Alabama, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. COMER, Mr. NEWHOUSE, and Mr. HUDSON.
H.R. 2575: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
H.R. 2586: Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. WELCH, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. CICILLINE, and Mr. HARDER of California.
H.R. 2598: Mr. DESAULNIER.
H.R. 2637: Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS.
H.R. 2639: Mrs. WALORSKI.
H.R. 2654: Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. ARMSTRONG, Mr. COMER, and Mr. MASSIE.
H.R. 2695: Ms. ROSS, Ms. WILD, Ms. HOULAHAN, Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. PERLMUTTER, and Mr. SHERMAN.
H.R. 2794: Mr. WELCH, Ms. NEWMAN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 2811: Mrs. BEATTY.
H.R. 2840: Mr. LANGEVIN.
H.R. 2920: Mr. CÁRDENAS and Mr. VARGAS.
H.R. 2962: Ms. FOXX.
H.R. 2998: Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. COHEN, Mr. COOPER, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. ESPAILLAT, and Mr. JONES.
H.R. 3012: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. ARMSTRONG, Mrs. CAMMACK, and Mr. MEUSER.
H.R. 3063: Ms. OMAR and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 3080: Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. JACKSON, and Mr. ALLEN.
H.R. 3088: Mr. CROW, Mr. CASE, Ms. DEGETTE, and Ms. NEWMAN.
H.R. 3090: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 3098: Mr. HERN and Mrs. FISCHBACH.
H.R. 3101: Mr. EMMER.
H.R. 3104: Mr. MOONEY, Mr. MOORE of Alabama, and Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina.
H.R. 3105: Mr. PERLMUTTER.
H.R. 3114: Mr. POCAN and Ms. BARRAGÁN.
H.R. 3126: Ms. PINGREE and Mr. SIRES.
H.R. 3134: Mr. GOHMERT and Mr. DAVIDSON.
H.R. 3135: Mrs. AXNE, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. CASTEN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KILMER, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. PAPPAS, Ms. PORTER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SIRES, Ms. TITUS, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.
H.R. 3136: Mr. GOSAR.
H.R. 3137: Mr. MCHENRY and Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina.
H.R. 3140: Mrs. BOEBERT.
H.R. 3148: Mr. GOHMERT.
H.R. 3155: Mrs. HINSON and Ms. PORTER.
H.R. 3179: Mr. GOHMERT and Mr. DAVIDSON.
H.R. 3202: Mr. SESSIONS.
H.R. 3217: Mr. GOSAR.
H. J. Res. 11: Mr. DUNN.
H. Con. Res. 33: Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. TIMMONS, Mr. STAUBER, Mr. PERRY, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. KEATING, Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana, Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, and Mr. GALLAGHER.
H. Res. 47: Mr. SAN NICOLAS.
H. Res. 145: Mr. DESAULNIER.
H. Res. 160: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
H. Res. 275: Ms. HOULAHAN, Ms. WEXTON, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. MALINOWSKI, Mr. KEATING, Mr. JONES, Mrs. DEMINGS, Ms. PORTER, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. COSTA, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. SOTO, and Mr. CASE.
H. Res. 283: Mr. JACOBS of New York.
H. Res. 329: Ms. TENNEY, Mr. FITZGERALD, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. CLINE, Mr. DUNN, and Mr. CHABOT.
H. Res. 352: Mr. EMMER, Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia, and Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER.
H. Res. 368: Mr. CASE, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. BASS, Mr. SABLAN, Ms. PINGREE, and Mr. DEFAZIO.
H. Res. 386: Mrs. SPARTZ.
H. Res. 392: Mr. CASE.
H. Res. 394: Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. BENTZ, Mrs. HARSHBARGER, Ms. SALAZAR, Mr. CLYDE, and Mr. HUDSON.
H. Res. 396: Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. HERN, Mr. GIMENEZ, and Mr. LATURNER.

## CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY MS. DELAURO

H.R. 3237, making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2021, and for other purposes, does not contain any congressional earmark, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

## DISCHARGE PETITIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XV, the following discharge petition was filed:

Petition 4, May 11, 2021, by Mr. PERRY on House Resolution 160, was signed by the following Members: Mr. Perry, Mr. Babin, Mr. Posey, Mrs. McClain, Mr. Roy, Mr. Steube, Mr. Jackson, Mrs. Boebert, Mr. Budd, Mr. LaMalfa, and Mrs. Cammack.

## DISCHARGE PETITIONS—ADDITIONS AND WITHDRAWALS

The following Members added their names to the following discharge petitions:

Petition 1 by Mrs. CAMMACK on House Resolution 274: Ms. Stefanik, and Mr. Wilson of South Carolina.

Petition 2 by Mr. ROY on House Resolution 216: Mr. Wilson of South Carolina, Mrs. McClain, Mr. Feenstra, and Mr. Clyde.

Petition 3 by Mr. ROY on House Resolution 292: Mr. Budd, Mr. Bishop of North Carolina, Mr. Babin, Mr. Posey, Mrs. McClain, Mr. Gosar, Mr. Emmer, Mr. Higgins of Louisiana, Mrs. Greene of Georgia, Mr. Clyde, Mr. Massie, Mr. Mooney, Mr. Gohmert, Mr. Armstrong, Mr. Lamborn, Mr. Westerman, Mr. Carl, Mr. Gibbs, Mr. Carter of Georgia, Mr. Fallon, Mr. Hudson, and Mr. Allen.